LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Major to lieutenant colonel

Joyner, Jere P., [redacted]

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Marshall, Gerald W., [redacted]

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain (Medical)

Dumas, Paul A., [redacted]

To be first lieutenant (Dental)

Engelmeier, Robert L., [redacted]
Hill Robert L., [redacted]
Rome, William J., [redacted]

To be first lieutenant (Dental)

Benenati, Fred W., [redacted]
Waldrop, Thomas C., [redacted]

The following-named Air Force officers for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code:

LINE OF AIR FORCE

To be colonel

De Sandros, Louis J., [redacted]

To be lieutenant colonel

Lakeman, Lyndon F., [redacted]
Robertson, Howard N., [redacted]

To be captain

Hokins, Albert H., [redacted]

The following-named Air Force officer for reappointment to the active list of Regular Air Force, in the grade of colonel, Regular Air Force, under the provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code with active duty grade of temporary brigadier general, in accordance with sections 8442 and 8447, title 10, United States Code:

To be colonel

Segura, Wiltz P., [redacted]

The following-named Air Force officer for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade of major, Regular Air Force, under the provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code with active duty grade of temporary lieutenant colonel, in accordance with sections 8442 and 8447, title 10, United States Code:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Welch, William J., Jr., [redacted]

The following-named persons for appointment as Reserve of the Air Force, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 593, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation as medical officers, under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Bacon, Glenn A., [redacted]
Conley, Charles C., [redacted]
Malone, Franklin J., Jr., [redacted]
Manley, Charles G., [redacted]
Metcalf, John S., Jr., [redacted]
Orr, Samuel R., [redacted]
Sachs, David (NMN), [redacted]
Snedeker, James R., [redacted]
Waldmann, Robert P., [redacted]

To be lieutenant colonel

Almand, James R., Jr., [redacted]
Statti, Thomas F., [redacted]
Suarez, Pura N., [redacted]

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Air Force under appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. Officer is subject to physical examination required by law:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

First lieutenant to captain

Graser, John C., [redacted]

The following-named persons for appointment as temporary officers in the U.S. Air Force, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8444 and 8447, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation as medical officers, under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Anderson, Duane D., [redacted]
Brichta, Edgar S., [redacted]
Dear, Steven R., [redacted]
Del Priore, Joseph A., [redacted]
Huitt, Carlton D., [redacted]
Rollyson, John D., [redacted]
Statti, Thomas F., [redacted]
Suarez, Pura N., [redacted]
Uhrman, Richard A., [redacted]

The following-named officer for appointment as a Reserve of the Air Force, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 593 and 1211, title 10, United States Code:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

Shea, Jerrold J., [redacted]

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Vincent P. de Poix, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, when retired, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

I nominate Lt. Gens. Foster C. LaHue, George C. Axtell, and Robert P. Keller, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with the provisions of title 10, U.S. Code, section 5233.

Having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, U.S. Code, section 5232, Maj. Gens. John N. McLaughlin, Edward S. Fris, and Robert L. Nichols, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, August 2, 1974:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 8066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 8066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Winton W. Marshall, [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

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

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Col. John W. White, [redacted] Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

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

To be lieutenant general

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

IN THE NAVY

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

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

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

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL TO MEET IN CHICAGO THIS MONTH

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, later this month a bipartisan group of conservative State legislators from across the country will meet in Chicago at a conference of the newly formed American Legislative Exchange Council. These legislators are uniting to try to reverse the trend toward greater and greater centralization of power in Washington. They will try to revitalize our Federal system by strengthening State government.

The Federal Government, in their view, and mine, is not only too far removed from—and insensitive to—the problems of education, taxation, welfare reform, crime, et al.; these legislators are convinced, and I agree, that the Federal Government is the cause, all too often, of the very problems which the States are called upon to solve. Worse, Federal bureaucracy too often discourages action by the States and local governments.

But reversing the present flow of authority and power toward Washington, D.C., will not likely be accomplished by action at the Federal level. It is the exception, rather than the rule, when any level of government readily relinquishes even a part of its authority. It is demonstrable that governmental powers have a momentum all their own.

Thomas Jefferson is credited with the precept that the government is best which governs least. I wholeheartedly concur. I do not believe that the cradle-

to-grave paternalism of the modern welfare state was in the minds of our Founding Fathers when they conceived the American Republic. It is not from lack of compassion that conservatives favor limited government, but from the deep-seated fear of the abuse of power. Surely, in this century, that fear has been borne out. It it no cliche to say that a government big enough to give us anything we want is big enough to take away everything we have.

Therefore, it seems obvious that decentralization of government is the most fundamental and urgent task before us today. If ever reform was needed in our public institutions, it is now; and the way to achieve it is by the reversal of the trend toward big brother government.

Through a conservative legislative initiative, the American Legislative Exchange Council hopes to galvanize our State governments into reclaiming for themselves the prerogatives and responsibilities that were once theirs. This type of initiative and enthusiasm is sorely needed at the State and local level to keep our Republic from sinking into the swamps of economic and moral stagnation. I wish these fine State legislators every success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Statement of Purpose" of the American Legislative Exchange Council be presented in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

We, as conservative legislators, believe that the unique American Federal system requires close cooperation and consultation among Members of Legislatures in the several States, and Members of Congress.

That belief springs from a conservative philosophical premise that nothing should be undertaken by a higher echelon of government which can be accomplished by a lower echelon and that individual freedom demands strict limitations on the power of all levels of government.

We further believe that State governments are vital to the continued success of our Federal Union and that the genius of our Constitution is summed up in the primary clause which delegates residual powers to the States and to the people in those spheres not specifically delegated to the national government.

We therefore establish the American Legislative Exchange Council:

1. To assist conservative legislators in the States and in the Congress by sharing research information and staff support facilities.

2. To establish a clearinghouse for conservative bills at the State legislature level and to provide for a bill exchange program.

3. To disseminate model conservative legislation in all fifty State legislatures and among several thousand legislators. Also, to promote the introduction of companion bills in Congress and in the States, including resolutions on amendments to the Constitution and State resolutions which memorialize the Congress to act in specific areas.

4. To improve communication between conservative State legislators and Members of Congress.

5. To formulate conservative action programs and legislative initiatives which will help to promote federalism by strengthening the position of State governments and to define conservative positions on intergovernmental relations.

AMERICA CANNOT ABANDON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to an article in today's Washington Post which clarifies the unfortunate effects on the Captive Nations of the current "détente" policy of the U.S. Government.

I believe it is most important that Members of Congress remember that policies made here in Washington can directly affect the lives, the hopes, and the dreams of millions of captive peoples—human beings who must daily endure the oppression and humiliation of Communist totalitarianism. We cannot ignore the just aspirations of these peoples to be free and to determine for themselves the type of government they wish to have.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 2, 1974]

"CAPTIVE NATIONS" AND DÉTENTE

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

"Captive Nations Week" came and went without much fuss last week. The particular kind of ethnic anti-Communism which the "captive nations" concept represents—the "captives" being the nations and nationality groups incorporated within the Soviet Union plus the East European States dominated by Moscow—has been pretty much eclipsed by detente.

Mr. Nixon has indicated firmly that it is not possible to try to improve relations with the Soviet government while at the same time trying openly to cultivate the nationalistic and even secessionist impulses of Moscow's constituent parts and allies.

Typically, the United States' annual ritual appeals for the "self determination" of the Baltic States, incorporated by Moscow as World War II began, ended as soon as President Nixon became a regular summiteer. At the last summit, Mr. Nixon agreed to establish a U.S. consulate in Kiev—a step regarded by the Kremlin and by Ukrainian Nationalists alike as a symbolic denial of Ukrainian nationhood. The two American radio stations broadcasting specifically to the "captive nations," Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, constantly wonder if they will survive the next summit.

Mr. Nixon's own "Captive Nation Proclamation" has become the faintest shadow of the original growling, anti-Russian, anti-communist resolution passed by Congress in 1959.

Yet the underlying issues do not easily go away. The "nations" themselves—some more, some less—remain undigested parts of the Soviet polity and the Soviet block. No sober analysis of the Soviet scene can ignore the tugs and pulls of, say, the Ukrainians and the Poles. Certainly the Kremlin takes these into the closest account in developing its own basic policies, from where it invests its money to where it stations its troops.

On the face of it, there is no apparent reason—except politics—why, say, Palestinians deserve a state of their own, as Moscow asserts, while a number of Soviet nationality groups, larger and with equal national credentials, are denied even the lesser goal of a genuine nationality group existence.

The connection of "human rights" to detente has been widely accepted in recent years, mostly in respect to Jews, intellectuals and dissenters inside the Soviet Union. And they pose no *territorial* challenge to the Kremlin. Their causes are certainly legitimate. But it is plain that at least part of the reason why their plight has become politicized is that each of these groups (they overlap) has a recognizable constituency within the United States.

In abstract terms, the cultural or national aspirations of the "captive nations" are hardly less legitimate. Yet their American spokesmen do not have the same political leverage.

The realities of American politics, then, have an effect on which people or peoples controlled by Moscow win active American concern. The realities of geopolitics also have an effect. Successive American Presidents have cultivated local nationalism in, first, Yugoslavia and, then Romania—Communist states which for their own reasons have chosen to assert a measure of independence from the Kremlin. The White House has done this for the purpose of strengthening the American hand in dealing with the Russians.

Like Yugoslavia, however Romania, which sits off in the southwest corner of the Soviet Union, has by virtue of geography a degree of political maneuverability which is simply unavailable to a country like Czechoslovakia which directly connects the Soviet Union with Germany. This in turn affects the degree of encouragement which any responsible American President can proffer.

The fact remains that the United States has no comprehensive strategy to free "captive nations." On the contrary, detente and the discipline necessarily imposed by the nuclear responsibility of a great power rule out much more than tentative efforts to remove certain symptoms of their plight. This is painful; some small part of the pain could perhaps be relieved if the rest of us looked with more sympathy at the very human emotions which touch many Americans whose kinsmen lived hard lives under Communist rule, but it is unavoidable.

Here it is useful to recall the time when the U.S. did have such a comprehensive strategy. According to a credible, though officially denied account in "Operation Splinter Factor," a new book by British journalist Stewart Steven, Allen Dulles set out to liberate East Europe by destroying liberal nationalistic Communists in those countries, thus provoking a Stalinist repression that would ignite a successful popular revolt. This fantastic operation called "Splinter Factor," may indeed have contributed to Stalinist repression. It certainly did not free East Europe. A more cynical and disastrous policy is hard to imagine. Its lessons linger.

POSSIBLE REVISION OF SENATE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL RULES

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in Extensions of Remarks a copy of my letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee regarding possible revision of Senate impeachment trial rules.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1974.

Hon. HOWARD W. CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, Senate Office Building.

MY DEAR HOWARD: I received your notice that your Committee will hold a hearing Monday on possible revision of the Senate impeachment trial rules.

Briefly, my view is this:

1. If and when the impeachment trial begins, the Senate should continue on this to the exclusion of all other business (excepting emergency matters) and should meet six days a week, and probably eight hours a day.

2. The present rules should be changed to the minimum extent possible and any changes should be as simple and concise as possible.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

RETAIN THE GI BILL

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been much discussion about whether the educational benefits conferred by the GI bill of rights should be terminated. I, for one, feel that this would be a serious and harmful mistake. Many young people would never have become the educated and productive citizens that they now are if they would have been deprived of their educational benefits. It is especially cruel to cut back the scholarships of young men and women who have served their country nobly and well.

On July 16, 1974, an editorial appeared in the San Jose Mercury concerning this issue. This editorial characterizes well the results that would occur if these educational benefits were to be discontinued. Mr. Speaker, I insert this piece into the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

RETAIN THE GI BILL

Congress and the Nixon administration should find other ways to balance the federal budget than by ending the educational benefits conferred by the GI Bill of Rights.

Both administration and congressional sources reported last week that termination of the GI Bill is under active consideration primarily for three reasons:

1. Wartime service is no longer involved.

2. The services are now all-volunteer; there are no more involuntary draftees in uniform.

3. Pay and allowances are now high enough to attract career military personnel; consequently, "fringe benefits," such as the GI Bill, are no longer needed or justified.

Granting the validity of all three assertions, they do not, nonetheless, add up to an adequate reason for terminating the GI Bill.

Education in and of itself is a positive benefit, both to the individual who absorbs it and to the society of which he becomes a more productive member because of his education.

Literally millions of young men and women who served in the armed services during World War II were educated under the GI Bill, and it is not overstating the point to insist that they would not have gone to college, or university or trade and professional schools had it not been for the financial help they received from Uncle Sam. Today those individuals are for the most part the taxpaying backbone of the nation's citizenry. The government's investment in their education has been repaid many-fold.

The same reasons that made the GI Bill a good investment for America in the 1940's make it a good investment today. The more broadly educated a nation's citizenry the more that nation's freedoms and prosperity are assured.

Self-government presupposes an educated, actively participating citizenry. In school or out Americans must continue to learn if they are to meet the mounting challenges of self-government in a complex, technological age.

Further, the so-called "civilian" aids to education, student loans and the like, are pitifully inadequate to the task. The GI Bill is needed to bolster and augment these efforts.

Finally, it is at least arguable that a great many of today's military volunteers might not have signed on at all if there had been no prospect of educational assistance after their time in uniform had elapsed.

No, Congress should not abandon the GI Bill of Rights. Other budget cuts are far more defensible.

MIA'S AND POW'S: A REAFFIRMATION

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest the July 23 remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD applauding the Iowa Republican State Convention for including a proamnesty plank in its platform. I am asking that the following article from my weekly newsletter be printed in the RECORD. Hopefully the content will reflect the views of millions of Americans who feel that our missing heroes should not be forgotten or ignored.

The newsletter follows:

MIA'S AND POW'S: A REAFFIRMATION

It was with utter and stunned disbelief that I read the platforms of both political parties in Iowa for 1974. In totally incomprehensible moves, both parties now cry for amnesty. The Democratic platform shamefully seeks to erase all vestiges of the Vietnam War by proffering *immediate, unconditional* amnesty to those who deserted this country by choice. The Republican statement was nearly as offensive.

Incredibly, neither party made any mention of the 1,200 valiant servicemen missing in action and the prisoners of war still unaccounted for in Southeast Asia. *These* were the noble soldiers who, as Lincoln once said, gave their last full measure of devotion that the nation might survive.

Both parties should hang their heads in shame to espouse such intolerable policies of amnesty, for in so doing they *honor* the *dishonored*. But more deplorable by far is the position of obscurity to which they would relegate those who demonstrated their courage. Is *this* the way we would repay the valor of men who made the supreme sacrifice? Is this how we pay tribute to the unwavering defenders of our nation by voiding their devotion and mettle? Have political futures become so dear that we would callously spurn the courage of men who perhaps did not agree with the war, but met their obligations nevertheless. Is *this* the new America? If it is, then heaven help the republic.

We are asked to forgive and forget. Does this mean we forgive those who selfishly valued personal safety over moral obligations of duty and honor? With faint hearts, the Vietnam deserters and draft dodgers willingly chose the protection and security of Sweden and Canada, a comfortable choice compared to the squalid cells our MIA's and POW's endured. We must not forsake the young men who made the difficult decision to answer the call of duty. The odious suggestion of amnesty has *no defense* in its sheer lack of accountability to the dauntless American heroes and the families who agonized in their continuing absence. Because of these selfless sacrifices, we can pursue our way of life and continue a democratic form of government. Yet, how easily we forget the sacrifices of so many. Until all MIA's and POW's are returned home or fully accounted for, I cannot forgive, nor will I forget.

Forgive and forget . . . the words smack of sentiment that is yet too early. For how can we forget the Gold Star mother with tears breaking over her cheeks, or the young wife who waits in anguished limbo for a husband who may never return, or the reoccurring sadness of children with no one to call father? It is for them that our compassion and sympathy is reserved, not for those who turned their backs on this country and fled. Until our lasting obligation to the MIA's, POW's and their families is fulfilled, we cannot forgive.

Perhaps the best answer to amnesty can be found at Arlington National Cemetery on any Memorial Day. As young children play in the grass, their mothers kneel by gravesides and remember the father these children will never know. For them, the question of amnesty has only one answer. If we truly cherish the men who paid the ultimate price for their country, we cannot now welcome with open arms those who gave nothing.

My flag hangs at half mast!

THE COSTLY GRAIN TRANSACTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, chaired by Senator JACKSON, has just concluded its study and issued its report on United States-Russian grain transactions. The subcommittee's findings corroborate the GAO study done last year which labeled the Russian wheat deal the most irresponsible, mismanaged, and costly grain transaction in our history.

The subcommittee's findings also back up my belief that we must establish a mechanism to prevent in the future the kind of economic disaster that accompanied the Soviet wheat deal. Any massive or mismanaged export agreement can be catastrophic, both in terms of our own economy, and our ability to respond to hardship in other areas of the world. This is why I introduced H.R. 10844, the Export Priorities Act, to establish an orderly procedure for the allocation of our food supplies and to prevent future mas-

sive giveaways like the Russian wheat agreement. If Congress fails to mandate by law a monitoring and restraining of our food export program, we will continue to lack the assurance that another Soviet wheat deal cannot take place.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent article that appeared in the Long Island Press which discusses the Soviet grain transaction and cites the subcommittee's report. I would also urge my colleagues to take a good look at the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee report.

The article follows:

[From the Long Island Press]

THE BITTER CHAFF OF THE WHEAT DEAL

Most Americans would agree that it is far better to do business with the Soviet Union than engage in economic, let alone military, brinkmanship.

However, that doesn't excuse the deal the White House engineered two years ago, in which we sold Russia 700 million bushels of wheat—25 per cent of that year's crop.

The Russians and large American grain companies reaped a rich harvest in grain and profits, respectively, but the market price of grain skyrocketed here. Thanks to the resultant shortage. Moreover, the price the Soviets paid was so low that the transaction wound up on the red side of the U.S. taxpayers' ledger.

A Senate subcommittee concludes that the deal was ineptly managed from the start. The subcommittee chairman, Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., charged that the sale was born, nurtured, and consummated in a climate of secrecy and bureaucratic negligence.

The subcommittee calls this a sad illustration of how "in pursuit of a worthwhile goal, government programs and officials can go astray." It also shows that doing business with other countries is another function that has been usurped by the White House instead of being shared with a fully informed Congress. That, too, must stop.

WISCONSIN STATE JOURNAL CALLS FOR NIXON IMPEACHMENT

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Madison Wisconsin State Journal, which is the largest daily newspaper published in my congressional district and which traditionally represents the viewpoint of the Republican Party, has editorially recommended, on August 2, 1974, the impeachment of Mr. Nixon. The editorial follows:

IMPEACH NIXON

The House of Representatives has no reasonable choice than to impeach President Nixon.

His guilt or innocence of the articles of impeachment alleging the obstruction of justice, abuse of power and spurning House committee subpenas, will be decided by the Senate.

In the Upper House the trial of the President would follow many of the procedures of a court trial for a criminal offense. Both the House, acting as the prosecutor, and the President, would be allowed to present witnesses and evidence. The President would be allowed counsel and the right to cross examine. The trial would be presided over by the Chief Justice of the United States.

Although many Americans have already declared the President guilty as charged, the presumption of innocence has the same weight when the President is involved as when any other citizen is involved.

The immediate question, however, is impeachment, whether the President should be put to trial.

The alternatives are unthinkable.

If the President is not impeached, future presidents would, in effect, be given blanket immunity to use the same methods to punish political enemies and impede justice that Nixon is accused of using.

The renowned historian, Arthur Schlesinger Jr. wrote recently:

"If it declines to impeach Mr. Nixon, Congress will instruct all his successors that nothing he has done constitutes an impeachable offense and that, if future presidents are prepared to run the political risk, they are constitutionally entitled to do the same things themselves.

"They will be free not to execute the laws faithfully; not to be responsible for the criminal acts of their closest associates; not to be limited in any deed they wish to commit in the name of national security; not to be restrained in any order, however improper they wish to issue to government agencies; and not to be worried hereafter by any prospect of impeachment.

"What is at stake, in short, is the theory in Senator Ervin's phrase of 'the constitutional omnipotence of the President.' 'There is no worse heresy,' wrote the great historian Lord Acton, 'than that the office sanctifies the holder of it.' Congress has it within its power in the next three months to vote that heresy down or to vote it up."

It is not just President Nixon and the current generation of Americans who are involved, but the future course of this republic for generations to come.

MOCK CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON ISSUES IN GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1974, I was privileged to be present as a theme session panelist at the annual convention of the American Personnel & Guidance Association in New Orleans. This program offered an unusual, and I believe innovative educational experience, to the 9,000 guidance, Counseling Education, State University counseling, and student personnel workers assembled for this convention—a mock congressional hearing. Sharing the panel with me was my distinguished colleague, Mr. WILLIAM LEHMAN, of Florida, and the panel's chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

In a 3-hour format, five witnesses from APGA—Mrs. Thelma T. Daley, chairman, guidance department, Overlea Senior High School, Baltimore, Md.; Dr. Norman C. Gysbers, associate professor of education, University of Missouri, Columbia; Dr. Marceline E. Jaques, professor and director, rehabilitation counseling program, Department of New York at Buffalo; Mr. Charles E. Odell, consultant on manpower services, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Industry, Harrisburg, Pa.; and Dr. Allan W. Purdy, director, student financial aid services, University of Missouri—presented testimony before our panel. They outlined the major legislative concerns of their profession within the guidance and counseling subdisciplines of elementary and secondary guidance, career guidance, rehabilitation counseling, employment counseling, and higher education and financial aid. The panelists questioned each witness about their testimony and the program concluded with audience participation from the 2,000 assembled conventioneers in attendance.

I particularly commend to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the full statements of each witness, contained in the document "Issues in Guidance and Counseling," available from the American Personnel & Guidance Association. From the positive feedback I have received, I unhesitatingly recommend this type program as an example of an outstanding means of educating the citizenry in the intricacies of the hearing and legislative processes. APGA members, their headquarters staff, board of directors, and government relations committee should be proud of their fine efforts in this endeavor.

CIA INTERFERENCE IN THE FORMATION OF FOREIGN POLICY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the New York Times, Friday that the CIA has been instructed by top officials of the Nixon administration not to interfere in the internal affairs of Greece nor to play favorites among Greek politicians.

While I applaud the decision to stop CIA intervention into Greek internal affairs, this disclosure is one more piece of evidence that keeps mounting and mounting that the CIA has been and is unlawfully intervening in the internal affairs of countries around the world. Hopefully, it will not be necessary to wait for any more disclosures of CIA indiscretions before Congress will act to limit CIA intervention in the formation of this country's foreign policy.

The text of the New York Times article follows:

UNITED STATES SAID TO ORDER CIA TO CURTAIL ROLE IN GREECE

(By David Binder)

WASHINGTON, August 1.—The Central Intelligence Agency has reportedly been instructed by top officials of the Nixon Admin-

istration not to interfere in the internal affairs of Greece nor to play favorites among Greek politicians.

