EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REPORT NO. 5, 1975 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING—AS OF AUGUST 2, 1974

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer for insertion in the RECORD for the information of Members, their staffs, and others, excerpts from the "Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 5, as of August 2, 1974," as prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. The report itself has been sent to all Members.

The excerpts from the report follow:

EXCERPTS FROM 1975 BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 5

This Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 5 is published in abbreviated form. It shows the impact of congressional action on the President's revised 1975 budget recommendations through August 2, 1974.

This report includes analysis of the scorekeeping highlights together with the main scorekeeping tables. It also includes summarized background information with respect to the revised budget requests and certain other significant budgetary factors. And, on tables 4 and 5, the report shows the current status of appropriation bills and necessary authorizing legislation. Reference to an earlier report in this series is suggested for full detail and historical comparisons. (See 1975 Budget Scorekeeping Report No. 2 as of June 7, 1974.)

It should be understood, of course, that action on significant legislation is still pending and may be expected to materially affect calculation of the impact of congressional action on the President's fiscal 1975 budget authority and outlay requests.

SCOREKEEPING HIGHLIGHTS

Fiscal year 1975—outlays

The impact of congressional action through August 2 on the President's fiscal year 1975 budget outlay requests, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

[In millions]

	House	Senate	Enacted
1975 budget outlay estimate as revised and amended to date	$306, 312	$306, 312	$306, 312
Congressional changes to date (committee action included):			
Appropriation bills:			
Completed action	—209	+395	—76
Pending action	—2, 631	—359	
Legislative bills:			
Completed action	+766	+1, 234	+1, 194
Pending action	+859	+2, 454	
Total changes:			
Completed action	+557	+1, 629	+1, 118
Pending action	—1, 772	+2, 095	
Total	—1, 214	+3, 724	+1, 118
Deduct: Portion of congressional action included in May 30 revisions	+311	+311	+311
1975 budget outlays as adjusted by congressional action to date	304, 787	309, 725	307, 119

Completed actions: A summary of major individual actions composing the $1,118 million total outlay impact of completed congressional action to date on budgeted 1975 outlays follows:

COMPLETED ACTION OF BUDGETED OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES)

Bills (including committee action)—Congressional changes in 1975 budgeted outlays (thousands)

1974 supplemental bills (1975 outlay impact):	
Second Supplemental	—$215, 000
Further Urgent Supplemental	—30
1975 regular bills:	
Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection	+130, 000
Special Energy Research and Development	+20, 000
Legislative Branch	—11, 000
Legislative bills:	
Veterans educational benefits—extend delimiting period	+759, 100
Child nutrition and school lunch	+200, 000
Civil Service minimum retirement	+157, 000
Veterans disability benefits increase	+134, 800
Food assistance and special milk programs	+75, 000
Postponement of postal rate increases	+45, 200
Donated commodities, older Americans	+5, 500
Civil Service survivor benefits	+4, 600
Civil Service—early retirement, hazardous occupations	+3, 400
Deputy Marshals pay raise	+1, 900
Congressional Record, reduced postage fees	—8, 486
Military flight pay incentive	—16, 700
Rejection of salary increases for federal executives	—34, 000
Unemployment benefits extension (trust fund)	—133, 000
Total, 1975 outlay impact of completed congressional action	+1, 118, 284

Pending actions: The major pending legislative actions affecting 1975 budget outlays which have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress are shown in detail on Table 1 and are summarized below.

MAJOR PENDING ACTIONS ON BUDGETED OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES)

Bills (including committee action)	Congressional changes in budgeted 1975 outlays (in thousands) House	Senate
Appropriation bills:		
Public Works and Atomic Energy	+$32, 000	+$65, 000
Interior and related agencies	+8, 300	+11, 000
District of Columbia	—15, 000	—23, 000
HUD, Space, Science, Veterans	—30, 000	—90, 000
Treasury-Postal Service	—77, 000	—57, 000
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary	—79, 000	
Labor, Health, Education and Welfare	—315, 000	
Transportation and related agencies	—355, 000	+265, 000
Defense	—1, 800, 000	
Legislative bills (backdoor and mandatory):		
Veterans educational benefits	+195, 500	+977, 500
Housing and Community Development Act	(1)	+553, 000
Emergency energy unemployment	Rejected	+500, 000
Small business direct loans	+360, 000	
Civil Service survivor annuity modification	+202, 000	(2)
Public safety officers death gratuity	+43, 700	(2)
Hopi and Navajo Tribes relocation	+28, 800	

1 Undetermined.
2 Action taken last session.

Fiscal year 1975—budget authority

The impact of congressional action through August 2 on the President's fiscal year 1975 requests for new budget authority, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

[In millions]

	House	Senate	Enacted
1975 budget authority requests as revised and amended to date	$325, 749	$325, 749	$325, 749
Congressional changes to date (committee action included):			
Appropriation bills:			
Completed action	+33	+246	+157
Pending action	—4, 360	—400	
Legislative bills:			
Completed action	+899	+1, 271	+1, 380
Pending action	+2, 619	+5, 651	
Total changes:			
Completed action	+932	+1, 517	+1, 537
Pending action	—1, 741	+5, 251	
Total	—809	+6, 769	+1, 537
Deduct portion of congressional action included in May 30 revisions	+311	+311	+311
1975 budget authority as adjusted by congressional action to date	324, 629	332, 207	326, 975