These orders, according to well-placed officials, reflect the current thinking of Secretary of State Kissinger and of the Director of Central Intelligence, William E. Colby—that Americans should keep out of the politics of other countries as much as possible. The C.I.A. is said to have been deeply involved in Greek politics for 25 years.

Until the last few weeks of the Athens military junta, according to high American officials and to Greek sources, American operatives remained quite close to the men in power in Greece.

A United States specialist on Greece said that the C.I.A. continued to maintain about 60 full-time operatives in Greece and that some had been there 15 years or longer.

The agency, the specialist said, had close contact not only with George Papadopoulos, the Greek colonel who led the 1967 coup, but also with his successor, Brig. Gen. Demetrios Ioannides.

Mr. Papadopoulos, who was deposed last November, was among many Greek political and military figures who received personal subsidies over many years from the intelligence agency, two United States officials said. Another source said Mr. Papadopoulos had received money from the agency since 1952.

The C.I.A. stopped its subsidies for Greek political figures about two years ago, a high American official said.

The operative closest to General Ioannides was said to have been Peter Koromilas, a Greek-American who also went by the name of Korom. An American official said Mr. Koromilas had been sent to Athens to confer with General Ioannides shortly before the July 15 coup in Cyprus, which was headed by Greek officers.

"PAPADOPOULOS IS MY BOY"

James M. Potts, the agency's station chief in Athens from 1968 to 1972, was described as having been on close terms throughout his stay there with Mr. Papadopoulos.

Mr. Potts was listed as a political officer in the American Embassy. He served earlier in Athens from 1960 to 1964 as deputy station chief of the intelligence agency.

A State Department official said that when Mr. Potts left Athens in August, 1972, his farewell party was attended by virtually every member of the military junta. The American Ambassador, Henry J. Tasca seeing who was present, turned and walked out, the source said, after which he sent a cablegram to Washington protesting Mr. Potts's action.

Mr. Tasca had adopted a chilly attitude toward the Athens junta and was appalled that the C.I.A. station chief would give a party that contradicted the position the American Ambassador had taken.

State Department officials who have served in Greece commented in background interviews on what they described as a negative role played in the past by the Central Intelligence Agency in Greek affairs.

One of them mentioned John M. Maury, the agency's station chief in Athens from 1962 to 1968.

"Maury worked on behalf of the palace in 1965," the official said.

"He helped King Constantine buy Center Union Deputies so that the George Papandreou Government was toppled."

Mr. Maury, 61, left the agency somewhat more than a year ago and is now Assistant Secretary of Defense for Congressional Relations.

Although generally leaning to Greek conservative politicians, the agency flirted briefly with the variant in Greek politics offered by George Papandreou and his Harvard-educated son, Andreas, in the early nineteen-sixties, a former Greek official said.

"In the beginning, say about 1962 or '63, the C.I.A. used Andreas as an agent, as a resource and supported him," the Greek said. "His buddy was Campbell," he added, referring to Laughlin A. Campbell, the C.I.A. station chief from 1959 to 1962.

AGENT REASSIGNED AFTER PROTEST

In his 1970 book, "Democracy at Gunpoint," Andreas Papandreou describes a scene in 1961 in which he had an altercation with Mr. Campbell.

Now retired and living in Washington, Mr. Campbell declined to talk with a reporter about his Greek service.

A knowledgeable Greek said that Stavis Milton, an operative who objected to the "cozy" relationship between the agency and the junta leaders over the last seven years, was moved out of Greece and sent to Iran and later to the Far East.

Mr. Milton was described as one of numerous Greek-Americans recruited by the agency in the early days of its operations in Greece. Another was said to be Thomas H. Karamessines, a 57-year-old New Yorker who served in Athens from 1947 to 1948, during the Greek struggle against Communist insurgents, then again as station chief from 1951 to 1953.

Mr. Karamessines rose to be head of the agency's clandestine services before his retirement, recently.

The Central Intelligence Agency also used enterprises of Thomas A. Pappas, the 75-year-old Greek-American industrialist, as a cover for its operations in Greece, according to the Greek source.

A spokesman at the headquarters of the agency, in Langley, Va., said he had no general comment on the allegations. He did say, however, that C.I.A. agents follow orders approved at the highest level in Washington.

IN MEMORY OF JACKSON B. CHASE

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remember, along with other Members of the House of Representatives, one of our former colleagues, Jackson B. Chase. A Nebraska Congressman from 1955 to 1957, Mr. Chase exemplified the dedicated leadership we all strive to achieve in public office.

Although born in Nebraska, he spent his early life in California and Illinois. He attended the University of Nebraska and graduated from the University of Michigan Law School in 1913. He began practicing law in Chicago, joined the Army during World War I, and then returned to Nebraska.

Public service started there when he became assistant attorney general for 2 years, 1921–22. Mr. Chase practiced law in Omaha from 1923 to 1942, when he once again interrupted his career to serve as a major in the Judge Advocate General's Department during World War II.

He was legal adviser to the Omaha Welfare Board in 1930–31 and a member of the State legislature in 1933–34. Mr. Chase served as chairman of the Nebraska Liquor Control Commission in 1945–46. In 1946 he was appointed judge of the Fourth Judicial District Court of Nebraska, was elected to the post in 1948 and again in 1952 and served until his resignation in 1954 to run for Congress. He was not a candidate for renomination in 1956, but did run again for the judicial post and held the position until 1960.

Throughout his career, Mr. Chase demonstrated a true concern, not only for the function of government, but for the people it represents. I know my colleagues join me in honoring the memory of this hard-working man, who served his State so well.

LAUDS SBA FOR OPENING DISASTER ASSISTANCE OFFICES

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the week of June 24, Pinellas County, Fla., most of which comprises my congressional district, received more than 20 inches of rain. This one week's total exceeded the total rainfall for the first 6 months of 1974. As a result, extensive flooding was caused throughout the county, not only in the flood-prone areas, and thousands of persons suffered excessive damage to their homes and property.

The State of Florida was rather slow in submitting the data required for a disaster declaration—removing the air of urgency of this situation. As a result, the Federal Disaster Assistance Administration and the President did not believe the damage was sufficient enough to warrant a major disaster declaration for the area. Both, however, recommend that the Small Business Administration's disaster relief program should be implemented. This would give the same assistance to the private property owner which would have been available had a disaster declaration by the President been issued. The Small Business Administration concurred, and it is now accepting applications for relief from private property owners in its Tampa and Miami field offices.

Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration did not initially plan to staff an office in Pinellas County—the county which was most severely struck by the torrential rains. Having brought this fact to the attention of SBA officials, I was pleased when they agreed to open two temporary disaster assistance offices in Pinellas County on Monday morning. One will be in St. Petersburg, the other in Largo.

This action by the Small Business Administration reaffirms my belief that it willingly and without delay makes itself accessible to people in need of emergency assistance, and I commend Mr. Kleppe and his staff for opening disaster relief offices in Pinellas County, so that the

Small Business Administration can meet its responsibilities to the people in greatest need without any unnecessary delay or inconvenience to them.

OMB PUSHES TRADE WITH REDS

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is indeed shameful to relate that the Office of Management and Budget has decided to end export promotion subsidies during fiscal year 1975. Here we are with more trade deficits looming ahead and OMB sees fit to reduce our efforts to expand trade. And—if this were not bad enough, there is going to be an exception to this policy. Promotion activities for trade with the Communist nations will continue. More wheat deals anyone? The story from the American Metal Market & Metalworking News of July 29, 1974, follows:

OMB HITS FED AGENCIES WITH MEMO CUTTING TRADE PROMOTION ACTIVITIES

(By Rick Belous)

WASHINGTON.—The White House' Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has issued an intragovernment memo telling federal agencies to end export promotion subsidies during fiscal year 1975, it was learned last week.

The OMB memo states that federal export promotion activities, except to communist countries, must operate "on a full cost recovery basis" during fiscal 1975.

Industry and government trade experts said this order will force the Commerce Department to reduce, and in many cases eliminate, most of its trade promotion activities.

Currently the Commerce Department sponsors numerous trade missions and operates trade centers in foreign countries.

According to these sources the OMB order will have the net effect on forcing the Commerce Department out of the trade mission business, except for communist countries.

The order will also force the Commerce Department to close most of its trade centers, except those in communist countries.

As reported in these columns, OMB seven weeks ago started an intense cost-benefit analysis of the federal government's trade promotion activities. One industry source, who was angered by the OMB move, claimed that the White House group had made up its mind to "use the knife" before the study was even started. A second industry source claimed "this cost-benefit analysis was just a sham."

Also, the OMB wants the Commerce Department to start billing firms for all trade services performed by American embassies. Currently United States embassies, as a matter of course, provide numerous free services and aid American firms doing business overseas.

OMB spokesmen have confirmed that a study is underway, but they have denied any firm decision has been made about trade missions and trade centers.

According to government sources, this OMB move will save the U.S. Treasury about $30-million a year, and the OMB decision is part federal budget cost cutting.

Metalworking and metal firms have increasingly used federal government trade promotion services. Many foreign trade deals have been the direct result of such services.

As one official put it, "the U.S. Treasury gets back more than this $30-million a year in added tax revenue created by expanded export sales.

Others point out that many foreign governments pay the entire cost of their trade missions. For example, one trade expert claimed that English Government "is picking up the entire tab for one of their trade missions coming there this year."

A second trade executive noted that the OMB move "will hurt the medium to small companies. The giant firms will be able to continue trade promotion. But what about the small company. Even if it has the $15,000 to shell out for homework and exploration of export sales, they still won't be able to get similar services."

OMB is also reportedly studying the Export-Import Bank and Domestic International Sales Corporations (DISC). Under the latter program, a firm is allowed to defer paying taxes on export sales.

The general thrust of "full cost recovery" so far is fait accompli, according to industry and government executives, but the OMB move can still be partially blocked, they insist.

Besides subsidies to Communist trade missions, the Federal Government may still subsidize trade promotion services for some "first place" deals. This would mean a firm, which has never traded in a specific area, could receive some subsidies on the first deal. But after this, "full cost recovery would be in effect.

THE DEATH OF WAYNE MORSE: A LOSS FOR RESPONSIBILITY IN POLITICS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, few public officials manage to retain their independence of mind and action in the face of intense pressures to compromise and conform. Wayne Morse was such a man. He personified a spirit of individual commitment and social responsibility throughout his 30 years of public service. He legislated and debated with great honesty and with greater vision than many of his contemporaries appreciated.

During his first term in the Senate, he demonstrated that his concern for the best interests of the people took priority over the constraints of party dogma. As a Republican, he aroused the ire of his fellow partisans by vigorously supporting President Truman's veto of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act. Senator Morse could not support the Presidential candidate and platform of his party in 1952, and he had the courage to act on his beliefs, returning to the Senate in 1953 as an Independent and then joining the Democratic Party in 1955.

In addition to his lasting interests in civil rights, education, and foreign policy, Senator Morse was among the earliest proponents of home rule for the District of Columbia, a goal we are only now beginning to achieve. But of all the independent positions which he took during his distinguished career, perhaps the most courageous was his opposition to the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in 1964. It is particularly tragic that, within 2 months, we have lost the two Senators, Senator Morse and Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska, who correctly anticipated the tragic consequences of American intervention in Vietnam.

Although Wayne Morse lost his bid for reelection to the Senate in 1964, he continued his active efforts against the Vietnam war and in support of human rights and the protection of the environment. It is fitting that this great man died doing what he loved most—speaking with the people of America, and telling them the truth.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE MORSE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I mark the passing of Wayne Morse, former Senator from Oregon, and wish to pay final tribute to this truly dedicated and moral man.

A strong and early critic of the Vietnam war, Morse will be remembered as one of the only two Senators who, on August 7, 1964, voted against the original Gulf of Tonkin resolution. It was on this day that Morse said:

I believe that history will record that we have made a great mistake in subverting and circumventing the Constitution of the United States . . . by means of this resolution. As I argued earlier today at great length, we are in effect giving the President . . . warmaking powers in the absence of a declaration of war. I believe that to be a historic mistake.

He was, of course, right.

It was this, against the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which contributed to Morse's defeat in 1968, as it also was a factor in the defeat of Ernest Gruening, the other dissenting Senator.

Morse's unflinching opposition to military involvement in Vietnam from the very start, is just one example of his strong convictions, which often placed him on the side of unpopular causes. In the early 1950's he fought for civil rights legislation and was also a strong supporter of trade unions.

For 24 years Wayne Morse served in the Senate—first as a Republican, then as an Independent, and finally as a Democrat. He was above all else a man of conviction who dealt with each issue on its own merit and would not compromise his stand to conform with party lines.

As a young man he studied at the University of Wisconsin and then went on to receive degrees of law from both the University of Minnesota and Columbia University. He became dean of the law school at the University of Oregon and subsequently achieved recognition as

an outstanding labor arbitrator. His brilliance and dedication was reflected in his outstanding work in Congress.

Defeat in 1968 did not cause Morse to give up his political aspirations. In fact, he was actively campaigning for a seat in the Senate only a few days before his death and had recently won the Democratic nomination.

Wayne Morse's passing was indeed untimely. His fortitude and foresight, combined with a patriotism dedicated to peace, will be greatly missed.

1974 SURVEY RESULTS

HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, this past May, I mailed a questionnaire to each household in the 16th Congressional District. A large number have been returned to my office. To date, about 25,000 people have responded. This is an increase of nearly 8,000 respondents over 1973.

A special effort was made to insure that the questions were fair and impartial. The experience and results of my 1973 questionnaire made this, in my opinion, a better questionnaire.

Printed below are the results of this survey and my comments.

The first section of the questionnaire asked respondents to list three problems Congress should act upon this year. There were many opinions. The three most frequent answers were inflation, health care, and impeachment. Each of these issues was covered by a separate question in the second part of the survey.

The inflation question was the one most frequently answered. The majority responding—58.4 percent—wanted less Government spending either by reducing taxes and spending or by balancing the budget. A sizable number—33.1 percent—wanted relief from rising prices by means of wage and price controls. A tax increase was the least popular way to deal with inflation—only 1.2 percent favored a tax hike. As to what course to take, 7.1 percent were undecided.

Federal financing of election campaigns was the second most answered question. The same question was asked in the 1973 questionnaire. In May, 1973, 71.4 percent were against federally funded elections. This year the number favoring Federal financing increased from 25.6 to 30.8 percent, while those opposed to Federal funding dropped from 71.4 to 63.1 percent; 5.9 percent were undecided. While there has been some change toward Federal financing of elections, the strong majority is opposed to the idea.

The last four questions, health care, Watergate and impeachment, off-shore drilling, and strip mine reclamation drew an approximately equal number of responses.

Concerning health care, 68.2 percent now feel that some form of Government health assistance is needed, be it complete coverage, 24.2 percent; major illness coverage, 23.5 percent; or Government coverage of low-income persons, 20.5 percent. The remainder thought business should provide health protection, 13.8 percent, or that no new programs should be started, 17.8 percent. More people now favor a national system of health insurance than when I asked a similar question last year. In 1973, 54.6 favored national health insurance versus 40.9 against.

Opinion about Watergate and impeachment was more evenly distributed than any other question. If A and C are combined, they show that 38.4 percent of those responding want the investigations to stop. Many fear that the effects of the investigations would be more harmful than helpful.

On the other hand, if B and E are combined, they show that 48.4 percent of those responding wish to see the investigations continue. Of those, 17.4 percent want the House of Representatives to continue its investigation to determine if there is enough evidence to support articles of impeachment; 31.4 percent believe the House of Representatives should vote articles of impeachment and the Senate should conduct a formal trial to establish the guilt or innocence of President Nixon.

Finally, 13.0 percent believe Mr. Nixon should resign for the good of the country. These answers show strong and divided feelings about the issue.

The last two questions concerning energy and conservation were approved by large majorities. On the continental shelf, 71.3 percent want drilling. An overwhelming majority desire a Federal strip mine law; 80.5 percent want a Federal law requiring strip-mined land to be reclaimed.

Because of space limitations, only a limited number of questions could be asked. Many people, however, took advantage of the space for additional comments. Impeachment, inflation, foreign aid, Government spending, aid-to-the-aged, requests and comments about my job as Congressman were most frequently mentioned. I appreciate these helpful thoughts.

I would like to publicly thank all those who took time to respond to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire follows:

1974 SURVEY RESULTS

1. Events surrounding the Watergate incident have caused public concern about honesty in government and the activities of the Nixon Administration. Which of the following is closest to your opinion?

a. President Nixon is innocent—it's time to stop all investigations and get on to other things, 22.2 percent.

b. The House of Representatives should continue its investigation to determine if there is enough evidence to support Articles of Impeachment, 17.4 percent.

c. President Nixon may be guilty of wrongdoing but he has been punished enough. Allow him to continue in office, 16.2 percent.

d. President Nixon has lost his effectiveness and should resign for the good of the country, 13.0 percent.

e. The House of Representatives should vote Articles of Impeachment and the Senate should conduct a formal trial to establish the guilt or innocence of President Nixon, 31.0 percent.

2. What action should Congress take to curb inflation without recession?

a. Authorize standby wage and price controls, 33.1 percent.

b. Reduce Federal taxes and spending, 31.8 percent.

c. Increase Federal taxes, 1.2 percent.

d. Balance the Federal budget, 26.6 percent.

e. Undecided, 7.1 percent.

3. Congress is working on health care legislation this year. Which would you prefer?

a. A government plan covering basic medical care for everyone, 24.2 percent.

b. A government plan covering major illnesses, 23.5 percent.

c. Continued reliance on private plans but the government would pay for low income persons, 20.5 percent.

d. Require that employers provide health insurance, 13.8 percent.

e. No new programs, 17.8 percent.

The next three questions were answered either by a Yes, No, or Undecided.

4. Should Federal tax dollars be used to finance election campaigns?

a. Yes, 30.8 percent.

b. No, 63.1 percent.

c. Undecided, 5.9 percent.

5. Would you favor a Federal law requiring that lands used for coal strip mining be reclaimed even if it will raise the average electric bill by a small amount?

a. Yes, 80.5 percent.

b. No, 14.1 percent.

c. Undecided, 5.3 percent.

6. Should the government allow drilling for oil on the outer continental shelf (in the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans)?

a. Yes, 71.3 percent.

b. No, 16.6 percent.

c. Undecided, 12.0 percent.

The distribution by age group of those who responded to the questionnaire is indicated below.

a. 18–25 years, 12.7 percent.

b. 26–34 years, 21.5 percent.

c. 35–54 years, 35.4 percent.

d. 55–64 years, 16.8 percent.

e. 65-over, 13.4 percent.

Questionnaire results are rounded to the nearest tenth. Where the totals do not add to 100 percent the difference is due to rounding.

ANN DULYE CHOSEN PRESIDENT OF NEW YORK PRESS ASSOCIATION

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Mrs. Raymond Dulye of Walden, N.Y., has been accorded the honor of being chosen as the first woman president in the history of the New York Press Association.

Ann Dulye is vice president of the Walden Printing Co., and along with her husband, Ray, publishes the award-winning Walden Citizen Herald and the Stewart Citizen in Newburgh, N.Y.

Raymond Dulye served as president of the State association in 1963, and together they are the first husband-and-wife team to hold this office.

The Dulyes, who have been active in their community affairs, have been prominently active in the affairs of the New York State Press Association for many years.

Mrs. Dulye began her newspaper career on the editorial staff of the Middletown Times Herald, in my hometown, Middletown, N.Y. In 1952, the Dulyes acquired the Walden Citizen Herald, and in the years since they have seen this fine weekly newspaper grow, under their guiding hands, into one of the best in our State.

The presentation of the press association president's gavel to Mrs. Dulye took place at the first truly international press convention, which was held last week in Toronto, Canada. This conclave brought together representatives from the New York Press Association, the National Newspaper Association of the United States, and the Canadian Community Newspaper Association.

Since this is the first time this honor has been accorded a woman, I wanted to share this honor with my colleagues.

THADDEUS DULSKI RETIRES

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Congressman THADDEUS DULSKI has announced that he will retire from the House of Representatives at the end of this session. Though a significantly large number of Members have already announced their intention to retire at the end of this Congress, Mr. DULSKI will be among those most sorely missed.

As Representative from New York's 37th Congressional District, Congressman DULSKI brought an inspiring sense of decency and diligence to his work in the Congress. Furthermore, as chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, he consistently displayed compassion, perseverance, and a great deal of legislative skill in dealing with the matters that came before his committee.

In addition, as a Member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I had the privilege of working on this committee with Congressman DULSKI. Again, his performance has been characterized by dedication and a willingness to work to do whatever is necessary to make life better for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to Congressman DULSKI on the occasion of his retirement, and to thank him not only for the many contributions he made to the people of his district, but for the contributions he made to America as well.

LET'S HOLD HANDS FOR BICENTENNIAL

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, "Wouldn't it be wonderful," asks Elizabeth Cleland in the July 14 issue of the Washington Star-News, "if on the Fourth of July, 1976, we held hands from coast to coast?"

She goes on:

Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could do something to reassure ourselves and each other and the rest of the world that this is a great country and that we love it very much.

It would, indeed, and that is just what my constituent, Mrs. Marietta B. Lazzo of Park Forest, Ill., had in mind when she suggested that Americans celebrate the 200th anniversary of our Nation's birth by joining hands to form a human chain from coast to coast. I put Mrs. Lazzo's letter in the RECORD on July 22, and have sent her idea to Administrator John W. Warner of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration for his consideration.

In the following article Miss Cleland supports Mrs. Lazzo's proposal and tells how she came to have the same thought:

[From the Washington Star-News, July 24, 1974]

LET'S HOLD HANDS—FROM SEA TO SHINING SEA

(By Elizabeth Cleland)

Wouldn't it be wonderful if, on the Fourth of July, 1976, we held hands from coast to coast?

Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could do something to reassure ourselves and each other and the rest of the world that this is a great country and that we love it very, very much?

Wouldn't it be wonderful?

And why couldn't we do it? There are roads across every inch of the three-thousand-odd miles. And there are enough of us.

This delirious scheme came to me while watching a political telethon on television. We were being treated to bits and pieces of patriotic speech and song when the program was interrupted with the shocking news of the shooting in Atlanta of Martin Luther King's mother. Poor Atlanta, I thought I wish I could hold their hand. (I have visited Atlanta only once, but I have a feeling for it. I'm rather soft about American cities, to tell the truth. I'm forever holding up soft-drink bottles and sending greetings to the city named on the bottom. "Hello, all you folks in Akron, Ohio," I say, or "How's it going, Nashville?"

And from there it was an easy leap. Let's hold hands from "California to the New York island." Let's hold hands because we care about each other and because we've been through a lot lately. And, I, for one, want to do something special on our 200th anniversary—something more than a picnic or fireworks or watching a televised speech. I want to put myself on the line.