Completed actions: A summary of major individual actions composing the $1,537 million total impact of completed congressional action to date on 1975 budget authority requests follows:

COMPLETED ACTION ON BUDGET AUTHORITY REQUESTS

Bills (including committee action)—Congressional changes in 1975 budget authority (in thousands)

Appropriation bills:	
Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection	+$138, 532
Special Energy Research and Development	+32, 361
Legislative Branch	—14, 197
Legislative bills:	
Veterans educational benefits—extend delimiting period	+759, 100
Child nutrition and school lunch	+200, 000
Civil Service minimum retirement	+172, 000
Veterans disability benefits increase	+134, 800
Food assistance and special milk programs	+75, 000
Postponement of postal rate increases	+45, 200
Civil Service—early retirement, hazardous occupations	+41, 100
Donated commodity program for older Americans	+5, 500
Civil Service survivor benefits	+4, 600
Deputy Marshals pay raise	+1, 900
Congressional Record—reduce postal fees	—8, 486
Military flight pay incentive	—16, 700
Rejection of salary increases for federal executives	—34, 000
Total, 1975 budget authority impact of congressional action	+1, 536, 710

Pending actions: The major pending legislative actions affecting 1975 budget author-

ity which have passed or are pending in one or both Houses of Congress are shown in detail on Table 1, and are summarized below.

MAJOR PENDING ACTIONS ON BUDGET AUTHORITY REQUESTS

Bills (including committee action)	Congressional changes in 1975 budget authority requests (in thousands) House	Senate
Appropriation bills:		
Public Works	+$63,159	+$41,377
Interior and related agencies	+18,921	+16,390
District of Columbia	−16,600	−26,600
HUD, Space, Science, Veterans	−41,519	−139,928
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government	−73,052	−52,688
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary	−100,355	
Labor, Health, Education and Welfare	−106,456	
Transportation and related agencies	−341,400	−238,912
Defense	−3,763,127	
Legislative bills (backdoor and mandatory):		
Federal Home Loan Bank System—temporary increase in standby borrowing authority		+2,000,000
Housing and Community Development Act	+1,500,000	+1,650,000
Veterans educational benefits	+195,500	+977,500
Emergency energy unemployment	Rejected	+500,000
Civil Service survivor annuity modification	+362,000	(1)
Small business direct loans	+360,000	
Private pension protection	+100,000	+100,000
Public safety officers death gratuity	+43,700	(1)
Hopi and Navajo Tribes relocation	+28,800	

[1] Action taken last session.

Fiscal year 1974

The impact of now completed congressional action, and inaction, in the current session on the President's revised 1974 requests for budget authority and outlays, as shown in this report, may be summarized as follows:

[In millions

	House	Senate	Enacted
Congressional changes:			
Budget outlays:			
Appropriation bills	−$875	−$775	−$880
Legislative bills	+162	+151	+151
Inaction on proposed legislation	−93	−90	−380
Total	−806	−715	−1,109
Budget authority:			
Appropriation bills	−1,722	−1,455	−1,799
Legislative bills	−27	−38	−38
Inaction on proposed legislation	−2,996	−3,105	−3,394
Total	−4,745	−4,598	−5,232

The scored impact of completed appropriation and other legislative action and inaction this session affecting fiscal year 1974, ended June 30, 1974, includes the following major items:

[In millions]

Bill (including committee action)	Budget authority	Outlays
Second supplemental appropriation bill	−$1,798,756	−$880,000
Unemployment benefits extension		+161,000
Veterans educational benefits	+44,800	+44,800
Social security benefit extension for presumptive disability		+24,000
Rejection of salary increases for Federal executives	−7,000	−7,000
Military flight pay incentive	−21,200	−21,200
Veterans disability benefits increase	−49,600	−49,600

[In millions]

Bill (including committee action)	Budget authority	Outlays
Inaction on legislative proposals:		
Consolidated education grants	−$2,851,985	
Payment to Postal Service fund	−284,667	−$284,667
Asian Development Bank	−120,635	−9,600
Other	−137,100	−85,600

Congress was asked to act this session on proposals to increase 1974 revenue by $1.2 billion, mainly the windfall profits tax on the oil industry. Such action was not taken.

The $1.1 billion impact of Congressional action and inaction on 1974 budget outlay proposals this session, and the failure to act on $1.2 billion in revenue proposals, have the combined effect of increasing the 1974 deficit by about $100 million.

THE REVIEW OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON JURISTS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Review of the International Commission of Jurists is most worthy of our attention.

The International Commission of Jurists was founded "to realize the lawyer's faith in justice and human liberty under the Rule of Law." The Review "is to focus attention on the problems in regard to which lawyers can make their contribution to society in their respective areas of influence and to provide them with the necessary information and data." Both quotations are from the Review. The Review is edited by the Secretary-General of the Commission, Mr. Niall MacDermot, a former member of the British Parliament.

I have just received Review No. 12, and I place in the RECORD a brief description of this issue. Readers of the RECORD interested in learning more about the Commission or the Review should write:

International Commission of Jurists, 109, route de Chêne, 1224 Chêne-Bourgeries, Geneva, Switzerland.

The article follows:

REVIEW No. 12

Review No. 12 of the International Commission of Jurists which has just appeared, carries eye witness reports on the condition of the rule of law in Chile and Uruguay, as well as a report on the coup in Portugal by a staff member present in Lisbon at the time.

The Review contains an analysis of developments in Southern Africa including the likely consequences of the recent change of regime in Portugal on the future of that area, together with details of new repressive legislation passed in South Africa. This legislation permits the classification of organizations as "affected organizations" by administrative action, following which they are unable to receive monies from abroad. Another law, the Riotous Assemblies Amendment Act, reduces almost to a nullity what little possibility still existed in South Africa for peaceful protest.

In the new issue there are also reports on the work of the UN Human Rights Commission; on the International Convention making *apartheid* a crime under international law; and on the present law applying to loss of nationality and exile.

Human Rights in Islamic Law are discussed in an article by Khalid M. Ishaque of the Karachi Bar.

The I.L.O.'s experience in examining Human Rights situations is described in an informative article by Mr. C. Rossillion, Chief of the Discrimination Section of the International Labour Organization. The work of the recent first session of the Diplomatic Conference on Humanitarian Law, in which a preliminary draft including liberation wars in the concept of international conflicts was passed, is commented upon in an article by Dr. S. Suckow.

This issue of the Review announces the appearance of an ICJ study on the breakdown of the rule and the reign of terror existing in Uganda, and a report on the continuing torture and ill-treatment of political suspects in Uruguay.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRESS IN NEW YORK

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, civil rights can be undermined in subtle ways. In this age of individual dependence on Government it is vital that these rights be scrupulously protected against Government abuse. Just because the Federal Government provides public schools, does that mean it has the right to expel public school students en masse? Of course not. But there are many less obvious realms of governmental power in which individual liberties can be overwhelmed by dependence on Government largesse. Public licensing is such a realm. What rights does an applicant have in the face of his need for a license from the local or Federal Government?

The New York Legislature recently acted to protect the rights of individual applicants for licenses. This new law protects from discrimination those who have been arrested but not convicted. I insert in the RECORD a WINS radio editorial describing the law. I urge my colleagues to study the law as a standard for securing the civil rights of individuals who are dependent on the Government.

The editorial follows:

A STEP FORWARD FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Robert W. Dickey, general manager, WINS Radio)

Among the less publicized bills recently approved by the Albany lawmakers is one which we think represents a step forward for individual rights.

This bill would amend the State civil rights law to prohibit any public licensing agency from inquiring about or acting upon arrests which have not been followed by convictions. Many types of employment in New York as elsewhere require a license from some public agency. Under current law, these agencies are permitted to ask license applicants whether they have ever been arrested, despite the fact that they might have subsequently been found innocent.

Thus, the applicant is forced to explain an arrest for an offense on which he or she

has been legally absolved and it could prejudice a chance for a job. This would be grossly unfair.

It is a long-established principle of American justice that a person is presumed innocent until proven guilty. An arrest, which may have been made in error, is not the same thing as a conviction in which the person has been found guilty of some offense.

Thus, a line should be clearly drawn between questions pertaining to arrests and those pertaining to convictions. This principle should apply to the job applications of private employers and employment agencies as well as public licensing agencies.

We think that a further amendment of the law to that effect should be approved as soon as possible.

FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, we are all talking now about how the Government can pull this country out of the tidal waves of inflation. The fact, of course, is that the Government and its deficit spending got us into the mess in the first place, so I am not very optimistic about the Government pulling us out of the fire.

I believe that in the final analysis the solution to our inflation crisis will come from our own free enterprise system. If we will simply cut the Federal red tape that burdens our free enterprise system we would go a long way toward putting our economy back on track.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that our free enterprise system works so well is the fact that our small businessman is one of the most productive and efficient forces in our economy. The small businessman is a great national resource, and it is one of which we can all be proud.

I am sure that many Members could cite examples of businesses that excel, but I am proud of the fact that my own First Congressional District boasts one of the finest. I am referring to the Robbins Packing Co. in Statesboro, Ga.

This year the Robbins Co. is celebrating its 25th anniversary. The firm was founded by Charles M. Robbins, Sr., on September 17, 1949. Charles M. Robbins, Jr., and Lewis W. Hook joined the company soon thereafter.

In continuing its pattern of growth, Robbins was incorporated in 1957. Extensive plant construction in 1965 and 1971 has permitted continued growth. Today, Robbins employs 75 individuals and contributes more than $2 million to the local economy in livestock purchases alone.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that Robbins is a member of the fine business community in my district, and I congratulate them for their industry and hard work over the years. Their fine spirit and activity as a good neighbor in our community reflects well upon themselves and all Americans.