Is it possible? Anything is possible, is my attitude. We had men playing golf on the moon a couple of years ago. We can do it.

I mulled this idea around for a few days and then threw it out. I didn't throw it very far at first, just to the next room, where Friend Husband was playing cards. He stared at me for a long minute and then whispered one word, "Tremendous."

The next day I threw it a little further. I presented it with a bit of a build-up at a largish lunch of colleagues. I feared hoots and jeers from this sophisticated, news-hardened group, and instead I got cheers and yes, tears. (These from a particularly delightful co-worker, young and cute and bright as two buttons. She dabbed at her eyes, smearing her eye-liner, and said in her impeccable Upper Case British accent, "And it's not even my country.")

One more test. A triple-birthday party in my home town of Falls Church brought together a good-sized crowd of people who care for each other and who care for the country. We all feel beaten up by the events of the past year, beaten up and beaten down at the same time. Hurrah, hurrah, they said, let's do it. Vince, one of the celebrants, started to sing "America I Love You And There's a Hundred Million Others Like Me."

As is my wont, and a wretched wont it is, I kept on talking about it. At least three people said "Write it and get it in print before the hucksters grab it. I feel that it is very important that this idea remain strictly out of the hands of any one group. Somebody has to sponsor it, I suppose, but I wanted the idea to be put forth as a non-political, non-commercial, non-anything-but-people idea.

But still I talked about it. I made figures. How many miles? How many feet in a mile? How many feet from coast to coast. How many people? I made figures and I talked and I talked and I figured, and guess what happened?

I sat down at my typewriter on Tuesday, July 23, with a "now or never" determination and the phone rang. It was a neighbor, one of the many who had heard my idea. "Get a copy of the Congressional Record for yesterday—Monday—and turn to page 24493."

And there it was. Mrs. Marietta R. Lazzo of Park Forest, Ill., wrote her Congressman, Rep. George M. O'Brien. She said: "Wouldn't it be wonderful if enough people wanted to, and would, on July 4, 1976, join hands along some of our nation's highways to make one great human, handclasped chain from shore to shore across our country?"

I not only couldn't have said it better myself—I didn't. Mrs. Lazzo had the idea last winter, she said, she went on in her letter with all the feet and miles and people figures that I had. Clearly, we are two minds with but a single thought . . . and I bet there are "a hundred million others" like us.

If you are one of them, and would like to see the figures, or add to this scheme, write me here. I'll tell Marietta. We're holding hands already.

SAMSO'S 20TH ANNIVERSARY NOTED BY SPECIAL EDITION OF SOUTH BAY DAILY BREEZE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the South Bay Daily Breeze, an outstanding newspaper in my congressional district, recently published a special edition commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Space and Missile Systems Organization of the U.S. Air Force.

This very impressive special edition

traces the history, development, and leadership of SAMSO since its establishment in 1954.

I would like to commend SAMSO for its fine contributions in the fields of both peacetime technology and military strategy and also the Daily Breeze whose excellent reporting is exemplified by this most interesting publication. A copy of the special edition is being delivered to the offices of each of my colleagues.

THE REAL ISSUE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that all of us serving in this House have more material to read than is humanly possible to digest, especially with all of the material from the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment hearings added to our normal reading pile. In spite of that, I am placing in the RECORD an editorial from the July 29, 1974, edition of the Peoria Journal Star entitled "The Real Issue," and I urge all of my colleagues to include this editorial in their homework as they prepare themselves for the upcoming debate in the House.

I place the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THE REAL ISSUE

When the impeachment process in the House began, the Republican members of the committee were often more aggressive than the Democrats.

They expected the evidence to be damning, apparently, and they were eager to disassociate themselves from the Republican President and prove themselves thus pure of heart. Their need was greater than that of Democrats.

The Democrats, themselves, except for the wilder characters like Drinan, were very cautious then. They apparently figured that they had *him* anyway, and as the known opposition, they didn't want too look overeager and thus unfair.

Such were the reactions when about all they really knew was what they'd been reading in the papers and from listening to Walter Cronkite—before they had seen the actual evidence, raw, for what it really was.

When that actual evidence was collected and studied instead of the piecemeal "leaks" fed the rest of us dressed up in its reportorial interpretations, the role of the party members turned upside down.

The Republicans got cautious, by and large, and the Democrats began to hammer away with every possible device. How come?

Well, apparently, the original asumptions didn't hold up very well. The Republicans discovered the evidence was not as damning as they thought from their former press exposure, and the Democrats discovered they really didn't "have him" after all.

The hard evidence simply isn't there that actually links the President as a participant in illegal acts. You have to juggle it around in a pretty complicated manner to weave him into something in some way *connected* to some illegal act. What *evidence* does exist offers clues, only, that have to be interpreted and manipulated and which can be interpreted, therefore, in different ways.

The Democrats, almost to a man, now, choose to manipulate and interpret such to the maximum disadvantage of the Republican President—not altogether unnaturally.

Some Republicans, who for their own political reasons once reacted in much the same way, now look at the full findings and shake their heads, recognizing that it is just as easy to make an innocent interpretation of what these things really meant in context.

What it comes down to is that the real issue, in the absence of the hard expected evidence, is whether there is to be any significant defference in the standards we apply in a national election and in those they apply to an impeachment vote in the House of Representatives.

We mean that literally.

In an election, there is no doubt that we feel free to guess, to manipulate shadowy evidence, to interpret and to reach conclusions and thus decide who we disqualify on grounds of suspicion.

That's as it must be.

But if impeachment is to play a role in presidential selection between elections, is it to operate on that same basis? If so, fine and dandy. Impeach him!

But if impeachment is to be significantly different than the election process, and the sovereignty of the people as expressed in their national election of a President a shade more potent than a vote in the Congress, it would require different standards for impeachment—standards such as are applied in a judicial process not in an election process.

And the judicial process simply does not accept these forward leaps in the interpretation of evidence with conclusions treated the same as facts. The evidence has to be there and it has to take you all the way home. You can't move mentally from the actual evidence forward to a conclusion of guilt two steps beyond the physical proof!

So which way shall we do it?

Shall we have a serious trial that incorporates the highest principles and practices of American justice? Shall we have a serious trial that meets the demands of any normal trial procedure? Or shall we have a "special" trial with extra latitudes for political decision? And give Congress the right to remove presidents by merely voting on the basis of the kind of charges and counter-charges that are so often used in an election campaign?

The House can decide that they are the people, that real sovereignty rests with them as the "people's representatives" to a degree superior to the sovereignty of the people, themselves, voting in national presidential elections. They can make themselves a substitute for direct sovereignty.

Should they?

The answer may be a more fateful decision than the Watergate furore, itself. And on it hangs the impeachment.

C. L. DANCEY.

ALABAMA STUDENT PRACTICE RULE

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on July 2 the Alabama Supreme Court adopted a student practice rule for Alabama. Under this rule, qualified law students will be able for the first time to actually participate in court proceedings and perform many functions previously restricted to members of the Alabama State Bar Association.

This rule will perform two vital functions. It will encourage law schools to provide senior law students with practical training during the period of their formal legal education. It will also open up a new source of legal assistance for people who can not afford to engage an attorney.

The law students will be working under the direct supervision of a licensed attorney who will assume personal professional responsibility for the student's work.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Supreme Court of Alabama, which approved the rule in a unanimous 9 to 0 decision, for its action. The leadership which the Cumberland School of Law faculty and students exercised in an effort which was pursued for over 4 years is also to be noted. The University of Alabama Law School and the Alabama State Bar should also be commended for their support.

I trust the law schools in Alabama will fully utilize this new opportunity. I am convinced that the student practice rule will result in better qualified young lawyers in Alabama.

TAX EXEMPTION ON INTEREST

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on May 16 I introduced H.R. 14859, which would allow a tax exemption on interest—up to $400 for an individual and $800 for a couple filing jointly—on deposits in savings institutions. This legislation is designed both to provide a tax break for the small depositor and to encourage savings in order to stimulate mortgage capital. Thus, this measure would help the average American hard hit by inflation, the banks, and the building industry.

The Savings Association League of New York State, whose president is Mr. Paul A. Schosberg, has launched a drive to gather signatures on a petition in support of H.R. 14859, and I am pleased to report that the number has now topped 200,000 names. I am, indeed, grateful for the support of the Savings Association League and the hundreds of thousands of people who have endorsed this legislation.

I have written to Chairman WILBUR MILLS urging that the Ways and Means Committee seriously consider the need for this legislation and include it in their comprehensive tax reform proposal. The bill has been cosponsored by 25 Members and I hope to gather additional support in the future.

I would like to include in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Schosberg regarding the petition drive and Mr. Herbert Stein's recent comment that the administration would like to see an increase in savings by the public. In view of this statement, I will look forward to the administration's support for H.R. 14859 as well.

Mr. Schosberg's letter and a list of those Members who have cosponsored H.R. 14859 follow:

SAVINGS ASSOCIATION LEAGUE
OF NEW YORK STATE,
Scarsdale, N.Y., July 31, 1974.

Hon. LESTER L. WOLFF,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR LES: I'm pleased to report that as of this morning the number of signatures on our petitions in support of H.R. 14859 topped 200,000. I fully expect we will exceed our goal of 250,000 by the end of the week and with the savings banks commencing their own petition drive within the next few days, the momentum will continue to build.

I know you share our hope that this petition drive will be a major factor in developing even greater support for your bill within the New York Congressional delegation and throughout the House of Representatives in general.

In this connection, I want to call to your attention a comment made by Herbert Stein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, at yesterday's joint Economic Committee hearing. Mr. Stein was reported in today's New York Times as saying that the administration would like to see an increase in savings by the public. This might be the first hard indicator that the administration might support legislation such as H.R. 14859.

Warmest regards,
Sincerely,

PAUL A. SCHOSBERG.

COSPONSORS OF H.R. 14859

1. Wolff.
2. Addabbo.
3. Badillo.
4. Brinkley of Ga.
5. Chisholm.
6. Mrs. Collins of Ill.
7. Mr. Collins of Texas.
8. Conte of Mass.
9. Derwinski of Ill.
10. Edwards of Calif.
11. Kemp.
12. Lehman of Fla.
13. Luken of Ohio.
14. Murtha of Pa.
15. Podell.
16. Roe of N.J.
17. Won Pat.
18. Yatron of Pa.
19. Lent.
20. Stokes of Ohio.
21. Harrington of Mass.
22. Roncallo of N.Y.
23. Brasco.
24. Abzug.

THE RETURN OF DEMOCRACY TO GREECE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am heartened by reports of a return to civilian rule and democracy in Greece. The fall of the military junta of General Phaedron Gizikis and the creation of the transitional government of former premier Constantine Caramanlis give hope that democratic rights can once again be established in the birthplace of democracy.

Since I have come to Congress, I have repeatedly spoken out against the suppression of human rights by the junta in Greece, and against the U.S. Government's close link with the oppressive militaristic government. However, I am now encouraged by this dramatic turn of events—by the indications of a coalition cabinet, creating the broadest based government in modern Greek history; by the Government's release of all political prisoners held by the Greek military junta; by the reported closing down of the camp for political prisoners on the Aegean island of Yaros; by the reinstatement of the Constitution of 1952; and by the decision to grant amnesty for all political crimes since the 1967 coup and the restoration of citizenship to all Greeks deprived of their nationality since then.

If, indeed, these reports hold true, and elections are held to determine the succeeding government, we may once again see freedom and democracy return to Greece.

LETTER TO SOVIET AMBASSADOR ANATOLY F. DOBRYNIN, JULY 29, 1974

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced another concurrent resolution on behalf of the Lithuanian seaman, Simas Kudirka. I am very concerned about the well-being of this Lithuanian. I have also written a letter to the Soviet Ambassador, Anatoly Dobrynin, which has been signed by several Members of Congress. I wish to insert this letter for the benefit of my colleagues:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *July 29, 1974.*

His Excellency ANATOLY F. DOBRYNIN,
Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Our purpose in writing to you is to request the immediate release from prison of the Lithuanian-American seaman, Simas Kudirka. As you will remember, Simas Kudirka was a crew member of the Soviet trawler fleet which was operating off the New England coast of the United States in 1970.

On November 23, 1970, Kudirka climbed aboard the U.S. Coast Guard cutter, Vigilant, which was tied up to a vessel of the Soviet trawler fleet. He attempted to obtain political asylum in the United States. However, crew members of the Soviet ship were later allowed to board the Vigilant, where they seized Kudirka and forcibly removed him to the Soviet ship. It was later learned that Kudirka was sentenced to a term in Soviet prison.

As a result of the tremendous protest which arose in this country, and as a result of recent information brought to the attention of the United States government, Simas Kudirka has now been declared to be an American citizen, and has been registered as such in our Embassy in Moscow.

The mother of Simas Kudirka, who was born in Brooklyn, New York, in 1906, has also been registered as a United States citizen, and has been issued an American passport.

At the present time, when our governments are cooperating to bring peace and understanding to our troubled world, it would be my hope that you would use your influence to inform your government of the views of the Members of Congress who have signed their name to this letter.

We petition the Soviet Government to grant exit visas to Simas Kudirka, his mother, Mrs. Marija Kudirka Sulskiene, and Kudirka's wife and two children. The mother and son are United States citizens, and certainly his immediate family would have a right to United States citizenship through the father and husband. Your government's assistance in this noble quest by demonstrating basic human compassion for Simas Kudirka, and his family would be taken as a gesture of good will.

I look forward to hearing from you soon on this important matter. Thank you again for your consideration.

With warmest regards,

Robert P. Hanrahan, John W. Wydler, J. Hastings, George E. Brown, Jr., Alphonzo Bell, Robert H. Michel, John D. Dingell, G. William Whitehurst, Ella Grasso, Thomas Ludlow Ashely.

Robert N. Steele, Parren J. Mitchell, Robert J. Lagomarsino, Joshua Eilberg, Edward Derwinski, Frank Thompson, Jr., John J. Rhodes, Victor N. Veysey, Samuel Stratton, Edward P. Boland.

Peter Rodino, Jack F. Kemp, Morgan F. Murphy, David C. Treen, Lou Frey, Jr., Howard W. Robison, R. Lawrence Coughlin, Frank Annunzio, Bill Archer, Gerry Studds, Samuel H. Young, Harold R. Collier, George M. O'Brien, Edward Madigan, John C. Kluczynski, Frank Horton.

Michael Harrington, John Buchanan, Edward I. Koch, James J. Delaney, J. Herbert Burke, William F. Walsh, Angelo D. Roncallo, John Dellenback, Mario Biaggi, Joe Moakley, Ronald A. Sarasin, Lamar Baker, Lester L. Wolff, Dominick V. Daniels, Robert J. Huber.

INDEXING

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable discussion underway about the proposals for "indexing" as a method of living with inflation. The "indexing" concept has been promoted by economist Milton Friedman and his followers; consequently, it has received considerable attention from leading political conservatives. However, Mr. Speaker, I think that there are many pitfalls to this proposal. For example, Brazil—who adopted indexing some years ago—has suddenly had a serious surge of inflation this year. Actually, "indexing" is simply a method of treating the symptoms rather than the disease itself. I have run across two very good statements on "indexing" that I fully recommend to my colleagues in the Congress. The first is a commentary by economist Hans Sennholz; the second statement is from the July 29 edition of the Wall Street Journal:

The material follows:

INDEXING: A NEW VERSION OF AN OLD MYTH

(By Hans F. Sennholz)

For more than one hundred years industrialists and economists from all over the world came to the United States in order to learn the secrets of American productivity and wealth. Thousands of foreign students attended our universities to observe the United States and study the principles of

economics that guided our economic lives. But all this is about to change if Professor Milton Friedman and his followers have their way. Our better economics students may soon attend the universities of Port Alegre and Rio Grande do Sul in order to study the art of "indexation." After all, Brazil has an "indexed economy" where every aspect of economic life is subject to some sort of adjustment mechanism for inflation.

The Brazilians have a long history of galloping inflation and have learned to live with rising prices as almost a way of life. But in 1964, a new military government imposed a system of "monetary correction," known as "indexing," in which wages, rents, interest rates, and many other payments and prices are adjusted frequently to offset the harmful effects of price increases. The ecomonic motto of the junta: "We no longer fight inflation—we live with it."

In reality, "indexation" is another version of the old myth that you can eat the cake and have it too. If a government resorts to inflation, that is, creates money in order to cover its budget deficits or expands credit in order to stimulate business, then no power on earth, no gimmick, device, trick, or even indexation can prevent the economic consequences. If by way of inflation government spends $10 billion in real goods, capital or labor, someone somewhere must forego $10 billion in real resources. It is a fundamental principle of inflation, that there must be victims. Indexation may shift the victimization; it cannot prevent it.

In Brazil the indexation shifted the economic burden of the budgetary deficits to the working people. Wages are indexed to an unrealistically low "expected" inflation rate, which resulted in a significant drop of labor's share of income. According to Paulo Singer of the independent Brazilian Research Center in São Paulo, the country's military rulers managed to reduce the real wages of unskilled workers by 30 per cent during the 1970's. Now, any economic policy that reduces the costs of labor and thereby transfers real income from wage earners to businessmen tends to create capital and thereby sets the stage for economic expansion. The Brazilian boom which so many American Economists now admire was built on this shift of government burden and flow of real income.

It should be obvious that this route to economic expansion is not open to the United States. American labor, through its spokesmen and Congressional representatives, is calling the shots. While protest is virtually impossible in Brazil because labor unions are weak and the press is censored, organized labor in the U.S. would play a crucial role in any indexation. In fact, their political muscle could dictate an index that raises labor's share of income and depresses business returns. At this very moment labor is resisting a minor revision of the Consumer Price Index, and Social Security pensioners are calling for a special index for the cost-of-living adjustments. This is why any attempt at indexation would generate bitter quarrels between interest groups over the appropriateness of an index.

Indexing wages, rents, interest rates, and prices means government control over wages, rents, interest rates, and prices. Of course, these controls designed to preserve yesterday's conditions may range from "voluntary" guide lines to mandatory restraints. Surely, there must be some penalty for those who do not comply.

But how about the labor unions who will try to stay ahead of the game? If George Meany and other labor leaders should ignore the index, what will be the reaction of the Federal Index Council? We probably know its reaction to rising prices and soaring profits no matter what the economic causes should be. But to bind organized labor to the index necessitates a Brazilian type of government.

This indexation of our economic lives differs fundamentally from that proposed by Senator James Buckley of New York. In a bill recently introduced the Senator suggests that both the federal tax system and government borrowing be indexed. The measure would tie personal income tax rates, exemptions, capital gains, depreciation deductions, and interest rates on government bonds to the Consumer Price Index. He argues that such indexation would take the profit away from the federal government, and would index the government, rather than the government indexing the people.

Most economists are aware that inflation produces inequities in taxation. It lifts us to higher income tax brackets although our purchasing power may remain the same or even fall. Investors are taxed on fictitious profits that merely reflect declines in the dollar's purchasing power. And business is forced to overstate its earnings as it can depreciate plant and equipment costs only on the basis of original rather than replacement cost. In each case the federal government reaps many billions of dollars of windfall taxes that were not imposed by the Congress. In addition, the federal government as the country's largest debtor reaps huge gains from the depreciation of its debt. At a 10 per cent rate of inflation, 10 per cent of its $470 billion debt, or some $47 billion, are repudiated each year.

The Buckley bill would deny government this huge profit from inflation, which is most laudable indeed. But would it really reduce government spending and the incentive for government to inflate in order to finance new spending programs? Would his colleagues in the Senate be resigned to spending less just because government revenues are reduced by the inflationary take? The Senator seems to cling to the old-fashioned notion that government spending is related to income. In reality, spending and income are rather independent magnitudes. Spending is determined by the "social needs" as envisaged by his colleagues in the House and Senate. Income, or the lack of it, tends to determined the size of the budget deficits, to which the huge deficits of the Nixon Administration clearly attest. Any reduction in federal revenue, either by tax reform or some indexation device, would probably boost the deficit and thereby fuel the inflation. "Nice try, Senator Buckley, but any political machination without the ideological support of the American people for an open reduction of the government role in our lives is bound to be disappointing."

We must expect the debate over indexation to heat up in the coming years as inflation continues to erode the economic substance of the middle class. To millions of Americans indexation is another straw to which they may cling. To bureaucrats and politicians the prospect for new powers and controls is tantalizing.

INDEXING "CURE" FOR INFLATION ANALYZED

(By Lindley H. Clark, Jr.)

"Several years ago . . . Chicago economist [Milton Friedman] began talking of something called indexing and hardly anyone listened. Now many people are listening, although the idea still has a long way to go before it achieves anything like broad acceptance.

"Indexing already exists in the U.S. in a haphazard way. The best-known form is the cost-of-living escalator clause that is showing up in more labor contracts. Under such a clause a rise in the cost-of-living index automatically gives workers a wage increase.

"The federal government now adjusts Social Security benefits and some employe wages to reflect the rising cost of living. Even without labor contracts, some private employers adjust pay to meet rising prices.

"In the credit markets, too, interest rates represent a crude form of indexing . . .

". . . this and more, much more, was debated earlier this month at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington. Speaking for indexing were Prof. Friedman and Prof. Robert J. Gordon of Northwestern. Their opponents were William Fellner, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and Charls E. Walker, former Deputy Treasury Secretary who now is a private economic consultant.

"One aspect of indexing that obviously attracts Prof. Friedman is the impact on federal finances. The tax system—individual exemptions, the standard deduction, rate tables—would be changed to reflect rising prices. Capital gains would be exempted if they reflect only inflation. Corporate depreciation allowances would also change in line with rising prices.

"A much more simple change would be to require the Treasury to issue purchasing power securities, on which interest rates would rise in line with inflation. Prof. Friedman would exclude short-term Treasury notes, which are close to cash. (Prof. Gordon suggested that we might want to consider indexing cash, too, but the notion seemed to appeal to no one.)

"The arguments in favor of the idea are strong, and some of them appeal even to Mr. Fellner, who was supposed to be in opposition. If the tax system were indexed, the government could no longer count on an increased inflow of revenue as inflation pushed taxpayers into higher brackets. Government, if it wanted more money for more spending, would simply have to bite the bullet and raise tax rates.

"The strongest overall argument for the idea, though, is simple fairness. Why should the public suffer for the inflation inflicted on them by the government's monetary and fiscal policies? (Prof. Friedman stresses that indexing is not an inflation cure, only a painkiller.)

". . . there are reasons to wonder whether broad indexing is the right approach. As Prof. Fellner points out, indexing can make the first flare-up of inflation worse. Wages will rise and government will almost certainly accommodate the rise by speeding the growth of the money supply.

"There is a danger, too, that an indexing system would lessen the governmental will to end the inflation."

GILMAN RECALLS WARSAW UPRISING

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, August 1, 1974, marked the 30th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising. I welcome this opportunity of recalling the heroic deeds of that historic day when the citizens of Warsaw, desiring the freedom which is a basic right to mankind, rose up against their German oppressors who had occupied the Polish city for a period of 5 years.

The spirit of those brave Poles who were willing to make the supreme sacrifice of their lives for their freedom is an inspiration to us today and reminds our free Nation that there still remain, throughout the world, individuals who suffer from oppression and terrorism alien to our own dedication to the principles of freedom.

The descendents of those courageous Polish patriots can be justly proud of

the impressive actions of their ancestors. August 1, 1944, is a proud day to recall with an important lesson for all mankind—that the principles of freedom and justice will in the end prevail over the forces of tyranny and aggression.

On this day, I invite my colleagues to join with me in honoring the remembrance of the Warsaw uprising as a symbol of the fight for freedom which continues from generation to generation throughout the world.

MANY HELPED IN SUCCESSFUL TELEVISED JUDICIARY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the great public interest in the recent televised meetings of the House Judiciary Committee—a first in congressional history—drew huge crowds and representatives of the media from throughout the world to view this most dramatic and challenging action.

Mr. Speaker, sufficient laurels have been heaped upon the members of our committee, all of whom performed their jobs with dignity. However, there are many others who contributed to make these public meetings successful and effective vehicles for communicating the committee's deliberative proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, the unsung heroes and heroines of this final phase of the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment inquiry were our capable Sergeant at Arms Ken Harding and the various staff personnel who manned room 2141 in the Rayburn Building, particularly during the recent televised debates.

Mr. Speaker, first, of course, are the impeachment inquiry staff members—ably headed by Chief Counsel John Doar, Chief Minority Counsel Sam Garrison, and Associate Committee Counsel Albert E. Jenner, Jr. Those who served with them, including both majority and minority counsel—are entitled to equal praise. Of equal importance were the committee's own Chief Counsel Jerome Zeifman, and Chief Minority Counsel Franklin G. Polk, who with their assistants backed up the chairman and all the members of the committee throughout this prolonged period.

Mr. Speaker, the media contacts and facilities were responsibly handled under the direction of our radio and TV director Mike Michaelson, and assisted by Tina Tate and Larry May. The writing press was served ably by our Press Gallery Superintendent Ben West and his assistant Jerry Gallegos. David Holmes, superintendent of the periodical gallery, provided other support to the media interests. The limited seating for members of the press and the restricted guest accommodations were allocated equitably and smoothly by Helen Starr. The majority staff facilities were under the capable supervision of Theresa Gallo. The minority staff room served the demands and needs of the Republican members and their staffs with the assistance of Nancy Parke.

Mr. Speaker, with the large number of media representatives and public visitors, throughout the meetings the Capitol Police under Captain Price maintained tight security and good order.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Vance handled the public address system as the skilled technician that he is—with the result that the more bombastic remarks were modulated and the quiet voices were adequately amplified so that every word of the weeklong meetings was capable of being heard.

Mr. Speaker, while many hearings of Senate committees and some House committee hearings have been televised in the past, this was our first experience with televised committee meetings. From the remarks that I have heard from our colleagues we can all feel proud of this example of a House committee at work. Assuming to speak on behalf of the committee, I am confident that I voice the appreciation of all committee members—for the supporting and sustaining roles which all of those whom I have mentioned and many others provided during these trying and historic days.

CONCERN EXPRESSED FOR CERTAIN ENDANGERED SPECIES UNLESS NEW RIVER IS SAVED

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues are aware, there is strong opposition to the proposed Blue Ridge power project in Virginia and North Carolina. One reason that many oppose this project is the significant adverse environmental effects which will result from this needless impoundment of the New River.

At my request, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior studied the effects of the proposed Blue Ridge project on the unique fauna of the area. At this time I would like to share with my colleagues their disturbing report on the destruction of certain endangered species which will result if the New River is not saved.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

Congressman WILMER D. MIZELL,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MIZELL: This is in reply to a telephone request requesting names of fish, molluscs or crustaceans in the New River in North Carolina, Virginia, or West Virginia that are considered candidates for the official list of endangered species. In particular, you inquired about the status of the New River snail. You wished to know which species would benefit if the New River was included in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Finally, you asked us to review the final environmental impact statement, June 1973, of the Modified Blue Ridge Project Number 2317, North Carolina and Virginia.

The following five fish, one snail, three crustaceans, and two pearly mussels are found in or near the area you outlined and are considered candidates for the official list of endangered species, or in the case of two of the crustaceans, are considered candidates for the official list of threatened species likely to become endangered:

The Kanawha minnow, *Phenacobius teretulus*, a large stream fish; the flat-head chub, *Nocomis platyrhynchus;* the New River shiner, *Notropis scabriceps;* the Kanawha darter, *Etheostoma kanawhae;* and probably the fine-scale saddled darter, *Etheostoma osburni*. These species are restricted to the New River system in North Carolina, Virginia, and possibly West Virginia.

The New River snail, *Polygyriscus virginianus*, particularly merits preservation because it is the only species in the genus. Thus the genus appears to be endangered and preservation of this animal would be an important contribution toward maintaining a diversity of animal life in the country. It is known only from a small area of a single river bluff opposite Radford in Pulaski County, Virginia. There are only a few hundred individuals at most in existence. The ephemeral cave scud, *Apocrangonyx ephemerus*, a blind white cave crustacean, found in small mud-bottomed cave pools, is known only from Tawney's Cave and Canoe Cave in Giles County, Virginia. These two caves occur in Sinking Creek valley, a small tributary of the New River, and the inclusion of a small section of this creek adjoining the New River, in a legislated wild and scenic area, would greatly benefit the continued existence of this species.

Mackin's cave scud, *Stygobromus mackinii*, is found in caves in Giles County, Virginia, and several other counties and is considered a candidate for the list of threatened species. The spiny cave scud, *Stygonectes spinatus*, is known only from the Greenbriar valley, a tributary of the New River in West Virginia. One unique subspecies of the spiny cave scud is found only in central Monroe County and would logically justify inclusion of a short section of the Greenbriar River adjoining the New River in the designated natural area.

It is estimated that West Virginia has lost about 90 percent of her fresh water mussels because of pollution from strip mining and other factors. Best remaining populations are in the Greenbrier River, the New River Gorge below Hinton, the Elk River tributary of the Kanawha River, and in the six-mile stretch of the Kanawha River immediately below Kanawha Falls. In this stretch of river are found the tuberculed-blossom pearly mussel, *Epioblasma torulosa torulosa*, and the pink mucket, *Lampsilis orbiculata orbiculata*. These two mussels appear to be on the verge of extinction. International concern has been expressed over the plight of these species. They appear in Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. Please find enclosed a copy of this convention which was signed on March 3, 1973, ratified by the United States Senate, and implemented in the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

The New River is a misonomer. This river is believed to be the oldest river in North America. It crosses the continental divide because it existed prior to the existence of the Appalachian Mountains. This may be one reason so many unusual species exist in the New River.

Available habitat for these eleven species has already been lost including the Kanawha River below Charleston, which is severely polluted, the impounded sections of the New River above Hinton and Radford, and impounded sections of the Elk and Gauley tributaries. Each of these eleven species is jeopardized by one or more of the following factors: acid mine wastes, municipal waste, proposed impoundments, over collecting, quarrying, road construction, ground water pollution, channelization, and the downstream effects of channelization of small tributaries, such as Cherry River and Paint Creek.

The impact statement for Project Number 2317, impoundments at Galax and Independence, Virginia, states on page 26 that, ". . . .no rare or endangered species have been reported or are known to exist in the project area." Reference is made to the Big-mouth chub, the New River shiner, the Kanawha darter, and the Kanawha minnow. Entirely omitted is any consideration that the creation of the two impoundments might make them endangered.

Sincerely,

JOHN PARADISO,
Chief, Branch of Biological Support Office of Endangered Species and International Activity.

A LONG STAY IN POWER FOR MILITARY JUNTA IN CHILE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the same week in which a Chilean military court sentenced four persons to death by firing squad for essentially political offenses, we learn in a comprehensive report from Santiago, by Joseph Novitski of the Washington Post, that plans for continued military rule in Chile are "for the long term and on a large scale." The article once again makes the obvious point that the military junta will remain a near-permanent fixture on the Chilean political scene unless the United States joins other Western nations in taking firm steps to withdraw our support for the junta.

In the pending foreign military aid request for Chile, the Congress has an opportunity to assert our influence against continued military rule and political trials in Chile. By unconditionally terminating all military assistance to the junta, the United States will put those rulers on notice that their policies no longer meet with our support. It is inconsistent with our asserted interest in human rights to ignore the existing situation in Chile by continuing our military aid program. I urge my colleagues to read the Washington Post article describing the prospects for continued military rule in Chile, and to consider taking a stand in favor of a termination of all U.S. military aid to Chile so that the unfortunate predictions coming out of Santiago may be proven untrue.

The text of the article follows:

CHILE JUNTA DEALS DEMOCRACY OUT OF LONG-TERM PLANS

(By Joseph Novitski)

SANTIAGO.—The Chilean military junta, after governing for 10 months with improvised policies and structures, has settled down for a long stay in power.

The junta, which replaced President Salvador Allende after the coup in which he died last September, began its tenth month by reordering the country's government, burning the national voter registry and breaking off relations with Chile's largest political party, the Christian Democrats. It all added up to a declaration that the military plans to govern for an indefinite span, without elections or organized civilian political support.

Government spokesmen, when asked how long military rule may last, answer, "We have plans, not deadlines."

The plans are for the long term and on a large scale.

"If we don't do big, lasting things, we might as well go home now," an adviser to the junta said recently.

Thus far, in what it calls "the second stage," the junta has made known its intention to rebuild the economy, to make it grow with the help of foreign investment, to reduce and reorganize the government bureaucracy and to enforce a total ban on civilian political activity by continuing the detentions and military-court trials that have been the rule since last September.

The first step of government reorganization came late in June, when the armed forces agreed to shift from a four-man junta to a one-man presidency. Since the military overthrew Allende and uprooted his Marxist-oriented government, the commanders of the army, the navy, the air force and the *carabineros*, Chile's national police force, had exercised the powers of the presidency. They also took over the law-making power of the Congress, which was closed last year.

Now, Gen. Augusto Pinochet, commander-in-chief of the army and leader of the junta has been named president for an indefinite term with the formal title of "supreme chief of the nation."

The point of the change, government sources said, was efficiency. The four-man junta had been slower in reaching decisions than one man would be, they said. The commanders of the army, navy, air force and police have retained the role of drawing up laws for promulgation by decree.

Pinochet's rise also represents an ascendancy of the Chilean army over the navy, air force and police. Some civilian observers, believing that the army officers in government had shown more moderation than air force and navy officers, thought this might mean an easing of repression. This has not yet been the case.

Chilean families report that men and women are still disappearing for days and sometimes weeks. A businessman told friends recently he had been arrested, held for four days alone in a tiny cell and then released without charges.

While Gen. Pinochet was forming a new Cabinet of 14 military men and 3 civilians, two of them technocrats with international reputations, the government burned the national voter registration records. A government spokesman explained that the lists of 4 million voters were "notoriously fraudulent." No plans were announced for making new lists or reregistering voters.

The remote expectation that the junta might call elections to carry out its announced aim of restoring Chilean democracy disappeared with the electoral records. There remained another possibility, suggested to the junta by leaders of the Christian Democratic Party. The party leadership, who opposed Allende and publicly accepted the coup as a necessary evil, had hoped for a return to civilian government within three to five years.

That hope, according to Christian Democrats familiar with party affairs, disappeared when the junta publicly broke off its semi-public relations with the party last week. Formally, there has been no political party activity in Chile since the junta outlawed the country's Marxist parties and declared the others, including the Christian Democrats, in recess.

During the recess, Christian Democratic leaders continued to meet privately. Last January they presented a memorandum to the government that criticized the military's treatment of prisoners and its disregard for legal and human rights. Also in January, former Sen. Patricio Aylwin, recognized by the junta as the party's president, suggested privately to a military minister that Christian Democats saw no need for more than five years of military dictatorship in Chile.

It was not Christian Democratic political opinions, but censorship imposed on a Santiago radio station owned by the party that caused the party's complete break with the junta.

After an exchange of letters, the government called the party an "instrument of international Marxism" and told Aylwin bluntly to keep a respectful tongue in his head when he spoke to the military government.

Christian Democrats said the government's move looked like a signal from the army that its contacts with Christian Democrats were at an end.

Some party leaders said the break helped the party overcome the reputation of having helped in the coup. Even former President Eduardo Frei, the grand old man of Chilean Christian Democracy who had gone, with other former presidents, to a thanksgiving Mass with the junta last year, was reliably reported to be critical of the military government now.

"In the end it's probably better this way," said a Christian Democratic lawyer. "They tell us to shut up and we stop arguing. It shows everyone that this is a dictatorship and that's that."

SEVENTY-THREE SOCIALISTS ON TRIAL IN SOUTHERN CHILE

SANTIAGO, August 1.—Seventy-three members of the outlawed Socialist Party are being tried on charges ranging from the illegal possession of arms to treason by a court martial in the town of Linares, about 172 miles south of Santiago, lawyers for the accused said today.

The lawyers said the prosecutor had demanded death penalties for four of the defendants charged with assisting the enemy during a state of internal war.

WILDERNESS WEST—WILDERNESS EAST

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a most interesting and thoughtful article appeared in the June 1974 edition of Conservation News, written by Mr. Charles L. Cadieux, and entitled "Wilderness West—Wilderness East." Some may find themselves in partial disagreement with several of the possibilities suggested by the article. I believe that Mr. Cadieux expresses some extremely thought provoking concepts, worthy of consideration.

Mr. Cadieux proposes the establishment of wilderness areas in the East, where the need for such areas is the most acute, and where the passage of time only serves to exacerbate the situation. However, Mr. Cadieux proposes more than the simply setting aside of existing wilderness areas, but imaginatively sug-

gests that we create wilderness in places where none exists, and that we manage that wilderness for everyone's benefit. The proposal is particularly intriguing when one considers the lack of any substantial natural wilderness in the East.

The Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Public Lands has under consideration legislation which I am cosponsoring to establish various eastern wilderness areas, and to study other areas for possible future inclusion in the wilderness system. I wish to applaud the committee's action and trust that we shall be able to move on this much needed legislation.

I now include in the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues, the text of Mr. Cadieux's article:

WILDERNESS WEST—WILDERNESS EAST

(By Charles L. Cadieux)

The Wilderness Act completed ten years of life on September 3, 1973.

The question "Has it worked? would bring different answers from east and west.

The Wilderness System began in 1964 with 54 areas created from the United States Forest Service's Primitive Areas and from parts of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in northern Minnesota. Today, in the Wilderness System, there are 95 units totaling more than 11 million acres. Some 62 more areas totaling 7.5 million acres are being considered by Congress. And 95 more are to be reviewed and reported on to the Congress. These 95 areas comprise almost 46 million additional acres!

The great bulk of the lands already included in the Wilderness System lie in the west. Bob Rowen of the United States Forest Service told me that the Forest Service areas under current consideration include only three areas in the eastern half of the United States—Bradwell Bay in Florida, Joyce Kilmer-Slick Rock in North Carolina, and El Cacique in Puerto Rico.

How have the big three land-managing federal agencies rated in their cooperation with the terms of the Wilderness Act? Their accomplishment depends entirely upon how they see the Wilderness Act in reference to their primary purpose.

The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has responded quite enthusiastically. It feels that wilderness area status is in agreement with its primary purpose of protecting and managing the wildlife on that property.

The National Park Service, which manages just a little less acreage than does the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, gets only so-so ratings from the superficial observer. In some areas, the Park Service sees wilderness status as being in agreement with its purpose of preserving the out-of-doors. In other areas, the Park Service sees the wilderness concept as a handicap to its purpose of showing the out-of-doors to as many people as possible.

The greatest portion of both BSF&W and NPS lands is the western half of the United States.

The United States Forest Service manages far more land than both the Department of the Interior agencies. How has it done? Again, we get two answers. West of the Mississippi, the Forest Service has designated huge acreages as wilderness. But it has failed miserably in the eastern half of the nation. Asked why this should be, the Forest Service people remind you that the Wilderness Act said that there could not be a wilderness where the signs of man's habitation—or use—of the land for a home was visible. The joke has it: "Where the hand of man has never set foot."

The Forest Service has argued that an area must be primitive—virgin timber, where man is but a visitor—or else it cannot qualify as part of the Wilderness System. That is—east of the Mississippi they argue this way.

The first wilderness proposed in our nation was the Gila Wilderness area, carved out of the Gila National Forest in New Mexico at Forest Service recommendation. This was in 1924, about 40 years before the environmentalists sponsored legislation which led to the Wilderness Act. The Gila boasts cliff dwellings—signs of man's habitation from pre-Columbian times.

This very first of all wilderness areas is not an area where "the hand of man has never set foot." It is a beautiful wilderness area. So is the Pecos Wilderness of the Santa Fe National Forest to the north, which boasts of "Beatty's Cabin" and other signs of former habitation.

If you look hard, you can find signs of man's former use in every single one of the country's wilderness areas. This has not diminished their value as wilderness one iota.

Professional foresters, men who look at the problem without emotion, tell me that we can *produce* wilderness almost anywhere we want to—anywhere plants will grow—if we are willing to invest the time and the money to do it.

Produce wilderness? Why not? It should be obvious that the healing hand of nature can reclaim all but the most sacrilegious treatment of the land. Even strip mines, ghastly crimes against the earth, can be made to produce a wilderness area, if the American public is willing to pay the bill. In addition to money, it will take time. But even the longest restoration job only needs to be started sooner, not surrendered without an attempt.

Congress never intended that the strict construction of the Act's wording should prevent inclusion of worthy areas into the system. Senator Church was floor manager of the bill when it passed the Senate in 1963. He said then, "It is one of the great promises of the Wilderness Act that we can dedicate formerly abused areas where the primitive scene can be restored by natural forces."

Congress in 1963 had no delusions that an area had to be pristine, never timbered, never plowed, never broken by the homesteader's cabin. It is much more likely that Congress envisioned the restoration of land to wilderness quality by proper management, rather than the preservation of a pitiful remnant of "virgin" wilderness with a tall fence around it.

Wondering whether it was possible to produce wilderness, we asked 15 people, all lovers of the outdoors, for their description of a wilderness. From this tiny sample we learned some interesting things. Most defined a wilderness as any area with mature trees, water, cleanliness, solitude, and beauty. We were not very surprised that so many people included beauty as a requisite for wilderness. But we were surprised that so many appended the remarks, "and it ought to have good roads to let us in and see it."

This was a shocker, because the original Wilderness Act called for roadlessness as a requirement for consideration of an area.

The solitude and unspoiled grandeur of the Bob Marshall Wilderness in Montana is very beautiful. But the trails of Shenandoah National Park in Virginia are also beautiful. It would be difficult to find 5000 acres without a road in the Shenandoah, and it would be difficult to pretend that the signs of man's former habitation have all disappeared from the Shenandoah. But why search for the signs of man's former use? The desired wilderness experience is available there now.

Deep in the Bob Marshall Wilderness it is easy to believe that you are the only human who ever set foot there. But 80,000 acres of the Bob Marshall have been logged over since 1900. Would you therefore rule out the Bob Marshall? If you found the cliff dwellings of the pre-Columbian Indians, would you rule out the Gila Wilderness?

If some signs of man are still to be found in a new wilderness area, in a generation or two they'll be obscured by the actions of nature. Can't we afford to put up with that process meanwhile? Isn't that better than having no wilderness in this generation?

If you'll agree that wilderness can be "restored," then you will agree that it is ridiculous to have ten million acres of wilderness in the West, where one-quarter of our population lives, and almost no wilderness in the East, where the other three-fourths of us live.

Stripping away the rhetoric, what are the real reasons for the failure of the eastern half to get its share of Forest Service wilderness? Remember that the Forest Service had a big head start in the West—they originated the whole idea of wilderness. The western National Forests were so huge that they could easily spare the acreage for wilderness.

The national forests of Wyoming alone are bigger than all of New Hampshire, nearly as big as Maryland. The national forests of California are just a bit bigger than the whole state of Maine. New Mexico's national forests are bigger than all of Massachusetts. You could put four Connecticuts and two Rhode Islands into the national forests of Montana and have room left over for Delaware to slip in on edge. With this tremendous area in national forest, it was easy to designate wilderness areas—almost unnoticed at first.

National forests in the East are comparatively small. Most of the forested lands in the East are privately owned. The Wilderness Act ruled out acquisition of privately owned land by condemnation. The government which cannot condemn land for purchase cannot provide wilderness.

Western-oriented, the Sierra Club deserves much of the credit for supplying the push in the West. The Sierra Club didn't push for wilderness areas in the East. No one did. So the East was left out in the first ten years of the Wilderness System program.

It's time for a new look at the ten-year old, it must be thinking about growing up, about maturing to fit the needs of 1974 and 1994 and 2204. The youngster succeeded in the West, where its aims were in harmony with the other purposes for which the candidate lands were managed, and where the acreage could be "spared" from a tremendous area of national forest lands. I think it is time that the maturing wilderness program starts to think about the needs of the three-quarters of our people who live in the eastern half of the nation.

Evidently Congress also notes a lack of progress by the Forest Service in the East. The tenth birthday of the Act saw a spate of Congressional legislation setting up wilderness areas in particular national forests regardless of Forest Services wishes or recommendations. An example is H.R. 4380, introduced by Congressman Gude of Maryland. Gude's bill called for the designation of 28 separate parcels of land in Alabama, Missouri, Florida, Arkansas, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Wisconsin. A dozen companion bills testify to the congressional impatience with a system that has not produced the desired wilderness results in the East.

But it will require more than congressional designation to provide instant wilderness. It will require lots of money to buy privately owned lands. Congressmen who enthusiastically introduce authorizing legislation are

much less enthusiastic about legislating the needed funds.

To be successful, legislation for eastern wilderness must specifically authorize condemnation as a means of acquiring title to eastern lands.

Without condemnation, there will be no Wilderness East.

A misreading of size regulations represents another obstacle. Contrary to popular opinion, the present act does not insist on a minimum of 5000 acres. But the wording of the law gave many the impression that it "ought to be" 5000 acres. This impression is a crippling requirement in the East. Proper management can restore lands once abused and create wilderness, regardless of the size of the area.

Uncle Sam doesn't own enough land in the East to solve our problem under the present rules. Private land and clear redrafting of the requirements must be the source of future eastern wilderness.

Conservation-minded agencies are fond of saying "What we save today is all we will ever have." This is definitely not true of the wilderness. The true situation is that what we plan and construct today is all the eastern wilderness we will have until we plan and construct some more.

Regional planning is the only sensible method of selecting the sites for future eastern wilderness. We must identify the need for wilderness, assign it its rightful place in our priorities, and locate the wilderness near the need it will satisfy. Then we must buy the land and go out and construct wilderness.