TEXT OF JUDICIARY IMPEACHMENT RESOLUTION

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the articles of impeachment recommended by the Judiciary Committee are here inserted for use by our constituents:

TEXT OF JUDICIARY'S IMPEACHMENT RESOLUTION

(Following is the text of the Resolution of Impeachment reported by the House Judiciary Committee:)

Resolved, that Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited in the Senate.

ARTICLE I

In his conduct of the office of President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has prevented, obstructed, and impeded the administration of justice, in that:

On June 7, 1972, and prior thereto, agents of the Committee for the Re-Election of the President committed unlawful entry of the headquarters of the Democratic National Committee in Washington, District of Columbia, for the purpose of securing political intelligence. Subsequent thereto, Richard M. Nixon, using the powers of his high office, engaged, personally and through his subordinates and agents, in a course of conduct or plan designed to delay, impede, and obstruct the investigation of such unlawful entry; to cover up, conceal and protect those responsible; and to conceal the existence and scope of other unlawful covert activities.

The means used to implement this course of conduct or plan included one or more of the following:

1. Making or causing to be made false or misleading statements to lawfully authorized investigative officers and employes of the United States;

2. Withholding relevant and material evidence or information from lawfully authorized investigative officers and employes of the United States;

3. Approving, condoning, acquiescing in, and counseling witnesses with respect to the giving of false or misleading statements to lawfully authorized investigative officers and employes of the United States and false or misleading testimony in duly instituted judicial and congressional proceedings;

4. Interfering or endeavoring to interfere with the conduct of investigations by the Department of Justice of the United States, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Watergate Special Prosecution Force, and Congressional committees;

5. Approving, condoning, and acquiescing in, the surreptitious payment of substantial sums of money for the purpose of obtaining the silence or influencing the testimony of witnesses, potential witnesses or individuals who participated in such unlawful entry and other illegal activities;

6. Endeavoring to misuse the Central Intelligence Agency, an agency of the United States;

7. Disseminating information received from officers of the Department of Justice of the United States to subjects of investigations conducted by lawfully authorized investigative officers and employes of the United States, for the purpose of aiding and assisting such subjects in their attempts to avoid criminal liability;

8. Making false or misleading public statements for the purpose of deceiving the people of the United States into believing that a thorough and complete investigation had been conducted with respect to allegations of misconduct on the part of personnel of the executive branch of the United States and personnel of the Committee for the Re-Election of the President, and that there was no involvement of such personnel in such misconduct; or

9. Endeavoring to cause prospective defendants, and individuals duly tried and convicted, to expect favored treatment and consideration in return for their silence or false testimony, or rewarding individuals for their silence or false testimony.

In all of this, Richard M. Nixon has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government, to the great prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore Richard M. Nixon, by such conduct, warrants impeachment and trial, and removal from office.

ARTICLE II

Using the powers of the Office of President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and to the best of his ability to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in disregard of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has repeatedly engaged in conduct violating the constitutional rights of citizens, impairing the due and proper administration of justice and the conduct of lawful inquiries, contravening the laws governing agencies of the executive branch and the purposes of these agencies. This conduct has included one or more of the following:

(1) He has, acting personally and through his subordinates and agents, endeavored to obtain from the Internal Revenue Service, in violation of the constitutional rights of citizens, confidential information contained in income tax returns, for purposes not authorized by law, and to cause, in violation of the constitutional rights of citizens, income tax audits or other income tax investigations to be initiated or conducted in a discriminatory manner:

(2) He misused the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Secret Service, and other executive personnel, in violation or disregard of the constitutional rights of citizens, by directing or authorizing such agencies or personnel, to conduct or continue electronic surveillance or other investigation, for purposes unrelated to national security, the enforcement of laws, or other lawful function of his office. He did direct, authorize, or permit the use of information obtained thereby, for purposes unrelated to national security, the enforcement of laws, or any other lawful function of his office, and he did direct the concealment of certain records made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of electronic surveillance;

(3) He has, acting personally or through his subordinates and agents, in violation or disregard of the constitutional rights of citizens, authorized and permitted to be maintained a secret investigative unit within the office of the president, financed in part from money derived from campaign contributions,

which unlawfully utilized the resources of the Central Intelligence Agency, engaged in covert and unlawful activities and attempted to prejudice the constitutional right of an accused to a fair trial;

(4) He has failed to take care that the laws were faithfully executed, by failing to act when he knew or had reason to know that his close subordinates endeavored to impede and frustrate lawful inquiries by duly constituted executive, judicial and legislative entities, concerning unlawful entry into the headquarters of the Democratic National Committee and its coverup, and other unlawful activities, including those relating to the confirmation of Richard Kleindienst as attorney general of the United States, electronic surveillance of private citizens, the break-in into the office of Dr. Lewis Fielding, and the campaign fiancing practices of the Committee to Re-Elect the President.

(5) In disregard of the rule of law, he knowingly misused the executive powers by interfering with agencies of the executive branch, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the criminal division, and the office of Watergate Special Prosecution Force of the Department of Justice, and the Central Intelligence Agency, in violation of his duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

In all of this, Richard M. Nixon has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government, to the great prejudice to the cause of law and justice, and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore Richard M. Nixon, by such conduct, warrants impeachment and trial and removal from office.