One result of sound regional planning might well be "rotating wilderness"—areas designed to serve our wilderness needs while their growing and mature trees provide the peace, solitude, and majestic seclusion which many of us have in mind when we visualize wilderness.

This rotating wilderness might well be harvested to build America's homes when its trees are mature and moving into old age. At that time another area would come into use, and the logged area would be intensively reforested to start the whole cycle over again. Wildlife managers are enthusiastic over this rotating concept because of the great wildlife value—abundant food and shelter—providing by the young forest growing in the timbered areas.

Undoubtedly the concept of rotating wilderness is anathema to many readers. But is this feeling the result of logical thinking, or merely an aversion to change?

To many, it is paradoxical to suggest managed wilderness. But we are already managing humanity within the wilderness areas to avoid damage caused by intensive use. We disperse visitors over large areas, and still we are forced to provide sanitary facilities or risk turning our paradise into a sewage disposal area. We have learned that we must limit access to wilderness, lest we destroy the thing we admire by the sheer weight of our admiring numbers.

We have wilderness west. We can have wilderness east. We will have to pay for it, plan for it, and manage for it. There's no other way.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE: OPINIONS OF PROF. GEORGE ANASTAPLO ON CYPRUS SITUATION

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, John Anastaplos, for many years one of the outstanding radio commentators with station WJOB in Hammond, Ind., has forwarded to me exerpts from a transcript of a radio interview with his brother, George Anastaplo, an eminent lecturer and professor of political science and philosophy at the University of Chicago and Rosary College. Professor Anastaplo has been a recognized international authority on Greek history and government for many years.

I am submitting this interesting and revealing interview of July 20, 1974, on WJOB radio, Hammond, Ind., for the enlightenment of the membership:

CYPRUS COUNTDOWN AND THE FOLLY OF THE GREEK COLONELS

JOHN ANASTAPLO. How does it look on Cyrus, George? On the basis of the little news we've been getting out of there, can you give us some thoughts?

GEORGE ANASTAPLO. My first thought is that something has gone wrong with American policy when two NATO allies such as Turkey and Greece fight each other. I suppose one can also say these hostilities show us that the government in Athens is well on the way to the final bankruptcy of its policies. I know the Greek military government to be desperate. I expected them to do something simply because they have been losing their standing at home. What is now happening is partly the result of a miscalculation on the part of the colonels: They may have figured that the Turks wouldn't do anything if the Makarios government should be overthrown. The action of the Greek army against Archbishop Makarios gave the Turks the opportunity and pretext to do it. Well, the chickens have come home to roost for the Greek colonels. That is, it does seem that the government in Athens, which was evidently behind the coup earlier this week against Makarios, is in some way responsible for what has happened.

JOHN. What do you know about this fellow Sampson, who is now the self-styled President of Cyprus? Do you know anything about him?

GEORGE. Not very much. I gather he's not a nice man.

JOHN. When he took over last Monday, he said that the government of Archbishop Makarios had tortured political opponents and had to be toppled to avoid civil war. That's a throwback to what the colonels were saying in April 1967, isn't it?

GEORGE. The colonels weren't claiming torture then. *That* has been what the colonels' opponents have claimed since then, and with considerable justification.

JOHN. But they were claiming in 1967 the thwarting of civil war.

GEORGE. There is, I should notice first of all, some question in the press about the torture claims now being made against the Makarios government. The people who have been said to have been tortured on Cyprus are also said by others to be quite jolly and untortured looking when not in front of cameras. Whatever threat of civil war there was this past week on Cyprus came because of the conduct of the contingent of Greek officials stationed on Cyprus pursuant to the treaty which established the independence of Cyprus. Those officers are under the control of the government in Athens. Makarios has been trying to get them out of there, or to rotate them more frequently, for he saw them as a threat to his security. Whether he went about getting them out of there in the best possible way remains to be seen. It's also evident that Makarios has been, for some years now, the overwhelming favorite of the Greek Cypriots.

JOHN. Does Turkey feel that the new rulers will not be as amicable as was Archbishop Makarios when it comes to getting the two ethnic groups together?

GEORGE. They know that Makarios has enough sense to realize that union with Greece at this time is an explosive issue. There are two reasons for this. One, the mainland Turks don't want it and will resist it; second, the Cypriot people don't want to become united with what would be a dictatorship. It is evident to the Cypriot people that to join Greece at this time would mean to move right into a jail.

JOHN. Obviously, Turkey has the concern of those 110,000 Turkish Cypriots in mind.

GEORGE. They may have other concerns, too. They may want to have some control over Cyprus, independent of any genuine concern about the people there. The foolishness of the government in Athens is that it is only a few minutes flying time from the Turkish mainland air bases to Cyprus, with fighters and bombers, while the Greeks have to come a very long way for such flights from secure bases. This means that Greek fighter planes can barely make the round trip: their air time over Cyprus is very, very short.

JOHN. What is the United States going to do, if anything?

GEORGE. What this country, which has armed both sides, will try to do is get the fighting stopped and try to restore the status quo ante.

JOHN. I was surprised, after Archbishop Makarios was ousted on Monday—he got out while his palace was burning, went to London, and then came to the U.N. Security Council—I was surprised that this country has been so silent about his ouster.

GEORGE. That's because our government is afraid of antagonizing the colonels in Athens. What is obviously the case is that the people who are running the government in Athens don't really know what they are doing. I think we are seeing that now, unless I am very much mistaken, in their ability to deal with the Turks. Even with respect to the things you might expect they would know how to handle—that is to say, military matters—I believe we are going to see they are not as competent as would be a decent civilian government which has some respect for political realities.

JOHN. Why was Joseph Sisco, the Undersecretary of State, sent to do the troubleshooting over there? He went to London, Ankara, and Athens. Why was not Kissinger sent?

GEORGE. Perhaps because Sisco has been involved in this before and may have been thought to be "up" on it. Besides, Kissinger may simply be running out of steam. The one good thing which could come out of this miserable situation is that if the Greek government is obliged to mobilize fully its army in order to stay in power——

JOHN. The story I have this morning is that the Greek army *is* being mobilized.

GEORGE. Then there may be one ray of light on this dark horizon. If it should get back to its full strength, it may take away from the colonels the power which they usurped seven years ago. One can at least hope that the Greek army may restore the government in Athens to civilians who know what they are doing. Thus, there is the possibility the Greek people just might recover control of their own country as a result of this crisis, a crisis which has been brewing for a year now. Even so, a very high price is being paid to put the colonels in their place, ranging from the slaughter of dozens of students in Athens last November to the deaths of hundreds of people in Cyprus already this week.

JOHN. You are aware that the capital of Cyprus was bombed this morning by the Turks?

GEORGE. Yes. As I have been saying, this killing and destruction are a dreadful price to pay in order to show everybody what has long been evident, that the colonels literally don't know what they are doing.

JOHN. When was the last time you were in Greece, George?

GEORGE. It must be four years now.

JOHN. Do you have reason to feel that even today you couldn't get back in. Are you still persona no grata there?

GEORGE. There is no question about that. But that's obviously not important. What is important is whether or not the government of Greece can be put back into the hands of people who can negotiate a just and proper settlement with the Turks, with the aid of the United States if need be and with the aid of the United Nations, and thereby restore things in Greece and in that part of the Mediterranean to normalcy.

JOHN. But there always has been bitterness between Greeks and Turks. We grew up as children with that drummed into our heads, even in this country.

GEORGE. The point is that people, no matter how bitter they are, should keep in mind what the facts are. The decisive advantage Archbishop Makarios had as President of Cyprus was that he could count: he could measure miles and he could weigh military forces. This is something that the colonels in Greece cannot do. They need an education, but the Greek people are paying the price for the colonels' education. I can sum up what I have just been saying by observing that one has to look at the numbers which are available on both sides of a conflict, and the distances involved, and conduct oneself accordingly.

JOHN. But, George, hasn't there been for years, even before the 1967 military coup on the island of Cyprus, a strong movement among the population (which is about 80% Greek and about 20% Turkish)—the Greek population there and in Greece for a union between Cyprus and Greece?

GEORGE. Yes, John, but what can be done about it? If Turkey, sitting there with its arms, with its superior numbers and with its superior strategic position, simply won't tolerate it, whatever the equities of the case may be, what can be done about it?

JOHN. The last time the Greeks and Turks fought—when was it, in 1921?

GEORGE. They have been fighting for four hundred years and more.

JOHN. But the most recent fighting was in 1921?

GEORGE. They have had other skirmishes since then as well. Such longstanding animosity should make statesmen even more cautious, lest passions get out of hand. Archbishop Makarios seems to have been trying to act as a responsible statesman. He couldn't have the luxury enjoyed by Greeks in Athens or in this country—the luxury of posturing for union. He realizes that it makes no sense—no military sense, no strategic sense. And right now, considering the character of the regime back in Athens, it doesn't make political sense either.

JOHN. Is the Archbishop in this country going to involve itself in this?

GEORGE. I have no idea, except that *this* archbishop has to be careful too—for different reasons.

JOHN. What do you think will come of all this in the Greek-American community?

GEORGE. One good thing which might happen in this country is that influential Greek-Americans——

JOHN. Who have been strangely silent, or rather who have been most favorable to the colonels' government in Athens?

GEORGE. That's right. Now Greek-Americans will have to consider whether the dictators in Athens really know what they are doing, something which should have been faced up to long ago by the Greek-American community. When the roof begins to fall in, as my wife reminds me from time to time, one is obliged to consider whether one's methods have been proper.

JOHN. Has your roof begun falling in?

GEORGE. It's leaking.

GILMAN URGES ACTION ON EDUCATION BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with Congressman WOLFF and some of my colleagues from the Veterans' Affairs Committee in urging your assistance in bringing the Senate version of the proposed education benefits bill for Vietnam era veterans to the full House for consideration. With the approach of a new school year, our hesitation in passing this legislation is perpetrating a cruel hoax on those individuals who deserve our best efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the process of providing suitable educational benefits for Vietnam era veterans has been a long, drawn-out process. For the benefit of my colleagues, permit me to recount the events which have led to the uncertain position we now find ourselves in.

On July 10, 1973, I joined in introducing legislation removing the time limitation in which a veteran might avail himself of educational benefits as provided under the GI bill.

On November 15, 1973, I joined in sponsoring legislation which would provide increased tuition assistance to Vietnam era veterans. At about the same time, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs began their hearings on this issue and began to formulate a plan for providing additional assistance to our veterans.

On February 19, 1974, the Veterans' Affairs Committee brought H.R. 12628, the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1974, to the House floor for consideration. This measure extended the time limitation for using veterans education benefits to 10 years and provided for a 13.6-percent increase in financial assistance to those veterans using the benefits. At that time I spoke in support of the measure which passed the House by a vote of 382 to 0.

Subsequent to the passage of this measure, the Senate began its efforts in developing an education benefits bill. While the House was pressing for prompt action, the Senate hearings and committee markup were delayed and by the time the 8-year limitation for education benefits of some Vietnam era veterans was due to expire, the Senate had not taken any final action on any bill. Accordingly, I wrote to Senator HARTKE, chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, urging his committee to take action on a veterans benefits bill so that our veterans might begin to make plans for their future study.

Since it was evident that the Senate committee intended to come forward with legislation substantially different from the House passed measure, on May 16, 1974, I joined in introducing legislation providing for a 2-year extension of benefits without any provision for increased benefits so that, at least, our veterans could begin to plan for utilizing this privilege.

On May 23 we passed an emergency 30-day extension of benefits and following that, on May 31, 1974, the President signed a measure providing for a full 2-year extension of benefits.

Subsequent to that action, on June 19, the Senate passed their version of the full benefit plan which differed from the House version in several respects. While the House authorized a 13.6 percent increase in financial assistance, the Senate bill called for an 18.6 percent increase. The Senate measure also included a tuition supplement program and called for the maximum entitlement of educational benefits for veterans to be extended from 36 to 45 months. The House bill did not include either of these provisions.

On June 26, 1974, I urged the House committee to adopt the provisions of the Senate bill. While these provisions differ substantially from the House bill, they are more responsive to our commitment to those veterans who fought bravely in an unpopular war. With the bill presently in conference and the House conferees reluctant to recede to the more inclusive Senate version, it seems doubtful that we will provide our veterans with the helping hand that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate proposal has never even come to the House floor for a vote. It is my opinion from discussing this issue with my colleagues, that if the Senate version were put to a vote, that version might prevail. However, with the pending stalemate in the conference committee, where neither side is willing to reach any viable compromise, we request your good assistance in intervening on behalf of our veterans so that we might assure these defenders of our country that Congress has not turned a deaf ear to their needs.

Mr. Speaker, the timing of this measure is critical. With the House scheduled to indefinitely postpone legislative business for several weeks in order to take up the Judiciary Committee's report on the impeachment of the President, we must assure the passage of a bill prior to our August 19 deadline. Inaction by the Congress in this important area would be inexcusable.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am joining several of my colleagues today in petitioning you to intervene with the House conferees and urge them to recede from their disagreement with the Senate amendments and adopt the provisions of the Senate bill. Anything less on our part would be an affront to those who gave so much for their country.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, when the election reform bill H.R. 16090, is before the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) and I, and others will offer the following amendment:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. FRENZEL AND MR. FASCELL

Page 25, strike out line 14 and all that follows down through page 27, line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) Section 308(a)(10) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as so redesignated by subsection (a) of this section), relating to the duty of the Board to prescribe rules and regulations, is amended to read as follows:

"(10) to prescribe suitable rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title, including such rules and regulations as may be necessary to require that—

"(A) reports and statements required to be filed under this title by a candidate for the office of Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, and by political committees supporting such candidate, shall be received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives as custodian for the Board;

"(B) reports and statements required to be filed under this title by a candidate for the office of Senator, and by political committees supporting such candidate, shall be received by the Secretary of the Senate as custodian for the Board; and

"(C) the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate, as custodians for the Board, each shall make the reports and statements received by him available for public inspection and copying in accordance with paragraph (4) of this subsection, and preserve such reports and statements in accordance with paragraph (5) of this subsection.".

(c) It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the House of Represenatives and the Secretary of the Senate to cooperate with the Board of Supervisory Officers in carrying out its duties under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 and to furnish such services and facilities as may be required in accordance with the amendment made by subsection (b) of this section.

Page 32, strike out lines 13 through 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(g) 'supervisory officer' means the Board of Supervisory Officers established by section 308(a)(1).".

Page 33, strike out lines 20 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

4 members as follows:

Page 33, line 24, strike out "(D)" and insert in lieu thereof "(A)".

Page 34, line 3, strike out "(E)" and insert in lieu thereof "(B)".

Page 34, line 8, strike out "(D) and (E)" and insert in lieu thereof "(A) and (B)".

Page 34, line 15, strike out "(D) and (E)" and insert in lieu thereof "(A) and (B)".

Page 34, line 24, strike out "(D)" and insert in lieu thereof "(A)".

Page 35, line 2, strike out "(E)" and insert in lieu thereof "(B)".

Page 35, beginning in line 6, strike out ", prorated on a daily basis" and all that follows down through line 11 and insert in lieu thereof a period.

Page 37, beginning in line 9, strike out "and to review actions of the supervisory officers".

Page 38, strike out line 25 and all that follows down through page 39, line 6.

Page 39, line 7, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)(1)", and renumber the following paragraphs accordingly.

Page 39, line 15, strike out "Any supervisory officer" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, or any other person receiving reports and statements as custodian for the Board,

Page 43, beginning in line 16, strike out "each of the" and all that follows down through line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

the Board such sums as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its duties under this Act.".

RACIAL INJUSTICE IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the many hours of debate spent in this forum on Rhodesian sanctions, perhaps too much attention has been paid to the economic and strategic aspects and too little to basic human rights.

I am sure my colleagues are familiar with the history of this unfortunate colony—of how a minority, bent on perpetuating the political subjugation of the majority, illegally seized power, and then proceeded to "enact laws specifically designed to uproot and disperse African people from their ancestral homes; deny them of free movement, free speech, and free association; subject them to arbitrary arrests, restrictions, and detentions; deny them every chance to become masters in the country of their own birth and forced thousands into refugee camps and exile around the world."

The Smith regime's doctrine of white supremacy has resulted in the virtual enslavement of Rhodesia's black majority.

Under the Registration and Identification Amendment Act—1972, it is a crime for an African to be found without a valid identity document. In addition, it makes it a crime for an African to leave Rhodesia without first getting a permit from a registration officer.

In the Land Tenure Act of 1969, blacks were prohibited from occupying land in European areas. This abominable legislation caused the forced movement of thousands of black Africans; to make matters worse, the Rhodesian Constitution gives 50 percent of the best land in Rhodesia to the 5 percent who are white.

These, however, are mild when compared to the countless instances of torture and injustice which have occurred since this illegal regime came to power. The Gestapo-like tactics of the Rhodesian police are exemplified in the following article: I encourage all of my colleagues to read this description by a Catholic bishop of life in Rhodesia.

RHODESIAN GOVERNMENT TERRORISTS LIKE NAZIS, BISHOP SAYS

(By John Maher)

WASHINGTON.—The process of terror and intimidation carried out by the white minority government in Rhodesia against black Rhodesians "differs, not in essence, but only in degree, from the persecution of the Jews by the Nazis," a Rhodesian Catholic bishop said here.

Bishop Donal Lamont of Umtali, chairman of the Justice and Peace Commission of the Rhodesian Bishops' Conference and former president of the conference, presented evidence of brutality by Rhodesian security forces that had led the Justice and Peace Commission to call for a government inquiry into allegations of such brutality.

The evidence included a statement by a 29-year-old African who is a music director at a Catholic mission. He told of being arrested by the police and accused of attending a meeting with black terrorists and of being a terrorist. To make him confess, the police held him down and beat him with sticks on the soles of his bare feet for three and a half hours until he could no longer walk, he said.

Two days later, after spending the intervening day in a cell, he was beaten with belts and fists by five policemen until he lost consciousness, he said. After reviving, he was picked up, dropped on the floor, jumped on and beaten until he again blacked out.

He was released nearly two weeks after his arrest, he said, adding "At no time did I have anything to do with terrorists."

On the basis of this and other evidence, the Justice and Peace Commission took an advertisement in The Rhodesian Herald, the country's leading daily newspaper, calling on the government to institute "a full and impartial inquiry" into "widespread accusations of brutality by members of the police and army against African civilians."

Acknowledging that witnesses of such brutality have been reluctant to testify for fear of reprisal, the commission said: "Where specific evidence has been available this has been communicated by this commission to the Minister of Justice."

Two days after the appeal appeared, Minister of Justice, Law and Order Desmond Lardner-Burke, speaking in parliament, rejected a commission of inquiry as unnecessary and possibly harmful to the morale of the security forces.

He accused the Catholic bishops of seeking "to provoke a state versus Church confrontation." The advertisement, he said, "is the latest in their persistent attempts to undermine lawful authority and the forces of law and order, which has emerged as their true policy in this country, as it is in Mozambique where the Church's involvement in the terrorist cause has been amply demonstrated."

In a statement issued before he left Rhodesia, Bishop Lamont had said that evidence presented to Lardner-Burke by the Justice and Peace Commission was "not based on rumor" and, calling the justice minister's accusations against the Church "a most serious calumny," he had demanded an apology.

The 62-year-old Bishop Lamont, a native of Northern Ireland, said in an interview here that the terrorism by black Africans that the government is trying to suppress by counterterrorism is a response to the institutionalized violence of the Rhodesian situation. "Under the terms of the Rhodesian constitution," he said, "Africans are second-class citizens and are imprisoned behind its bars."

Now, he said, there is hope for blacks to advance politically, socially and economically only "very, very slowly and a very, very few of them."

Giving instances of the blacks' plight, the bishop said:

"Because elementary education is compulsory for white children but not for blacks, the government is required to support education for whites, but not for blacks. Two percent of the gross national product, the total value of goods and services produced by the national economy, goes into the education of Africans, who are 22 times more numerous than whites;

"Wages are 10 times higher for whites than for blacks and in many trades there are no apprenticeships for blacks;

"The per capita income of those living on the peasant economy, 60 percent of the population, is $29 a year;

"The Tribal Trust land assigned to Africans comprises 47 percent of the land area, but only 18 percent is suitable for cash cropping. Africans are 94 percent of the population;

"Of African children in school in 1972, 105,000 were not in school in 1973 because of the percentage control exercised by the government on those who can proceed further."

"To me," Bishop Lamont said, "everything is calculated to bring about an explosion of the most horrible magnitude." He said a "hurricane of hatred" is building up.

"White lay people of all denominations," he said, "will vote at least 95 percent solidly with the government. They are not cruel people, but selfish, insensitive, unwilling to share."

Rhodesia was formerly a British colony. The present government declared the country independent in 1965 after failing to agree with Great Britain about giving blacks a greater voice in government.

Britain imposed a trade blockade and the United Nations voted to impose economic sanctions, barring its members from trading with Rhodesia.

A proposed agreement between Great Britain and Rhodesia that would have recognized Rhodesia's independence and ended the sanctions was dropped in 1972 after a British commission reported that a majority of black Rhodesians rejected the agreement.

In 1971 Congress authorized the United States to make an exception from the sanctions for Rhodesian chrome ore. In testimony before a Senate subcommittee, the U.S. Catholic Conference last year urged a halt to the chrome imports. The Senate voted to end them and the matter has not yet come before the House.

"Sanctions are the alternative to physical force," Bishop Lamont said. "They are a civilized manner of imposing a penalty on those who violate the human condition. They are not a punishment for Rhodesia's declaration of independence but for Rhodesia's violation of the most fundamental human rights."

He said the declaration of rights in the Rhodesian constitution has been "emasculated by provisos which leave all decisions as to its validity in the hands of the appropriate minister of government."

"We are told," he said, "that sanctions hurt Africans more than Europeans (Rhodesian whites). That's rubbish. They do reduce the possibilities of employment for the small number of blacks in industry but even those in industry, who are paid slave wages, want the sanctions in the hope of getting rid of the government."

Bishop Lamont met with Congressmen here to present his view of the Rhodesian situation.

Catholic education, the bishop said, can have little effect on changing the minds of the younger white population, because there are fewer than 10 private Catholic secondary schools for whites in the country.

"The young people would get out of Rhodesia if they could," the bishop said, pointing out that the main resistance to change is from those who now hold power. "They're providing all the ammunition for the communists."

The Catholic Church, Bishop Lamont said, has continued to accept blacks in predominantly white schools "in defiance of the law" which forbids persons of one race from occupying land assigned to another race.

Because Catholic schools receive "minimal" government support, however, he said, they have to charge tuition and for economic reasons there are few blacks in white Catholic schools.

It is perhaps evidence of the blacks' recognition of the Church's defence of their rights that the national seminary is full. "We have had to add to it in the past five years," Bishop Lamont said. But, he added, there are hardly any vocations among white Catholics.