ARTICLE III

In his conduct of the office of president of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, contrary to his oath faithfully to execute the office of president of the United States, and to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, has failed without lawful cause or excuse to produce papers and things as directed by duly authorized subpoenas issued by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on April 11, 1974, May 15, 1974, May 30, 1974, and June 24, 1974, and willfully disobeyed such subpoenas.

The subpoenaed papers and things were deemed necessary by the committee in order to resolve by direct evidence fundamental, factual questions relating to presidential direction, knowledge or approval of actions demonstrated by other evidence to be substantial grounds for impeachment of the president.

In refusing to produce these papers and things Richard M. Nixon, substituting his judgment as to what materials were necessary for the inquiry, interposed the powers of the presidency against the lawful subpoenas of the House of Representatives, thereby assuming to himself functions and judgments necessary to the exercise of the sole power of impeachment vested by the Constitution in the House of Representatives.

In all of this, Richard M. Nixon has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as president and subversive of constitutional government, to the great prejudice of the cause of law and justice, and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore, Richard M. Nixon by such conduct, warrants impeachment and trial and removal from office.

INFLATION AND GOVERNMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, part 2 of a recent study from the Bureau of National Affairs Daily Labor Report on the course of Government inflation policy deals with recent criticisms of the Nixon administration's handling of its twin policy weapons, budget and credit restraint. I insert herewith the article by BNA associate editor, Ben Rathbun:

"CAP THE KNIFE" AND FISCAL POLICY

The Nixon Administration's continuing insistence on budget or fiscal restraint, and credit or monetary restraint as the twin pillars of anti-inflation policy ran into significant criticism. For example, the effectiveness of fiscal policy as one of the main responses to higher prices was questioned by one of the Administration's most influential leaders, HEW Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger, the former director of the Office of Management and Budget under President Nixon. In his little-reported Doubleday Lecture in May, Weinberger indicated that the Administrations' reliance on keeping a lid on congressional spending is an illusion due for the dustbin of economic history.

Of all the Nixon Administration figures directly concerned with the budget since 1968, none has more of a reputation as a budget cutter and as an exponent, therefore, of a tough fiscal policy than Weinberger; hence his nickname, "Cap the Knife." Before coming to Washington, Weinberger had earned a name as a skilled and persistent budget-cutter in California Governor Ronald Reagan's administration.

For Weinberger to express his skepticism about fiscal policy is an arresting development. In his lecture, he rejected the Keynesian approach to economic policy and economic stabilization as bankrupt. Writing in the 1920s, British economist John Maynard Keynes plumped for heavy government spending when the economy needed stimulation and fiscal retrenchment for an overheated economy. Weinberger noted that Keynes never had to go up to Capitol Hill to propose that Congress cut back spending programs. He summed up this way:

"International conditions, private collective bargaining arrangements, and scientific discoveries, just to name three, have a far greater influence on our economy today than whether the budget has a deficit of $10 or $20 billion in an economy where the GNP is approaching a trillion and a half. . . . Increased spending may help fan the flames of inflation, but restraint does not put them out—if real budget restraints were ever possible."

Weinberger did not reject budgetary restraint as an essential aspect of Administration policy. He confined himself to its relatively minor role in combatting an inflationary spiral. Meanwhile, others at the Capitol and in the business community said their doubts about the Administration's dedication to fiscal austerity were spurred by the record budget deficits of $23 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $23.2 billion for fiscal 1972; and $14.3 billion for fiscal 1973.

OMB and White House economic advisers also have stressed that it has been the longtime position of "the public finance people" that if you want to be serious about fiscal policy and budget cutting, you have to give the President discretionary tax authority. To make it work, the President must have some authority for tax cutting. In this view, Congress cannot respond swiftly enough to save the policy from failure.

FRB AND CREDIT: THE POLICY VERSUS THE PRACTICE

The execution of the Administration's other policy weapon, monetary policy, also has been criticized. The charge is an echo of the persistent view of Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago that inflation is created in "the stately and impressive Grecian temple on Independence Avenue [in Washington] that houses the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board." The Board's critics among the bankers, businessmen, academicians, and at the Capitol insist that the stated policy of monetary restraint has been seriously at odds with the Fed's actual practice since 1970. They note that the money supply, defined as currency in circulation plus demand deposits, expanded by 4.5 percent in 1970. Thereafter, it hit the up-escalator with a 7.0 percent expansion in 1971 followed by 6.4 percent and 7.4 percent in '72 and '73.

According to this thesis, the Fed—fearful of the persistently high six percent unemployment rate—switched from monetary restraint to markedly expansionist tactics. A major aim was to try to bring down unemployment prior to the 1972 election campaign.

The newest member of the Board, Henry C. Wallich, formerly of Yale University and the Treasury Department, indicated recently that the switch from restraint indicated the Fed's impatience with the failure of its tight credit policy to help reduce the inflation inherited by the Nixon Administration. In a May 30 speech, Wallich cautioned that monetary policy is effective only when applied in a most gradual way. He said that the Fed's "impatience with the slowness of results" of the monetary restraints of 1968–71 became a prime cause of the continuing inflation after 1970.