Mr. Speaker, the price we paid to rid this country of slavery was a long and bloody civil war. We now have the opportunity to bring about the peaceful transition to majority rule in Rhodesia through U.N. sanctions. It would be wrong, indeed criminal, to not meet this obligation. I therefore ask my colleagues to support S. 1868—a bill to restore the United States to full compliance with U.N. sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

NEW HOPE TOWERS

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 1, 1974

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, there is not one Member of Congress who comes to Washington without a great deal of idealism. Every Congressman has a vision, a hope, a dream—for his Congress, for his constituents, for his country. As you and I are well aware, a tremendous amount of personal energy is expended working to realize the ideals of our time. So much of what we do advances us frustratingly little toward this goal. Democracy is a slow and lumbering means to our ends. But you and our colleagues must know as I do, those rare moments of reward—those moments when dedicated individuals working together for a common cause meet with their due success—and really is that not what government is all about? And that success fills you with such pride—pride in the process and pride in the people involved. I have recently known such a moment. I am sure you will share in my overwhelming sense of satisfaction and join me in congratulating those involved when I tell you about a truly historic instance of community cooperation.

Some of you may not know a great deal about Stamford, Conn. It is a city in which I have always taken a great deal of pride and you are about to hear one of the reasons why I continue to do so. Stamford has, for years, been engaged in a massive urban renewal program. The innovations in the downtown area to date are extremely impressive. The tired cityscape has been miraculously renewed already and I marvel every time I drive down the Connecticut Turnpike, for it seems Stamford's got another landmark building up. It is utterly fantastic.

The incident I am relating today began almost 8 years ago, when a black church in Stamford—Faith Tabernacle Baptist—formed the New Hope Corp., and petitioned the local authorities to be allowed to sponsor a nonprofit housing development on 2 acres of the city's central city redevelopment project.

Over the years, the project encountered the usual number of frustrating delays, and the start of New Hope Towers was set back. Determined to press forward with its black self-help program, the church went out and acquired another site, with the help of a grant from Clairol, Inc., a nationally known firm based in Stamford, and proceeded to build another, more modest, nonprofit housing development—Coleman Towers.

Eventually, the site for New Hope Towers was turned over to the church and construction began on a 200-unit apartment complex. Again the church was faced with the usual run of problems, necessitating costly change orders which were approved by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

However, while HUD approved the change orders, no change was made in the FHA permanent mortgage commitment. When the project was nearing completion last fall, and the term of the construction mortgage was about run out, the church was faced with a dilemma.

The construction mortgageholder was naturally skeptical about the prospects for approval of an increase in the permanent mortgage, in view of the President's "freeze" on housing funds, and was unwilling to extend the construction mortgage unless he had some guarantees assuring payment of the additional interest and penalties. The church had no funds to meet these additional carrying charges. Foreclosure seemed imminent.

At this point the contractor for New Hope Towers—Frank Mercede & Sons of Stamford—stepped forward. The Mercedes—Frank and his son Nick—had already put up escrow money to cover the change orders, as required by HUD, and had not been paid for much of their work.

To their credit, they volunteered to guarantee the additional interest and penalty payments to the construction mortgagee for a period sufficient to arrange refinancing. It seemed obvious, however, that an application for an increase in the permanent mortgage would have rough going in view of the freeze, and that even if such an application were approved it would in all likelihood not be sufficient to cover the construction over-runs and the additional carrying charges.

The Mercedes engaged a Stamford consulting and housing management firm—Cooke, Haynes and Co.—which has done outstanding work on nonprofit housing ventures in the Stamford area, and on the advice of Cooke, Haynes decided that the only viable solution to the church's problem was to convert New Hope Towers to a limited dividend venture.

This would provide some of the additional capital necessary to avert foreclosure, would allow the Mercedes to convert the balance owed to them into an equity interest, and would assure that New Hope Towers was preserved for its originally intended use—housing for low-moderate income families.

All parties agreed to this procedure and application was made to HUD to approve the conversion. In this instance, I was pleased to be able to join with other members of the Connecticut delegation to help expedite HUD's approval.

During the months when the conversion application was being processed, the Mercedes sought limited partners to provide the additional financing. Efforts

to place the limited shares through the market were unsuccessful, and with the help of the mayor of Stamford—the Honorable Frederick P. Lenz, Jr.—an approach was made to a number of Stamford-based corporations.

Under the leadership of Clairol and with the specific guidance of one of its employees, Wayne Tyson, and with a strong commitment by another Stamford-based firm, General Telephone & Electronics, a consortium of six companies was created to form the limited partnership. With GTE putting up 50 percent and Clairol, Continental Oil, Olin, Pitney Bowes, and Xerox sharing the other 50 percent, the consortium invested $850,000 in New Hope Towers. The Mercedes agreed to leave approximately $200,000 in the project and to form, with the church, the general partnership.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tyson's role in this effort should be especially noted for it was he who provided the necessary glue and is credited by most as the one who stayed with the project through it all; his dedication should serve as an inspiration to all of us.

As for the six corporations—and the Mercedes—none of them viewed this as what could be called a financially attractive investment; they saw it as a socially responsible investment in their community.

On June 4, 1974, a final closing was held in the Hartford office of Lawrence Thompson, area director of HUD, and on June 10, 1974 it was my pleasure to participate in ceremonies at New Hope Towers in which keys to their apartments were presented to the first three families.

This was, indeed, a day of "New Hope" for the Stamford community. It marked the coming together of the entire community, black and white, rich and poor, a church, the private sector, and local and Federal Government. It brought to fruition the housing self-help efforts of a black church; it saved for the entire community 200 units of desperately needed low-moderate income housing; and it contributed significantly to the eventual success of what I believe to be one of the truly outstanding urban redevelopment projects in the Nation.

The Rev. Dr. Samuel L. White, and his predecessor as pastor of Faith Tabernacle Baptist Church and founder of New Hope—the Rev. Rafe M. Taylor—and their parishioners, deserve great credit for their vision, their perseverance and dedication. They carried this project, and Coleman Towers, on their own for many years, coming up with funds out of their own pockets—$5, $10 and a $100 at a time dipping into savings and cutting corners at home.

The Mercedes—father and son—are owed a tremendous debt of thanks by all concerned. They committed themselves to saving New Hope, and carried it alone for many months at great cost when everyone said there was "little hope" of saving New Hope.

The six corporations demonstrated corporate social responsibility at its best, and great credit must go to those executive officers who promptly made commitments on behalf of their companies—Bruce S. Gelb, president of Clairol; C. Howard Hardesty, Jr., executive vice president of Continental Oil; Leslie H. Warner, chairman of the board of General Telephone and Electronics; John Henske, president of Olin; Fred T. Allen, chairman of the board of Pitney Bowes; and C. Peter McColough, chairman of the board of Xerox.

Many others deserve credit—Terrence M. Cooke of Cooke, Haynes and Co., HUD Area Director Thompson and his staff, and the many lawyers and accountants who worked late hours to put the pieces together.

Finally, after standing completed but unoccupied for more than 6 months, New Hope is a reality, and it is a special testament to the black members of Faith Tabernacle Baptist Church that New Hope Towers will be fully integrated, with a majority of apartments occupied by whites.

In closing I would like to quote from a resolution by the board of directors of the Stamford Area Commerce & Industry Association:

The Board of Directors of the Stamford Area Commerce and Industry Association, Inc. recognizes fully that the New Hope Towers moderate income housing project is critical to providing the Stamford Community with housing in this price range, also to the success of the Stamford urban renewal project, whose expeditious completion continues to be a major goal of SACIA and the business community whose interests it serves.

Accordingly, the Board of Directors commends the consortium of community minded Stamford corporations and the project's contractor, Frank Mercede and Sons, for making possible the additional permanent financing of $850,000 needed to save the 200 units of moderate income housing for Stamford. Without this commitment, Stamford could have lost this important housing project. In turn, it would have affected the entire urban renewal effort, making it more difficult, if not impossible, to realize needed retail and commercial development within the urban renewal area.

The Board of Directors expresses its full appreciation to Leslie Warner, Chairman of the Board of General Telephone and Electronics; Fred T. Allen, Chairman of the Board and President of Pitney Bowes; Bruce Gelb, President of Clairol; John Henske, President of Olin Corporation; John Kircher, President of Continental Oil; and, Archie McCardell, President of Xerox Corporation for the corporate financial commitment made to the New Hope Towers project which will now serve as a major source of relocation housing for families from the urban renewal area and other community citizens who need safe, sanitary, decent housing for themselves and their families.

The Board of Directors believes that this corporate commitment reflects positively on the entire business community and stands as an example of the effective role that business can play in advancing sound private sector solutions to the urban problems of American cities.

Mr. Speaker, none of these individuals working alone could have saved New Hope. The financial complications of the project were too serious. A cooperative effort was needed—a cooperative effort born out of the good will and sense of community responsibility exhibited by each and every individual who believed strongly enough in the Tower's project to invest hundreds of hours and hundreds of thousands of dollars for the good of all. Thanks to the contributions of these outstanding community members a dream has come true and Stamford's housing problem is that much closer to being solved. The New Hope story should be just that—a story of new hope. From this lesson of dedication and cooperation we can indeed derive new hope for our future ability to solve the problems of this Nation.

COASTAL ZONE AND ENERGY PRODUCTION COORDINATION ACT OF 1974

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, I introduced the Coastal Zone and Energy Production Coordination Act of 1974, H.R. 16228. The purpose of this bill is to insure that those States with coastal area have adequate financial and technical capacity to perform the planning and management functions required to coordinate energy-related development in their coastal areas. My statement explaining the bill and the text of the proposed legislation can be found on pages 7552, 7553, and 7554 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In April of this year, the Council on Environmental Quality issued its preliminary assessment of the environmental implications of drilling for oil and natural gas on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf and in the Gulf of Alaska. Its conclusions made provocative reading and I would like to insert them for the information of my colleagues and in support of my legislation:

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Outer continental shelf oil and gas production will result in onshore development of huge refineries, petrochemical complexes, gas processing facilities, construction industries, and other service operations. This development will create jobs, increase income, shift populations, change residential and commercial development and land use extensively, and degrade the environment. These impacts are at least partially controllable by siting and development policies that encourage environmental protection and good design.

ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Economic impacts, including employment and output, vary from region to region. By the year 2000, as many as 75,000 additional jobs would be created in one sample area (Charleston) and as many as 120,000 in one sample region (South Carolina and Georgia) under high OCS production assumptions. These figures represent 40 and 25 percent increases over expected conditions without offshore drilling in the area and region, respectively.

Not all regions would experience such growth. In New England, less than 20,000 new jobs would be created in the local area (9 percent over the base case) and about 80,000 jobs in the region (3 percent). The west coast growth is somewhat smaller—about 20,000 new local jobs and 40,000 or fewer for each region.

Impacts in Alaska would be smaller in terms of the absolute number of jobs but much more significant in terms of percentage increases. Under low OCS production assumptions, new employment would be roughly one-third to one-half of the high development case.

Of the five industrial sectors analysed—oil and gas recovery, gas processing, refining, petrochemicals, and construction—construction in 1985 and petrochemicals in 2000 tend to be the largest employers. The assumed development timeables result in maximum construction employment in the 1980's to support the rapid refining and petrochemical development that occurs as OCS production builds to its 1990's peak. The demand for construction workers in 1985 would lead to shortages of skilled personnel in some areas. Overall, the largest employer will be the service sector that supports these industries and the larger population.

The significant demands for labor could lower local and regional unemployment rates relative to other areas of the Nation. But low unemployment will not always result because publicity often attracts more workers than are needed and unemployment remains high. The increased demand for labor may also raise average wages in an area and therefore the average per capita income of each area. However, income benefits may not always accrue to current residents of the area but may instead go to imported labor.

Specific industrial sectors within each area will be especially affected. Less land will be farmed, for example, due to the demand for large land parcels for indutrial development and to increasing land values and taxes. Commercial fishing may be seriously damaged by both water pollution and mechanical interference from increasing marine activity. Experience in Alaska indicates that per capita income of fishermen may decrease. Consideration must be given to the fact that fisheries are renewable resources and are continuing sources of income, whereas minerals may be depleted in our lifetime.

The demand for hotels, motels, restaurants, and temporary housing for construction workers could be stimulated. On the other hand, recreational industries could be hurt, especially where the character of the communities is one of isolation, historic preservation, or natural beauty. Resort and recreational patterns could be radically altered by offshore drilling and production. A major oil spill along the beaches of Cape Cod, Long Island, or the Middle or South Atlantic states could devastate the area affected.

Assuming that the goal toward U.S. energy self-sufficiency is vigorously pursued, aggregate domestic oil, gas, and coal production will rise correspondingly. Any employment, investment, income, or population shifts to regions or localities resulting from Atlantic or Alaska oil and gas development will probably represent shifts away from other areas. For OCS development the shift will be to coastal areas, thus reinforcing what some consider an undesirable trend of population movement.

SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACTS

OCS-related development onshore will create new markets and new demands on land and services to support the industries and employees who locate in an area. Although land use planning and controls can reduce the damage of such development to the environment and to the fiscal capacity of a community, the pace at which development occurs and the tremendous changes that it will bring in some communities make careful analysis of the effects of the development an essential part of any community's decision to allow the refineries and other facilities to come in.

Population increase figures are one measure of the kinds of impacts that can be anticipated. Increases of between 20,000 and 145,000 over base case projections may be expected in sample areas (excluding Alaska). Low OCS development could require one-third to one-half of this growth. Impacts appear greatest in the Charleston area, where the added population could almost double the current population and would be the equivalent of building a new city in little over a decade. Increases in Alaska, though smaller in absolute numbers, would be greater in degree because of the impacts on lifestyles and on pristine, fragile ecosystems. Table 7–22 shows the impacts on employment and population in several Alaskan communities. In all other regions except Florida and Alaska, increases would be less than 5 percent, although local areas in New Jersey, Jacksonville, and Puget Sound could experience significant growth.

The concomitant demand for services—schools, hospitals, transportation, housing, commercial facilities, sewers, office space, and public utilities—may be difficult for some communities to meet. Water demand is approximately 65 percent by the direct industries, 22 percent indirect, and 13 percent for residential and commercial use.

Industry's major water use is for cooling, a need that can be satisfied at coastal locations. The sample areas with the greatest water supply problems are San Francisco and southern New Jersey, although the Charleston area would have some supply problems. Planning for these public services and facilities would require large increases in local government overhead. Furthermore, the service infrastructure and the needed new housing and commercial facilities would require major capital expenditures; in the Charleston area alone, needed mortgage financing is estimated at about $1 billion.

In all areas infrastructure impacts could strain individual communities. The ability of a given community to cope with this growth depends largely on its size, its existing capacity to plan and control growth, and its financial structure. A city like Jacksonville, where rapid growth has already occurred and planning agencies exist, should be able to respond to OCS-related growth if it desires. But small areas and those without much experience handling growth may be unable to meet demands.

There may also be great changes in the social and psychological fabric of communities. The transition from rural life to an industrial economy involves many social, institutional, economic, and psychic changes. Many communities may resist the promise of economic gains in order to preserve their traditional lifestyles and the character of their towns and villages.

The case studies point out a number of these important community impact issues. The New England case study shows how development, if not controlled regionally, will gravitate to a number of smaller towns where residential and commercial activity could threaten the architectural and historic resources that have been protected for generations. Development might better be directed to the declining areas of the larger cities, where the infusion of economic activity is needed. The New Jersey analysis shows greatly reduced community impacts by expanding existing sites and locating new facilities in the already industrialized Delaware Valley. The Charleston case study points out the need for locales to anticipate and plan for large population influxes and to protect their most valuable natural and manmade resources from destruction by the new economic forces at work. Good planning and regulatory programs can channel those forces into desirable development that will enhance the environmental quality and life in an area.

LAND SUPPLY

Even under the high development cases, each sample region has sufficient undeveloped land to meet the requirements for OCS-induced development if environmental and locational values were ignored. As much as 75,000 acres of previously undeveloped land would be required in the South Carolina/Georgia region. However, large amounts of undeveloped acreage are really unavailable due to environmental values (e.g., wetlands, ecological sanctuaries, national parks and seashores, and coastal recreation areas), locational constraints (e.g., excessive slopes, inadequate water, and distance from major population centers), and such factors as local preference for agricultural preservation and low-density single-family housing.

Excluding land for these reasons causes a shortage for OCS-related development in some regions. It may be extremely difficult, for example, to find enough land in the San Francisco Bay and Puget Sound regions for base case and OCS-induced growth. In fact, environmental and locational constraints remove about 90 percent of the undeveloped land in the San Francisco Bay region. Land in some of the potential Alaska staging areas is scarce due to land configuration, native claims, and location of natural areas.

It must be emphasized that primary industry need not develop adjacent to offshore production areas. Onshore development sites may be determined more by what land is available when needed than by location alone. If a company has refining capacity in particular locations, it may elect to expand capacity, but if it has no refineries in reasonable proximity or desires to establish capacity in a new area, new sites may be needed.

Although land appears available in most regions, inland locations are often preferable to the environmentally fragile coastal areas. Transporting crude oil inland may not cost as much as the benefits.

WILDLIFE AND VEGETATION

The habitat most in danger from OCS-related development is the estuarine wetlands. It can be a land fill site, a source for dredge and fill operations, a solid waste disposal site, agricultural land, and once dried, a site for industrial or residential development. Over time these uses have resulted in loss of a significant percentage of U.S. wetlands, and most states have not taken steps to protect further encroachment. Inland forest, woodland, and wetland habitat can also be harmed by poorly regulated development. Population increases create demands for more highways, houses, shopping centers, etc., which in turn increase the vulnerability of natural areas and other wildlife habitat.

In a relatively undeveloped area like Cumberland and Cape May Counties, N.J., the population growth and related industrial development could adversely affect one of the Nation's most productive and ideally located coastal wetland areas and its productive estuarine zone. With good planning and effective protective measures, however, there is an opportunity to accommodate most development anticipated by OCS activities, especially if upriver sites are used as often as possible. In contrast, in Solano/Contra Costa Counties, Calif., an area that is already relatively developed, even the small population increase and related development expected with OCS production could significantly increase the pressures on the limited remaining wildlife habitat.

In all the localities and regions the impact will be determined by the way that development is handled. Design and siting decisions and good wildlife management practices can help prevent or mitigate damage. In the case of OCS-related development, this may mean narrow pipeline or tanker corridors, restoration of any disturbed areas, and inland siting.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION IMPACTS

Air and water pollution are not generally expected to be significant with use of emission and effluent control technologies. In

selected locations, hydrocarbon emissions and BOD levels may rise due to concentration of refineries and petrochemical industries. In these areas, decreased hydrocarbon emissions as a result of auto emission controls would be offset by new sources of hydrocarbons. Where significant increases in population are anticipated, as in Charleston, auto emissions may also be a factor.

Before any definitive conclusion can be reached about air and water quality levels in a particular area, diffusion modeling is necessary. Ambient levels do not always relate directly to emissions, and health standards could be exceeded, depending upon exact location, terrain, and meteorological conditions. Other pollutants, such as sydrogen sulfide, oils and grease, phenols, and ammonia should be carefully controlled.

Gas recovery and processing would seem to have significantly less environmental, economic, and social impacts than oil recovery and processing, assuming oil as a feedstock for petrochemical plants. For example, a typical refinery of 200,000 barrels per day employs 500 people, contributes $330 million to economic output, and requires 1,200 acres of land. A typical gas processing plant of 500 million cubic feet per day employs 50 people, contributes $11.8 million to output, and requires about 20 acres of land. Oil-induced development is considerably more vast than gas-induced development and also produces more pollution emissions.

Barring major changes in the U.S. import policy in the next few years, refinery and petrochemical industry growth may be expected prior to OCS development in conjunction with possible dispersed deepwater terminals to receive oil imports. The impacts of this growth should be similar in each local area and region to the onshore impacts of high OCS development. How the areas respond to import-induced growth should set the stage for understanding possible response to OCS-induced development.

STATUS OF VETERANS' EDUCATION BILL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I, along with five of my colleagues, four of whom are members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, have written to the Speaker urging him to intervene with the House conferees on the Veterans' Education and Rehabilitation Amendments Act. I was joined in this effort by Representatives BENJAMIN GILMAN, WILLIAM WALSH, DON EDWARDS, JOSEPH MARAZITI, and ELLA GRASSO. A copy of our letter will follow my remarks.

The veterans' education bill has been in conference for over a month now. If it does not come out of conference before August 19, when we are scheduled to begin impeachment debate, the Vietnam veteran will more than likely not have the adequate assistance he needs to start school in September.

The Speaker has already indicated his support for the Senate version, which contains far more equitable and needed improvements in the GI bill than does the House measure. We are asking the Speaker to translate that support into positive action to insure that the House has an opportunity to act on the Senate bill and give the Vietnam vet the assistance he needs and deserves.

The major obstacle to House-Senate agreement on the veterans' education bill remains the Senate provision to provide tuition payments to offset high tuition costs. This provision could possibly do more than any other to equalize the GI bill, to give vets in high-cost tuition States the chance to use their GI benefits.

This week the President issued a strong statement opposing the improvements contained in the Senate bill. I, for one, was dismayed that the same President who said:

As a matter of equity, today's veteran should receive benefits in inflated adjusted dollars that are no less than the maximum amount that was available to me and other veterans following World War II.

And should so utterly denounce improvements which are specifically intended to bring the present GI bill up to a par with its WW II predecessor. The President also said,

Just as we have kept faith with our allies abroad, let us now keep faith with our returning veterans at home.

What kind of faith are we keeping when we can provide $350 million to the Government of South Vietnam and yet will not spend $250 million on the young men and women who served in Vietnam, to give them their chance at tomorrow? It is simply unacceptable that $350 million can be requested by the administration for South Vietnam, while $250 million in educational benefits for those who served in Vietnam is denounced as "too inflationary and unnecessary."

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a responsibility to effect a reordering of our priorities. The improvements contained in the Senate bill were adopted by the Senate by a vote of 91 to 0. The House should do no less to repay the debt of gratitude we owe to those who served.

I would like to include in the RECORD the text of our letter to the Speaker, as well as a list of the more than 70 House Members who have endorsed tuition payments for Vietnam veterans.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1974.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are writing to request your intervention with the House conferees on the Veterans Education and Rehabilitation Amendments Act.

The major stumbling block to House-Senate agreement on this vital legislation remains the Senate provision to provide tuition payments to Vietnam veterans. On July 10, in response to a New York Delegation letter, you wrote to Congressmen Jim Delaney and Congressman Howard Robison indicating your concurrence that the House should recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendments and adopt the provisions of the Senate bill.

At each day passes, it becomes more imperative that the House agree to the Senate version. If this matter is not resolved prior to August 19, when the House is scheduled to begin the impeachment debate, it is more than likely that Vietnam veterans will not have adequate assistance when they register in September for the fall term.