At the Capitol and even among some of the FRB's own regional presidents, there is growing frustration at what is regarded as the contradictions between the Fed's endlessly-reiterated policy of keeping the money supply from expanding too swiftly and its expansionist practice. However, there is recognition that too tight a rein on the money supply can cause a broad-scale "money crunch," including a crisis for the savings and loan and other savings institutions. There also is recognition that out-of-line federal spending puts great pressure on the Fed to expand the money supply, and that Burns is correct—up to a point—in leveling an accusatory finger at his severest congressional adversaries, like Chairman Wright Patman of the House Banking Committee.

At the same time, they believe that Burns has tried to do too much. As an influential Congressional staff member put it: "Burns has been overly-ambitious in his policy moves. He has tried to do contradictory things, notably in his attempts to play the Big Daddy on both prices and unemployment. His eye should have been more on the price precinct."

A House Banking Committee staff member recalled that Shultz, as the Labor Secretary, used to advise the unions *not* to bet on inflation. He repeatedly warned labor leaders not to raise their demands too high. Such action, said Shultz, would foolishly ignore the Administration's monetary and fiscal policies for keeping prices under restraint. The practical effect, according to the Shultz strictures, was that labor would be courting unemployment. "Experience" said the committee official, "now shows that Shultz was dishing out lousy advice to his AFL–CIO pals."

Updating his comment, he noted that a

July 1974 Administration bid for union restraint must seem to the unions "like an invitation to play Russian roulette." As he put it: "Judging by the past, the Fed's going to ratify those 15 percent wage demands" by expanding the money supply accordingly.

MONETARY AND FISCAL TOOLS ARE "NOT ENOUGH"

Ex-Cost of Living Council Chairman John Dunlop has agreed that fiscal and monetary policy are "the major tools" for cooling off or stimulating the economy. However, he represented a developing point of view on the Hill and among union leaders, bankers, and economists when he added: "But I reject the absolutism and exclusivity of this [analysis]."

He added this comment in a June 1974 speech in San Francisco:

"The experience of recent years supports the realistic judgment that monetary and fiscal policies are not sufficient tools by themselves to restrain effectively the types of inflation we have had. . . . It matters little whether monetary and fiscal tools are inherently inadequate to deal with contemporary inflation or that the users are inhibited by practical considerations in their application of these classical measures. The simple fact is that monetary and fiscal tools are not enough . . . and we must get to the task of developing other measures even though their contribution might be less immediate or powerful."

In the same vein, a 1974 Joint Economic Committee report said this of the lessons of the 1973 inflation: 1973 has shown that "inflation is a hydra-headed problem, and a more sophisticated set of policy instruments must be developed to deal with it." The report added that monetary and fiscal policy "must be coordinated with specific programs directed at particular sectors of the private economy and at the relationship of the domestic economy to the world economy."

However, businessmen and economists at July 1974 White House sessions on inflation found a frosty welcome for policy initiatives going beyond fiscal and monetary restraint. They indicated that the President and his principal economic advisers, notably Greenspan, appeared to have little interest in policy "innovation."

The Administration officials noted that the only revised ingredient in their formula was the willingness "to tough out" a restrictive policy for a year or two regardless of the fallout of political chips or casualties. In a subsequent comment on the practical implications of this "steady-as-we-go" approach, Greenspan said: "Certainly you run a risk [of politically-dangerous unemployment]. And the probability is that you'll get a sluggish, perhaps stagnating economy." But he indicated that the government, particularly the Fed and the White House, must stop trying to have it both ways, with restrictions to cure inflation and concomitant money supply expansion to ward off unemployment. Greenspan's preoccupation with fiscal restraint also was underscored by his answer on an earlier occasion to a question about his three dominant priorities: "The budget. The budget. The budget."

In partial rejoinder, a high executive of one of the largest manufacturing corporations who was not at the White House meetings said: "This 'sweat-it-out' policy would be fine by itself if the so-called free market were as free as the Greenspans and the Simons say it is. But it ain't all that free. There's where the fantasy comes in."

NIXON AND THE JAWBONE

As for the White House "jawboning" scorned by Nixon over the years but discussed with favor in the President's July 25 speech on the economy, observers are skeptical about his authority to wield the jawbone effectively these days. For example, the President's friend and supporter, Victor Riesel, the syndicated columnist, wrote this in mid-July about the White House's frustrations in its relations with the labor movement on inflation policy:

"They [the White House staff] want restraint by labor. The White House wants to ask for it personally. But Dick Nixon now has no business agent."

There are lots of new faces [charged with doing something about labor policy] in the White House. Nice chaps. But they really don't know their way around, nor do they know anything about labor disputes and economic settlements.

"One former Nixon policy maker says, There literally is no effective communication between the White House and labor. I can't remember when this was so."

Two of the most effective Administration emissaries to labor had been Shultz and Dunlop, but both have departed. Federal Mediation Service Director W. J. Usery, Jr., a former Machinists official who also served as a liaison man between the Administration and George Meany in Nixon's first term, now is less than welcome at AFL–CIO headquarters. His protracted consideration and ultimate rejection of a high AFL–CIO job last year was not pleasing to the AFL–CIO high command.