We reiterate our belief that the Senate version would receive majority support were it brought to the House floor for a vote. We thus respectfully urge you to intervene with the House conferees to insure that the House has this opportunity and the Vietnam veteran the assistance he needs to pursue his educational goals.

Sincerely,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
JOSEPH J. MARAZITI,
WILLIAM F. WALSH,
DON EDWARDS,
ELLA T. GRASSO,
Members of Congress.

BILLS CONSIDERED, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION & TRAINING—H.R. 11134 AND IDENTICAL BILLS BY NUMBER

H.R. 11134—Mr. Walsh.

H.R. 11545—Mr. Walsh (for himself, Mr. Helstoski, Ms. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Marazati, and Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas).

H.R. 11681—Mr. Walsh (for himself, Mr. Danielson, Mr. Peyser, Mr. Fish, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Horton, Mr. Gilman, Mrs. Chisholm, and Mr. Mitchell of New York).

H.R. 13183—Mr. Wolff (for himself, Mr. Walsh, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Carney of Ohio, Mr. Roe, Mr. Roncalio of Wyoming, Mr. Rose, Mr. Rosenthal, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Studds, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Winn, Mr. Mitchell of New York, and Mrs. Chisholm).

H.R. 13184—Mr. Wolff (for himself, Mr. Walsh, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Carney of Ohio, Ms. Abzug, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Bergland, Mr. Boland, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Clay, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Cohen, Mrs. Collins of Illinois, Mr. Conte, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Cronin, Mr. Danielson, Mr. Drinan, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Eilberg, Mr. Esch, Mr. Morgan, and Mr. Murtha).

H.R. 13185—Mr. Wolff (for himself, Mr. Walsh, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Carney of Ohio, Mr. Fish, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Crover, Mr. Harrington, Ms. Holtzman, Mr. Horton, Mr. Kazan, Mr. Koch, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Maraziti, Mr. Minish, Mr. Mitchell of Maryland, Mr. Nix, Mr. Owens, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Peyser, Mr. Podell, Mr. Rangel, and Mr. Regula).

H.R. 13433—Mr. Wolff (for himself, Mr. Walsh, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. Carney of Ohio, Mr. Ford, Mr. Gunter, Mr. Mallary, Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Mr. Sandman, Mr. Sarasin, Mr. Seiberling, and Mr. Thompson of New Jersey).

H.R. 15977, EXIMBANK ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, July 31, 1974, the Committee on Banking and Currency reported H.R. 15977, amendments to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945. I was prepared during the markup session to offer amendments to the bill but withheld them because the committee was proceeding under a temporary "2-minute" rule, and it was obvious that my amendments would not receive the careful and deliberate consideration which is required when dealing with a subject as complex as international trade. It is my intention to offer these amendments when the bill comes before the House next week.

The first amendment would transfer from the President to the Congress the

authority to approve transactions with Commmunist countries, including the Soviet Union, upon a finding, on a case-by-case basis, that such transactions are in the national interest. This would be consistent with the constitutional responsibility given to Congress under article I, section 8, "To regulate commerce with foreign nations." The second amendment would attach to the Export-Import Bank Act the "freedom of emigration" amendment to H.R. 10710 which the House adopted last December by the overwhelming vote of 319 to 80.

Both of these amendments are essential, in my judgment, in order to establish a sound basis for the conduct of East-West trade where government-sponsored credits, loans, guarantees, and insurance are involved. I strongly urge my colleagues to review the amendments, which are inserted in the RECORD immediately following this statement, and to support them strongly on the floor.

The amendments follow:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROUSSELOT TO H.R. 15977

Section 2(b)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by striking out "President determines would be in the national interest if he reports that determination to the Senate and House of Representatives within thirty days after making the same." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Congress determines would be in the national interest. Such determination shall be made with respect to each such transaction through the adoption of a concurrent resolution during the first period of continuous session of Congress after the date on which the Bank requests, in writing, that Congress consider adoption of such a resolution. For the purpose of this paragraph, continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the thirty-day period."

EXPLANATION

This amends section 2(b)(2) to prohibit the Bank from participating in any extension of credit to a Communist country unless Congress determines, by concurrent resolution, that each transaction is in the national interest.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROUSSELOT TO H.R. 15977

Section 2(b) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6) and inserting immediately after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend credit, or participate in any extension of credit with respect to any nonmarket economy country which—

"(A) denies its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate;

"(B) imposes more than a nominal tax on emigration or on the visas or other documents required for emigration, for any purpose or cause whatsoever; or

"(C) imposes more than a nominal tax, levy, fine, fee, or other charge on any citizen as a consequence of the desire of such citizen to emigrate to the country of his choice;

until such time as the country is no longer in violation of this paragraph."

EXPLANATION

This prohibits the Bank from participating in the extension of credit to any nonmarket economy country which denies its citizens the right of emigration.

SOUTH KOREA

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Committee is currently meeting on a markup session to prepare the new foreign aid bill. Included in this massive new bill is $300 million to the Government of South Korea. We are being asked to spend this money in the interest of world peace. But at what price?

Reports coming out of South Korea require, even demand, that we take a long, hard look at what kind of peace we are purchasing there. During the past several months, hundreds of persons protesting what has become the totalitarian regime of President Park Chung Hee have been arrested; 91 have been convicted and others are awaiting trial. Some of these have even been condemned to death. Among those imprisoned is a professor of history who earned his Ph. D. at Boston University and whose thesis discussed the impact of Lincoln's democratic ideals on the peoples of Asia—hardly the type whom the South Korean Government is claiming to be a Communist threat. Perhaps the best example of how extreme have become the Government measures is one of the latest decrees which states that "a student absent from class without a good excuse is subject to a penalty of death." These are measures which, if they were not so deadly serious, would be laughable.

Peace at any price is not now, nor ever has been, the aim of the U.S. Government. If innocent people are being harassed, imprisoned, and tortured for voicing their dissent with the policies of their own government, we are not fulfilling our commitment to peace or justice by continuing to support such a government. It is not so very long ago that the blood of 50,000 American soldiers was spilled on Korean soil to help the liberty-loving people of South Korea fight off the threat of repression from the Communists in the North. The people of South Korea had not intended to exchange one yoke of repression for another and we must not abandon them in their quest for freedom now.

The whole idea of foreign aid is to help other countries develop their own democratic institutions and, as we have often been warned even by some of our own citizens, to allow them to do so without any interference. While it is true that we have no right to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries, neither are we required to continue to support those governments when those democratic institutions disappear. Continuing to disburse financial and military assistance while actions repugnant to the whole concept of justice are freely carried on is nothing less than condoning those actions. Granted, we cannot insist that the Government of South Korea comply with our requests; however, I would recommend that unless the government of President Park restores free speech and open trials of political prisoners to all members of the press and not only those approved by the Government, the Congress should begin to reduce our assistance. This would be done so that the people whom we have pledged to protect do not end up as the victims of our own support. To those who claim that withdrawing our aid is tantamount to delivering these people into the hands of the enemy, may I point out that we are in the process of losing them already! Under the currently prevailing conditions, were a war with the North to break out, we might find ourselves fighting for a people who are not interested in sustaining their tormentors. We have been there before!

It is time to take a stand on the question of justice and to take whatever affirmative action is necessary to insure that stand so that we not condone actions which are contrary to the cause of real peace. Peace at any price is too expensive and it is a price which we must no longer be willing to pay.

COMMUNIST CHINA AND THE HEROIN TRADE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, for some time there has been significant evidence of participation by the Government of Communist China in the production and distribution of narcotic drugs, particularly in the production and distribution of heroin.

A recent report issued by the Ministry of Justice's Bureau of Investigation in Taiwan—BOI—reveals that a total of 9,530,000 mou of land, or approximately 1,600,000 acres, on the Chinese mainland is being used to cultivate poppies.

In a recent statement M. Stanton Evans, chairman of the American Conservative Union and editor of the Indianapolis News, contended that in the international crackdown on the heroin trade, we have concentrated only on the activities of our allies such as Turkey, Thailand, and South Vietnam. According to official policy, he claims, "Communists just don't push drugs."

Yet, in the past, U.S. authorities have acknowledged that Communist China has been involved in the heroin traffic. U.S. Narcotics Commissioner Harry Anslinger made this clear in public testimony and our Government has, in the past, made formal protests to the United Nations about the Communist role in this field. Now, in the era of détente, we seem willing to overlook these activities. Such governmental blindness serves neither a real détente nor our interest in stemming the tide of narcotics addiction.

Much of this material is highlighted in a recently published book "Psycho-Chemical Warfare: Chinese Communist Drug Offensive Against the West," by A. H. Stanton Candlin, a former member of the British Foreign Service with extensive experience in Asia. Mr. Candlin ex-

presses the view that the Chinese Communists were largely responsible for the drug offensive carried out against American servicemen in Vietnam. The sale of heroin at one-tenth of its actual value, he states, points to the Chinese Communist objective of weakening their intended victims in Southeast Asia, particularly South Vietnam and Cambodia.

In an editorial entitled "China and the Heroin Trade," the Norwich Conn., Bulletin states, in its issue of April 29, 1974, that:

If, in fact, the State Department knows this to be true, and if the practice goes unchallenged in the name of pragmatic diplomacy, it is still another example of our retreat from morality in foreign policy. Simply on the strength of present allegations, a Congressional investigation would seem fully justified. . . ."

In an editorial entitled "Peiping's Narcotics Trade," the English language Taiwan daily newspaper, the China Post, in its issue of June 8, 1974, declares that—

U.S. officials should heed the recent warning by Minister of Interior Lin Chin-sheng for "freedom loving people to raise their standard against the Chinese Communist drive to poison the universe. . . ."

The Post notes that the latest figures released in Taiwan have been confirmed by Prof. James Turnbull of the British Royal Military Colleges of Science who noted that the Chinese Communists export illicitly 2,000 tons of opium a year with 800,000 acres under cultivation.

I wish to share these two important editorials, from the Norwich Bulletin and the China Post with my colleagues and insert them into the RECORD at this time.

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, April 29, 1974]

CHINA AND THE HEROIN TRADE

The pragmatism of American foreign policy is troubling to citizens who believe that, above all, we should lend aid and comfort only to those who uphold the highest humanitarian ideals. We have often been accused, rightfully, of surrendering principle to temporary and insubstantial political advantage.

The American Conservative Union president, M. Stanton Evans, has called attention to the operation of such foreign policy with respect to Red China's involvement in the heroin trade. There are other illustrations. Perhaps the most noteworthy has been the insistence of the State Department that we should grant trade concessions and credits to the Soviet Union, despite its continued violation of international standards of human freedom. We have been accused, correctly, of looking the other way at the political imprisonment of thousands of dissenters in South Vietnam, and at the South Vietnamese policies that hold others prisoner in refugee compounds in the name of internal security.

Evans contends that, in the international crackdown on the heroin trade, we have concentrated only on the activities of our allies—Turkey, Thailand, and South Vietnam. According to official policy, he claims, Communists just don't push drugs.

Yet Evans points to testimony that Red China is not only engaged in the heroin trade, but that it is probably the largest source in the world for the illicit narcotics supply. He quotes a study published by a British official Far East specialist, whose duties included liaison with military intelligence, which cites testimony to the United Nations that there is a continuing heroin trade between Red China and the United States.

Particularly cited is the testimony of former U.S. Narcotics Commissioner Harry Anslinger who claims that "Emissaries have been sent to the United States to arrange for details of smuggling transactions. One of the principals in the case in which 300 ounces of heroin were smuggled in from Communist China is now serving a ten year imprisonment."

The study notes that U.S. authorities acknowledge the so-called Gold Triangle in Burma, Thailand and Laos as a major source of heroin. But, it claims, the authorities neglect to mention that all of these areas adjoin China's Yunnan province.

Before we became international buddies with Red China, Yunnan was officially identified as a major growing area for opium. Since that time, however, our foreign policy has changed, and with the change, apparently, the opium crop in Yunnan has ceased to exist.

It must be granted, at the outset, that the American Conservative Union speaks with a biased tongue. It has, without deviation, opposed the detente that will, in the future, lead to formal recognition of Communist China at the expense of Taiwan. ACU cannot be expected to offer pro and con arguments in any controversy that involves the Communist Chinese.

Nonetheless, as Evans notes, the estimates of our own officials show that the amount of heroin entering the free world cannot be accounted for by the other known producing nations. That seems, on circumstantial evidence, to leave Red China as the prime suspect.

If, in fact, the state department knows this to be true, and if the practice goes unchallenged in the name of pragmatic diplomacy, it is still another example of our retreat from morality in foreign policy.

Simply on the strength of present allegations, a Congressional investigation would seem fully justified before there is any further action on the Trade Reform Act of 1974.

[From the Taipei (Taiwan) China Post, June 8, 1974]

PEIPING'S NARCOTICS TRADE

A recent report by the Ministry of Justice's Bureau of Investigation (BOI) has thrown more light on the latest development in Red China's flourishing narcotics trade around the world.

The BOI report of June 1 revealed that a total of 9,530,000 mou of land, or approximately 1,600,000 acres, on the Chinese mainland is being used to cultivate poppies. According to a survey made at the end of 1973, there were 76 plants on the mainland devoted to processing opium and other opium derivatives with an annual production amounting to more than 10,000 tons.

BOI said that those processing plants are called "special products factories" or "pharmaceutical plants." Their products are marketed under 47 brand names by the "Special Products Trading Company" set up in Peiping after the United Nations had served a warning against Peiping's narcotics sales.

The BOI report brought up to date the big "leap forward" of the systematic Chinese Communist planting, production and sales of narcotics to poison the people of the world. In 1952, Peiping's annual sales amounted only to some 2,000 tons. This figure was confirmed by Professor James Turnbull of the British Royal Military College of Science who noted in his report that the Chinese Communists export illicitly 2,000 tons of opium a year with 800,000 acres under cultivation.

Thus the BOI report revealed a fivefold increase of the annual production and twice the acreage of poppy cultivation. The Chinese Communist role in the world narcotics traffic is not only confirmed by the U.S. Narcotics Commissioners at various periods but is also confirmed by the Soviets. In 1964 a Soviet correspondent based in Tokyo charged that Communist China was the biggest opium morphine and heroin producer in the world. The illicit narcotics traffic, he noted, yielded some US$500 million in annual revenue for the Chinese Communists.

A recent book by a British author A. H. Stanton Candlin, former member of the British foreign service, expressed the view that the Chinese Communists were largely responsible for the drug offensive carried out against American servicemen in Vietnam. The sale of heroin at one-tenth of its actual value pointed to the Chinese Communist objective of weakening their intended victims in Southeast Asia, especially South Vietnam and Cambodia.

Candlin's book entitled "Psycho-Chemical Warfare Chinese Communist Drug Offensive Against the West," was reviewed by Allan C. Brownfeld in the May 18 issue of Human Events magazine. While government officials were at one time concerned about the narcotics offensive being launched by the Chinese Communists, the book review noted, today there is an attempt to ignore and cover up the available material. Thus Candlin observed that "The threat has apparently been concealed from the public by persons who evidently had the desire to cultivate better relations with the Red Chinese."

The people of the free world should not permit this wool-over-the-eyes attitude of those eager to appease the Chinese Communists. Brownfeld writes that "the official U.S. position is that we have no evidence that opium and opiates are coming out of Communist China into world markets." They should heed the recent warning by Minister of Interior Lin Chin-sheng for "freedom-loving people to raise their standard against the Chinese Communist drive to poison the universe and destroy the existing anti-Communist will."

IMPEACHMENT AND THE FUTURE OF THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENCY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, an article by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "What's at Stake: An Historian's View," appeared in the July 31 issue of the Wall Street Journal. Professor Schlesinger, the Albert Schweitzer professor of the humanities at the City University of New York and winner of Pulitzer Prizes in history and biography, writes that—

We must, as I say, widen the perspective in which we see the events of 1974. Congress is not just meeting a particular and transient problem. It is defining or redefining the Presidency for the rest of American history.

I would argue that Professor Schlesinger's article deserves the attention of every Member of Congress not only for the wisdom a skilled and professional historian lends to the debate we are about to undertake; but more than that, we had better, as an institution, realize the profound nature of impeaching a President of the United States and begin now to plan for the challenge and redefinition of our basic institutions of government.

The text of Professor Schlesinger's article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 31, 1974]

WHAT'S AT STAKE: AN HISTORIAN'S VIEW

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

The high drama at last is under way. It is an exciting time for an American historian—for, one hopes, every American—to watch the resources of the Constitution and the wisdom of the Founding Fathers under test in a moment of exceptional national perplexity.

We must not, however, let the drama of the occasion beguile us into seeing it all in too narrow, personal and immediate a context, too much in relationship to a particular President, a particular Congress, a particular political confrontation. The question is too grave for that, and its gravity enjoins us to widen our perspective. We must try and see the events of 1974 in the light of two centuries of American history and of the nature of American institutions.

For Congress is not acting merely to dispose of a passing and forgettable problem. What Congress does about the deeds and misdeeds of Mr. Nixon will reverberate through the chambers of the future. Action, or refusal to act, will define the powers and the obligations, not just of this President but of the presidency itself for our children and our grandchildren. The decision Congress takes in the weeks ahead will set forth to Mr. Nixon's successors what our legislators consider it constitutionally proper for Presidents to do and what they regard as constitutionally forbidden in the exercise of presidential power. Their decision will establish the standards that determine the balance of the Constitution and govern the behavior of Presidents for a long time to come.

If Congress should decide not to impeach and remove Mr. Nixon, it can only mean that, after due and reverent consideration, Congress has concluded that Mr. Nixon has done nothing to justify impeachment. Such a decision will mean that Congress finds no serious constitutional objection to any of Mr. Nixon's acts—which means that all future Presidents will be licensed to behave as Mr. Nixon has behaved. A future President modeling himself too closely on Mr. Nixon may well run political risks. But constitutionally he will be in the clear. This will be the message that a decision against impeachment will send to the generations to come.

Specifically what will Congress have legitimized in the way of presidential behavior? First of all, it will dilute for all time the constitutional command that the President "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed." If Congress judges Mr. Nixon's execution of the criminal laws to be quite acceptable, this will open up a great vista of permissible action to future Presidents, such as, for example, suppression of evidence, obstruction of justice, subordination of perjury and misprison of felony. The 93rd Congress will have solidly created the precedent that such presidential conduct, however hazardous it may be politically, is not beyond the constitutional pale. Future Presidents will have the assurance that unless one of them commits some monstrous and highly visible outrage, like shooting his wife in the presence of the Cabinet, they need worry no more than Mr. Nixon has done about their constitutional obligation to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

PRESIDENTIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Secondly, Congress by this decision will liberate the presidency from any accountability for the pattern of behavior of the top officials in his White House and his Cabinet. Mr. Nixon's defenders claim that he was not "directly" involved in the crimes committed by those closest to him—crimes that have already resulted in the confession or conviction of 16 members of his administration—and contend that this relieves him of all responsibility for their misconduct. There would seem abundant evidence that Mr. Nixon was indeed directly involved; but suppose he was not. Would this really exonerate him? What kind of sense does this doctrine of presidential irresponsibility make? Would any reader of The Wall Street Journal apply it to his own business? Yet this absurd doctrine is the fulcrum of the pro-Nixon case. Without the doctrine the case would collapse.

It is a novel idea. None of Mr. Nixon's predecessors ever advanced it. Madison pointed out in the First Congress that the President's power to remove government officials would make him "responsible for their conduct, and *subject him to impeachment himself*, if he suffers them to perpetrate with impunity high crimes or misdemeanors against the United States, or neglects to superintend their conduct so as to check their excesses. The 93rd Congress, if it repudiates the Father of the Constitution, will free all future Presidents from responsibility for skulduggery committed on their behalf by the White House staff or by the Cabinet so long as nothing can be traced back to a written directive from the Oval Office. Congressional endorsement of the doctrine of presidential irresponsibility, in short, will consolidate Mr. Nixon's effort to break the presidency out of the constitutional system of accountability.

Third, Congress will have placed the seal of constitutional sanction on Mr. Nixon's extraordinary theory of national security. Of course there may well be moments of desperate national emergency in which Presidents are compelled to take action beyond the Constitution. But such action must conform to standards that have evolved in the course of the national experience. There must be a clear, present and uncontestable danger to the life of the nation; the President must define and explain to Congress and the people the nature of this threat; waiting for normal legislation action must constitute an unacceptable risk; the problem must be one that can be met in no other way; and none of the presidential acts may be directed against the political process itself. Lincoln's decisions after the attack on Sumter, Roosevelt's North Atlantic policy in the months before Pearl Harbor met these tests. Jefferson's reaction to the Burr conspiracy, Truman's seizure of the steel plants met some tests but failed others, and therefore suffered judicial and political repudiation. Mr. Nixon's actions in setting up his secret White House posse fails every one of these tests. There was no threat to the life of the nation, no explanation of an alleged emergency to Congress or the people, no risk in delay, no lack of alternatives; and there was, on top of the rest, a shocking attempt to subvert the political process.

Mr. Nixon's claim is that the power to invoke national security is an inherent and absolute presidential right, whatever the surrounding circumstances, a right to be exercised in secret at presidential pleasure without accountability to Congress and the people. This theory is unknown to the history of the Republic. If this Nixon doctrine is not expressly rejected and condemned, Congress will signal future Presidents that they can define "national security" as their spirit moves them, check their findings with no one else and do whatever they pretend national security requires. Should our present Congress conclude that it does not regard the Nixon theory of "national security" as an appalling abuse of presidential power, it will be hard for future Congresses to object when future Presidents act upon the powerful precedent Mr. Nixon will thus have established.

PERSONAL VENGEANCE

Fourth, by declining to act against Mr. Nixon, Congress will say that it is not especially bothered by his effort to convert government agencies—the Internal Revenue Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secret Service—into instruments of party advantage and personal vengeance. Future Presidents will feel justified in doing with impunity what Mr. Nixon had done with impunity. Future civil servants will feel much less confidence about resisting or rejecting presidential orders that their agencies do improper things.

Fifth, Congress will destroy forever the ultimate remedy provided by the Founding Fathers to protect the Republic from the abuse of presidential power. The impeachment provision may not have been much of a deterrent in the century since Andrew Johnson. Yet it has remained on the books, a remote threat perhaps but still a threat. If Congress acquiesces in Mr. Nixon's refusal to comply with subpoenas from the House Judiciary Committee, it will give all future Presidents the power to pick and choose the evidence in their own cases and thereby render impeachment ever after a charade. And if Congress acquiesces in Mr. Nixon's other actions, it will surely mean that no President will ever again be impeached; for if there were ever a time in the life of the Republic requiring impeachment in order to defend the community, as Madison recommended, against "the incapacity, negligence or perfidy of the Chief Magistrate" through the impeachment process, it is today. If the man who has run the most lawless administration in American history, a man not much liked even in his own party, cannot be impeached and removed even in a Congress controlled by the opposition, then we can kiss impeachment goodbye as a restraint on Presidents for the duration of the Republic.

If it declines to impeach Mr. Nixon, Congress will instruct all his successors that nothing he has done constitutes an impeachable offense and that, if future Presidents are prepared to run the political risk, they are constitutionally entitled to do the same things themselves. They will be free *not* to execute the laws faithfully; *not* to be responsible for the criminal acts of their closest associates; *not* be limited in any deed they wish to commit in the name of national security; *not* to be restrained in any order, however improper, they wish to issue to government agencies; and *not* be worried hereafter by any prospect of impeachment. What is at stake, in short, is the theory, in Senator Ervin's phrase, of "the constitutional omnipotence of the President." "There is no worse heresy," wrote the great historian Lord Acton, "than that the office sanctifies the holder of it." Congress has it within its power in the next three months to vote that heresy down—or to vote it up.

"REVENGES OF THE FUTURE"

We must, as I say, widen the perspective in which we see the events of 1974. Congress is not just meeting a particular and transient problem. It is defining or redefining the presidency for the rest of American history. Henry James once wrote in a striking phrase about "the revenges of the future." Congress can act now to enforce the constitutional system of accountability and to reinstate the relatively high standards that have characterized the American presidency. Or it can abandon the system of accountability and endorse the debasement and betrayal of those standards. If it follows the second course, let us have no doubt that the future will indeed exact its revenges.

I have never thought Congress would take the second course. For the impeachment of Presidents is one of the sacred rites in our constitutional process. Those who participate in the rite know that this will be the most solemn decision of their public lives, the occasion for which they will be longest remembered. They know that the eyes of history are upon them. Now, if ever, they will vote their

consciences. This is what happened during the impeachment of Andrew Johnson. It is beginning to happen today. Our legislators are about to decide the shape of the American government for generations to come—whether it will be the balanced government envisaged by the Constitution or an imperial presidency raised above the Constitution. Let none of them forget General de Gaulle's memorable injunction: "One should not insult the future."

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS OPPOSES BINARY NERVE GAS MUNITIONS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing items in the defense appropriations bill, which will come before the House this Tuesday, is a provision for $5.8 million to build a production line for the new binary nerve gas. As many of my colleagues have pointed out, this appropriation must be seen as the first step in a program to replace our present nerve gas stocks, which will eventually cost us $1.5 to $2 billion. The best that can be said about this program is that it is worthless. More likely, however, it will provoke a new spiral in the chemical arms race and actually decrease our national security.

It is important to realize that the distinguished Federation of American Scientists has strongly denounced this measure. According to a statement released today by the FAS—

Appropriations ought to be withheld on the general ground that nerve gas weapons are not necessary.

But, in any case, says the FAS, this is a particularly unfortunate time to begin production of a new nerve gas because of recent administration commitments to negotiate for a limitation on chemical weapons.

I believe this is a significant statement, and am taking this opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

FAS OPPOSES BINARY NERVE GAS MUNITIONS

SUMMARY

The Department of Defense is seeking appropriations this year to build production facilities for binary nerve-gas munitions. U.S. armed forces already have enormous numbers of nerve-gas weapons at their disposal which are more than enough to satisfy any real need. Thus we see no advantage in replacing them with—or supplementing them with—binaries. It is particularly unfortunate that this request comes just after a summit reaffirmation by the Administration of its commitment to the negotiation of limitations on chemical weapons.

The appropriations ought to be withheld on the general ground that nerve-gas weapons are not necessary, or at least on the narrower grounds that such funding ought to await the outcome of negotiations to limit chemical weapons.

BACKGROUND

Binaries have been in research and development since 1954. They provide a new way for using lethal chemical agents on the battlefield. Instead of a nerve-gas payload, a binary munition contains two chemical fillings of relatively low toxicity that can be kept apart from one another until the "delivery" of the munition to its target has commenced. A mixing process is then activated in which the chemicals react together to form nerve gas. Although certain of the binary chemicals are themselves hazardous materials, they are much safer to handle than actual nerve gas.

The initial binary procurement funding that is being sought, for provision of production facilities, amounts to $5.8m. Like so many other DoD programs that have burgeoned from modest beginnings, this item is likely to prove the thin end of a substantial, and possibly intractable, wedge. The Secretary of the Army has already spoken to Congress about plans for eventually replacing the entire nerve-gas stockpile with binaries. The cost of this may be estimated from DoD data to be on the order of $2000m, at current prices.

Because strong interests are likely to become vested in a program of this magnitude, it is essental that the program receive close scrutiny before its momentum becomes irresistible. The basic questions to consider are these: does the United States still need to maintain a nerve-gas capability? If so, does the capability need upgrading, and would binaries present the best means for effecting this?

Current U.S. chemical weapons policy is to maintain a nerve-gas stockpile as a like-with-like deterrent, and as a retaliatory option in the event of deterrence failing. The principal threat is considered to reside in the possibility of Warsaw Pact forces using chemical weapons against NATO troops in Europe. The most recent additions to the nerve-gas stockpile were made in 1969, and although there seems to be no evidence of any increase in the threat since then, DoD now wishes to make further additions. It is claiming that its stock of immediately-usable nerve-gas weapons is inadequate, quantitatively and qualitatively, to meet all the contingencies for which it believes it should prepare.

The Army has an unbroken 56-year-old tradition of maintaining a capability in lethal chemical weapons, and it seems that this has now become a custom too hallowed by time, and too institutionalized, to be internally questioned. Yet it is not at all clear that deterrence is the best of the various policy alternatives for meeting the threat that nerve gas presents today. Indeed, as with nuclear weapons, there is some likelihood of the nerve-gas stockpile aggravating the threat which it is supposed to be deterring. Even if a case can be made for some nerve-gas capability, it is hard to understand why our existing stockpiles need to be expanded. An alternative policy is to devote resources, not to the weapons, but to the defenses against them. Under circumstances where chemical warfare is both illegal and unlikely, there is a strong case for believing that the existing conventional and nuclear posture, plus an improvement in the CW protective stance, makes possession of nerve gas unnecessary.

But even for those who believe that the nerve-gas stockpile should be retained, the central question is whether binaries make better sense than regular nerve-gas weapons. Considered from a purely military viewpoint, they do not. The munition that is now coming up for procurement, a 155mm howitzer shell, disseminates less toxic agent than does its nonbinary equivalent, and has a smaller fragmentation effect. Moreover, the fact that the disseminated agent is adulterated with other binary reaction products acts, for several reasons, to reduce the dependability of the munition.

The impulse behind the binary program has been a search, not for greater munitions effectiveness, but for the solution to a problem that is essentially political. The Army is unable to increase its immediately-usable retaliatory capability without transporting nerve gas from bulk-storage to munitions-filling locations, and then into Europe. But this it cannot do without risking yet another of the domestic outcries about transportation hazards that have beset it since 1969. Because of their safety features, binaries are seen as a possible means for removing this constraint, thereby restoring the Army's freedom of action.

However, in testimony to a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee recently, the State Department noted that any attempt to increase the size or numbers of U.S. chemical-weapons depots in Europe was "likely to run into very serious difficulties." It seems that the European governments concerned are displaying considerable, and understandable, reluctance about accommodating any more American nerve gas, whether binary or not. Unless and until they are willing, therefore, the binary program will remain, for the most part, an essentially futile one.

It is in Europe that the nerve-gas threat, such as it is, has its immediacy. If, as appears to be the case, the people on the spot do not see over-riding merit in an upgrading of the NATO nerve-gas deterrent, why should anybody else?

Another disturbing feature of the binary program is that DoD is seeking initial procurement funding without the Administration yet having reached a final decision about binary production. The weapons have not even been field-tested yet. Requesting money because it *may* be needed is the type of foot-in-the-door fiscal planning that bloats appropriations. It is a practice which is normally reserved only for strategic weapon systems that involve long lead-time components.

In an artillery shell, the fuzing is the only long lead item; but it so happens that the binary rounds are to employ fuzes that are already in mass-production for other munitions. It therefore seems that DoD is acting with capricious and undue haste. It has certainly not demonstrated any need for urgency. Moreover, in view of the United States commitment to the international chemical disarmament negotiations that are now under way in Geneva, the present moment is a singularly inopportune one for precipitate nerve-gas procurement. It is particularly inappropriate when President Nixon and Secretary Brezhnev have just agreed to seek early progress in dealing with the most dangerous lethal means of chemical warfare.

Provided the verification problem can be resolved, participation in international chemical disarmament is potentially the most attractive of all the policy alternatives for chemical weapons. As a means for preserving the national security against the dangers of nerve gas, it would place reliance neither on a counter threat that could prove ineffectual, nor on a defensive posture that could prove inadequate. And it would serve to control what could ultimately prove a far graver danger than the nerve gas threat in Europe, namely the possibility of nerve-gas proliferation. This is a danger which binary technology is likely to increase, not only at the international level, but also as regards terrorist organizations. But the negotiation of an adequate chemical disarmament treaty will require a good deal of time; and despite its public protestations of commitment, the United States has yet to convince its negotiating partners at Geneva of its good faith. The DoD binary program is incompatible with both these requirements, and if it is allowed to go forward, it may well kill the negotiations completely. With them will be lost a prospect for improving United States security to a far greater extent than binaries ever could.

CHILD HEALTH SCREENING SERVICES UNDER MEDICAID

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the Social and Rehabilitation Service today published final regulations covering imposition of a financial penalty upon States for failure to provide child health screening services under medicaid.

I should like to insert the text of the regulation, along with a summary of the major comments the agency received after it published a proposed regulation last December 19, as they appeared in today's Federal Register.

Please note that a line of type appears to have been dropped from point No. 5 of the summary (after the line ending ". . . period nor-") which appears in the Register, and that the same paragraph contains a typographical error ("as" instead of "a"). The material follows:

TITLE 45—PUBLIC WELFARE

CHAPTER II—SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE (ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS), DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Part 205—General Administration—Public Assistance Programs

Part 249—Services and payments in medical assistance programs

Medicaid; Financial Penalty for Failure to Provide Child Health Screening Services

Notice of proposed rule making was published December 19, 1973 at 38 FR 34821, implenting section 299F of Pub. L. 92-603, Social Security Amendments of 1972. Requirements were specified for the application of a financial penalty against States which fail to inform AFDC families of the availability of screening, diagnosis and treatment services under the title XIX program of medical assistance, or to provide or arrange for such services.

Five State agencies, eight organizations and one Congressional delegation responded. Two respondents concurred in the regulation as proposed. Several suggested changes which could be made only by statute, such as application of the penalty against title XIX rather than AFDC funds or postponement of effective date. The remaining major comments and the Department's responses are summarized below:

1. *Minimum screening services.* A respondent stated that the minimum components of a State screening program should be expanded by incorporating the recommended services listed in the screening guideline, MSA-PRG-21. This would be inappropriate at this time, because States need flexibility to meet their own particular health needs, and, in fact, most States have incorporated the recommended services.

2. *Annual written notification of AFDC families.* Suggestions were that written notice be optional; that States set their own notification schedules; and that in addition to written notice, other more aggressive techniques including personal contact be required. A written notice is the most practical method of complying with the requisites of Congressional intent. Given the limited capability of States to relate notification schedules to screening schedules on an individual basis, and the flow of recipients in and out of the assistance payments system, notification no less often than annually is a reasonable compromise. With respect to the third comment, the purpose of the regulation is only to prescribe the requirements representing the legal minimum necessary to avoid a penalty. In implementing the program, States are free to use additional means to inform recipients, including mass media, educational programs, and caseworker contacts.

3. *Informing the medically needy.* The suggestion was made that Congress intended the informing process be extended to the medically needy. However, by statute, the penalty can apply only to the failure to inform, provide or arrange for EPSDT services to those on cash assistance.

4. *Providing necessary transportation.* The requirement was interpreted to mean provision routinely of transportation for all Medicaid eligibles. This is not intended; the regulation has been clarified to indicate that the reference is simply to the existing requirement in effect under State plans.

5. *Provision of screening within 60 days of request, and of diagnosis and treatment within 60 days of screening.* Objections to the time requirements cited the possible difficulty of scheduling appointment to read "a reasonable period nor-recipients or scarcity of providers. To allow for extenuating circumstances, the Department has changed the requirement to read "as reasonable period normally not to exceed 60 days" from the date of request or screening.

6. *Arrangement for treatment not available under State plans.* It was suggested that the State should refer eligible children to other sources for uncovered services. States have been encouraged to make such referrals (MSA-PRG-21) and this is also included in the guide issued with this regulation.

7. *Informing recipients of provider names and locations.* One respondent interpreted the requirement to mean that recipients were to be given a list of all providers, regardless of the particular type of service needed. This is not intended. States may furnish lists geared to service needs. It was also suggested that the lists be provided only on request; this is not acceptable since such provision is part of the State's responsibility for arranging for services.

8. *Reports and other means for determining application of penalty, and documentation by States.* Respondents suggested both more and fewer reporting and documentation requirements. The Department does not believe it practical to impose additional requirements at this time, since many States do not have the necessary capability. The requirements as stated are the minimum necessary to assure proper application of the penalty, which relates to all aspects of informing families and providing and arranging for services. In administering any statistical reporting system, the Department will allow reasonable time periods for collecting and reporting data. One respondent suggested the reporting system be able to demonstrate that States will develop and maintain standards for quality of care. The statutory provisions relating to the penalty do no provide authority to establish standards for quality of care. However, existing title XIX regulations require States to assure quality of all services (45 CFR 249.10 (a)(8)).

9. *Existing enforcement procedures.* The question was raised whether existing administrative compliance procedures are replaced by the penalty provision. Congress has provided, with the one percent penalty, an additional penalty for nonimplementation. Existing enforcement authorities also remain in effect.

Accordingly, the regulation as proposed with changes noted above in items 4 and 5 has been adopted. A technical change has also been made to clarify that the provision for reconsideration of imposition of a penalty, under section 1116(d) of the Social Security Act, applies to the WIN and family planning sanctions specified in § 205.146 (a) and (b) as well as to the early screening penalty (new § 205.146(d)).

Chapter II, Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

1. Section 205.146 of Part 205 is amended by adding new paragraphs (c) and (d) to read as set forth below:

§ 205.146 Specific limitations on Federal financial participation under title IV-A.

* * * * *

(c) *Penalty for failure to provide early and periodic screening, diagnosis and treatment of children under Title XIX of the Act*—(1) *General.* Pursuant to section 403(g) of the Act, notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, total payments to a State under title IV-A of the Act for any quarter of any fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1974, shall be reduced by 1 percentage point (calculated without regard to any other reduction under this section), if the State fails to:

(i) Inform all families in the State receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children under the State's title IV-A plan of the availability of child health screening services under the State's title XIX plan. For purposes of this provision, to "inform" means to notify all AFDC families in writing no less often than annually of the availability of the early and periodic screening, diagnosis and treatment (EPSDT) program under the State title XIX plan by providing pamphlets, brochures, or other written materials, which clearly and specifically describe (A) what EPSDT services are available and (B) where and how they may be obtained. States must also have arrangements to inform those individuals for whom printed material is inappropriate.

(ii) Provide or arrange for the provision of such screening services in all cases where they are requested. This means that a State must:

(A) Inform recipients requesting screening services of the names and locations of providers offering such services, and of the transportation services available under the State plan as required under § 249.10(a)(5) of this chapter; and

(B) Take steps to assist recipients requesting screening services so that such recipients are able to receive them within a reasonable period normally not to exceed 60 days from the date of request.

(iii) Arrange for (directly or through referral to appropriate agencies, organizations, or individuals) corrective treatment the need for which is indicated by such screening services and which is available under the State plan in accordance with § 249.10(a)(3) of this chapter. This means that the State must:

(A) Inform recipients in need of diagnostic and treatment services of the names and locations of health providers offering such services, and of the transportation services available under the State plan as required under § 249.10(a)(5) of this chapter; and

(B) Take steps to assist recipients needing diagnostic and treatment services so that such recipients are able to receive them within a reasonable time period. Initial diagnosis and treatment must be available normally within 60 days of the screening.

(2) *Application of penalty.* (i) The penalty will be applied on a quarterly basis, beginning with the quarter starting July 1, 1974.

(ii) Determination of whether the penalty is applicable will be based on:

(A) Reports from States on actual compliance in practice with the conditions specified in paragraph (c)(1) of this section; and

(B) Such other surveys or reviews as may be deemed necessary by SRS.

(3) *Documentation.* States must be able to document that they have met each condition of paragraph (c)(1) of this section

and shall provide reports thereon as prescribed in this regulation and in Program Regulation Guides and Program Instructions issued by SRS.

(d) *Reconsideration of penalty imposition.* Whenever a penalty is imposed under the provisions of this section, the State shall be entitled to and upon request shall receive a reconsideration of the imposition of the penalty in accordance with section 1116(d) of the Social Security Act and regulations issued thereunder.

2. Section 249.10(a)(3) is revised as set forth below:

§ 249.10 Amount, duration, and scope of medical assistance.

(a) *State plan requirements.* * * *

(3) In carrying out the requirements in paragraph (a) (1) and (2) of this paragraph with respect to the item of care set forth in paragraph (b)(4)(ii) of this section, provide:

(i) For establishment of administrative mechanisms to identify available screening and diagnostic facilities, to assure that individuals under 21 years of age who are eligible for medical assistance may receive the services of such facilities, and to make available such services as may be included under the State plan;

(ii) For identification of all eligible individuals, including those who are in need of medical or remedial care and services furnished through title V grantees, and for assuring that individuals eligible for title V services are informed of such services and are referred to title V grantees for care and services, as appropriate;

(iii) For agreements to assure maximum utilization of existing screening, diagnostic, and treatment services provided by other public and voluntary agencies such as child health clinics, OEO Neighborhood Health Centers, day care centers, nursery schools, school health programs, family planning clinics, maternity clinics, and similar facilities;

(iv) That early and periodic screening and diagnosis to ascertain physical and mental defects, and treatment of conditions discovered within the limits of the State plan on the amount, duration, and scope of care and services, will be available to all eligible individuals under 21 years of age; and that, in addition, eyeglasses, hearing aids, and other kinds of treatment for visual and hearing defects, and at least such dental care as is necessary for relief of pain and infection and for restoration of teeth and maintenance of dental health, will be available, whether or not otherwise included under the State plan, subject, however, to such utilization controls as may be imposed by the State agency. See § 205.146(c) of this chapter relating to reduction in Federal financial participation under title IV–A of the Act for failure to provide early and periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment of children.

* * * * *

(Sec. 1102, 49 Stat. 647 (42 U.S.C. 1302))

Effective date. These regulations shall be effective July 1, 1974

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 13.714, Medical Assistance Program and 13.761, Public Assistance—Maintenance Assistance (State Aid)).

Dated: May 30, 1974.

JAMES S. DWIGHT, Jr.,
Administrator, Social and Rehabilitation Service.

Approved: July 18, 1974.

CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 74–16945 Filed 7–23–74; 8:45 am]

THE HOUSE AND IMPEACHMENT

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal has offered us some good advice on impeachment. In an August 2 editorial entitled "The House and Impeachment," the Journal said:

At this state of the proceedings, every one of the 435 members of the House has a constitutional obligation to face the issue squarely, hear the issues debated and render his own judgment, putting aside bandwagon psychology, preconceptions and fears of political consequences.

The Journal has defined our duty in terms everyone should understand and respect. Its complete editorial follows:

THE HOUSE AND IMPEACHMENT

Broadcast projections that the House of Representatives will impeach the President by a landslide vote, 300 or more in favor, have been creating a bandwagon atmosphere in the capital, with a mass psychology developing not exactly appropriate to a grand inquest. Among the most serious offenders in contributing to this atmosphere are elements of the right wing of the GOP.

The concern in that quarter has little or nothing to do with the pros and cons of the three articles of impeachment reported by the House Judiciary Committee. Rather it is purely and unabashedly political. The assumption is that in his presumed impeachment and disgrace, Richard Nixon will bring down the Republican Party in the November elections, especially decimating the ranks of the House Republicans.

This will occur, so it is reasoned, because there is no way Republican incumbents can vote, aye or nay, without embittering one faction or the other within their core of support at home. A vote to impeach will lose Nixon supporters in the GOP; a vote to not impeach will lose Nixon critics both in the GOP and among the swing voters. The solution, propounded most persistently by William Buckley of The National Review, is for Mr. Nixon to stipulate House impeachment and invite one and all to vote the articles, without prejudice, in order to expedite a Senate trial.

Presidential aide Patrick Buchanan has now floated the idea that this is a possibility. That Mr. Nixon would even consider this option, if he has, would further damage him. It could only be viewed by the public as a sign of panic and an outbreak of political frivolity. If it were done, those House Republicans who attempted to lean on this rationale to explain their abdication of constitutional obligations would deserve the response they would surely get at the polls.

At the same time we find this idea of a harmonized congressional cop-out despicable, we are no less disheartened by the other side of the coin—the bandwagon notion that an avalanche of impeachment votes is already in the bag. If there are now 250 or 300 votes in the bag, the House is dealing in hypocrisy if it does *not* suspend the rules and vote without debate.

For more than a year, the nation has been pulled one way and another by blocs either favoring or opposing the President's impeachment, with charges, evidence and inferences changing from one day to the next. For the very first time, the people can now focus—through their representatives—on genuine articles, on specific charges, and on the evidence in support of same.

By a wide margin, the Judiciary Committee believes it can prove its case to the satisfaction of the House, the Senate and the American people. But there are those on the committee who obviously were not overwhelmed. We cannot discount one iota the intellectual honesty of men like Wiggins of California or Sandman of New Jersey, both of whom were among the minority of Republicans who voted against the unseating of Adam Clayton Powell. There are still two sides to the impeachment argument, and before judging a matter of this overwhelming importance the House has a duty to allow those arguments to be developed to the fullest.

At this stage of the proceedings, every one of the 435 members of the House has a constitutional obligation to face the issue squarely, hear the issues debated and render his own judgment, putting aside bandwagon psychology, preconceptions and fears of political consequences. The process is spelled out in the Constitution and should be allowed to run its due course.

Public reaction to Judiciary Committee members on both sides of the argument has been uniformly favorable. Similarly, those Representatives who have the intellectual honesty to follow the high course and vote their consciences will be able, however they vote, to defend themselves at home.

SENATE—*Monday, August 5, 1974*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, JR., a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose glory is in all the world; we commend this Nation to Thy merciful care, that being guided by Thy providence, we may dwell secure in Thy peace under Thy higher rulership. Grant to the President, the Congress and all in authority, wisdom and strength to know and to do Thy will. Fill them with the love of truth and righteousness; and make them ever mindful of their calling to serve this people in Thy fear. In these fateful days keep us "one Nation under God," mindful that as we are under Thy guidance, so also we are under Thy judgment and that "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." Redeem us by Thy grace for the making of Thy coming kingdom.

We pray in the name of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).