Shultz, now a top officer of the Bechtel Corporation, San Francisco, offered a small assist in July by organizing a golf foursome at the Burning Tree Club near Washington with Meany and Kenneth Rush, the new White House counsellor on economic affairs. But Meany aides and ex-Administration figures view this as nothing but Meany's longtime practice as "a master power broker" of keeping the pipeline open to the White House. It is no signal, they say, that Meany, so long as Nixon remains, will offer support on economic issues.

In a July 29 colloquy with Senator Proxmire at a Joint Economic Committee hearing, Rush discouraged the notion of an activist President in executing stabilization policy. He indicated that there would be very little jawboning from the President or other White House spokesmen. He told Proxmire that he regarded the White House role on stabilization initiatives as closer to "education" than to jawboning.

Rush also coldly rebuffed the notion of White House promulgation of wage and price guidelines for management and labor. When Proxmire reminded him that guideposts had been "very successful from 1962 to 1966 [with the Administration getting] marvelous cooperation from labor," Rush displayed the minimal possible enthusiasm for such counsel.

As for his relations with Meany, Rush said in an interview that he has "a very high regard for Mr. Meany." He indicated his hope that the lines can be kept open to the AFL–CIO but declined to make any comment about what he is doing to assuage what Washington observers regard as the most bitter conflict between labor and the White House in U.S. history. As a Meany spokesman noted: "This is much worse than when John L. Lewis [the United Mine Workers' president and the country's most influential labor leader at the time] turned on FDR and called his Vice President Cactus Jack Garner 'a poker-playing, whiskey-drinking, evil old man.'"

A PLUS FOR CONGRESS

The 1974 Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act requiring the establishment of Senate and House Budget Committees is designed to shuck the fragmented and unprogrammed congressional approach to appropriating money. It has had widespread praise, particularly for its anti-inflation implications. James W. McLane, the former Deputy Director of the Cost of Living Council, has called it "the most important law passed in the last five years. For the first time, the Congress will have the budgetary planning and analytical arm it has never had before." The plaudits have come from all areas of the political scene. John Dunlop has noted that congressional assertion of control over its own appropriations process is a fundamental first step toward an effective national stabilization policy.

Nevertheless, supporters of the law are reserving judgment about its effects. After saying this is "clearly a step in the right direction and long overdue," Alan Greenspan, the chairman-designate of the Council of Economic Advisers, was asked if "it will work."

His answer: "I will announce it a success when we go through the first round of that and all the individual budgets are cut down a little bit, and we're . . . [hearing] all sorts of howls in the process." Also giving pause to observers is the failure of a comparable experiment under the 1946 Congressional Reorganization Act. The Act called for a unified budget, but the process was deemed so unsatisfactory that it was abandoned after one year.

A WARNING WORTH REPEATING

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, many of us who serve in the Congress are deeply concerned that unless the people of this Nation become aware of the irreversible damage that is being done to our land, the water and the air, we will soon find our natural resources fully depleted, the land destroyed, the air fouled, and the water polluted.

Neither the threat, nor the recognition that the danger exists, is new. Sixty-six years ago President Theodore Roosevelt spoke before the Conference on the Conservation of Natural Resources. I would like to share some of his words with you today:

We have become rich because of the lavish use of our natural resources, and we have just reason to be proud of our growth. But the time has come to inquire seriously what will happen when our forests are gone, when the coal, the iron, the oil and the gas are exhausted, when the soil has been further impoverished and washed into the streams, polluting the rivers, denuding the fields and obstructing navigation. These questions do not only relate to the next generation. It is time for us now as a Nation to exercise the same reasonable foresight in dealing with our great natural resources that would be shown by any prudent man in conserving and wisely using the property which contains the assurance of well being for himself and his children.

As Americans, we have certain unalienable rights, but we also have "unalienable responsibilities." One of these is to protect, conserve and restore our natural resources.

STATEMENT ON IMPEACHMENT

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it became apparent some months ago that I as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives might be called upon to consider certain articles of impeachment against President Nixon. I gave much consideration to how I should approach this awesome potential responsibility.

I concluded that my essential task was to prepare myself to cast as fair and as intelligent a vote as was possible. To this end, I determined that I should not in any manner or to any degree engage in any public prosecution or defense of the President and that I should keep an open mind until such time as I became aware of clear and convincing evidence of the President's guilt of impeachable offenses and that unless and until such should occur, I should presume him innocent.

I began and have continued to study the law and the evidence involved in this issue.

During many weeks of such study and consideration I was of the opinion that the key to my judgment might well rest upon what interpretation I placed upon those pertinent words in the Constitution, "high crimes and misdemeanors." I no longer believe it necessary, in this instance, to distinguish between a narrow or a broad interpretation of those words.

As the evidence increased in quantity and in weight, it seemed to me that the most pertinent criminal statute might be USCA 18, section 1510. This statute provides that its violation is a felony. That is to say, it is more than a misdemeanor. It is a high crime. I am attaching a copy of that statute hereto and in its entirety. Its entitlement is "Obstruction of Criminal Investigations".

On August 5, 1974, I read a statement issued by President Nixon on that day, which statement made reference to a conversation which he says occurred between himself and his Chief of Staff, H. R. Haldeman, on June 23, 1972. On yesterday, August 6, 1974, I read a transcript of that conversation as released by the President. Both of these documents are now matters of public record.

This admitted conversation by the President makes it clear that some 6 days following the Watergate break-in—wherein persons other than the President violated criminal statutes of the United States and for which they have been convicted and sentenced by Federal Courts—and at a time when the Federal Bureau of Investigation—a "criminal investigator" as defined in the above statute—was conducting an investigation of such crimes, President Nixon directed H. R. Haldeman to "obstruct" and even to "prevent" such investigations of such crimes for reasons admitted to be personal and political.

It is my considered and firm opinion that the President's directive to Mr. Haldeman constitutes strong evidence of a violation of USCA 18, section 1510 and that such violation constitutes an impeachable offense as defined in the Constitution; namely, high crimes or misdemeanors.

I am now convinced that in order for the House of Representatives to adhere to responsibilities assigned to it by the Constitution, this body must deem it justified and necessary to call upon the U.S. Senate to conduct a trial of President Richard M. Nixon upon a charge of the commission of impeachable offenses.

Therefore, I have determined that I will vote at least for article 1 of the bill of impeachment against President Nixon.

The material referred to follows:

OBSTRUCTION OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS

§ 1510. Obstruction of criminal investigations.

(a) Whoever willfully endeavors by means of bribery, misrepresentation, intimidation, or force or threats thereof to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication of information relating to a violation of any criminal statute of the United States by any person to a criminal investigator; or

Whoever injures any person in his person or property on account of the giving by such person or by any other person of any such information to any criminal investigator—

Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) As used in this section, the term "criminal investigator" means any individual duly authorized by a department, agency, or armed force of the United States to conduct or engage in investigations of or prosecutions for violations of the criminal laws of the United States. (Added Pub. L. 90–123, § 1(a), Nov. 3, 1967, 81 Stat. 362.)

CROSS REFERENCES

Wire or oral communications, authorization for interception, to provide evidence of offenses under this section, see section 2516 of this title.

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 1961, 2516 of this title.

TEXACO INCREASES OIL DRILLING

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week, Texaco released its operations report for the first 6 months of 1974. During recent months, press headlines have stated that Texaco and other major oil companies have shown tremendous profits. Unfortunately, these news stories do not examine the figures and do not note the underlying causes of the operations facts. I would like to share with my colleagues some of the actual figures as contained in the Texaco report.

Texaco's revenue from domestic operations dropped from $199 million in 1973, to a figure of $183 million in 1974. This is a decline of 8 percent. Although worldwide net income was up for the first half of 1974, Texaco's Chairman and Chief Executive Officer Maurice F. Granville noted:

Market prices outside of the United States late in the second quarter of 1974 began to decline from earlier levels following resumption of more normal deliveries after the cutbacks and embargoes were withdrawn. It also becomes apparent that substantially higher world market price levels for petroleum products, as well as conservation practices were having a significant dampening effect on demand.

It is also interesting to note that $25 million of the increase in the company's total earnings was attributable to the effect of the higher net value, in terms of U.S. dollars, of operating earnings realized in the currencies of foreign countries. Here we have a foreign exchange valuation figure which is strictly a paper profit figure.

Texaco made one more extremely important comment regarding international operations. They referred to Libya's nationalization of Texaco's interests in that country. We never seem to mention the fact that these oil companies have suffered nationalization and loss of assets in their foreign investment and high-risk business.

Inventory profits for the first 6 months of 1974 were $339 million for Texaco. This money, in turn, was reinvested to provide replacement inventories of petroleum. While inventory profits provided a higher statement for Texaco during this period, they are nonrecurring. Next time there could be an inventory loss.

Maurice Granville pointed out that—

Earnings for the first six months, excluding inventory profits, averaged less than 2 cents a gallon for all petroleum and products sold by the Company during the period.

Let us look at this profit. Last week I was commenting on the average 15 cents in sales and excise taxes that rest on every gallon of gasoline sold at the pump. This means that for every 2 cents profit Texaco earned on a gallon of gasoline, seven times as much was paid in Government taxes at the service station.

I was impressed with Texaco's leadership in working to solve our current energy domestic crisis. During the first half of 1974, Texaco's capital and exploratory expenditures for additional oil and gas production totaled $1,060,000,000. If you consolidate all types of worldwide net income and every paper figure, you come up with a figure of $1,049,771,000. This means that Texaco more than reinvested all of its earnings during this first half of 1974 into additional oil exploration and development.

What is the summary of Texaco's first 6 months report? These two key facts stand out: The first one is that earnings on actual operations within the United States which were based on the business operations themselves, were down 8 percent from 1974 compared to 1973. The next important fact was that, including all types of profits from all worldwide sources, Texaco had capital and exploratory expenditures larger than gross earnings received. In other words, Texaco has met the challenge, and is expanding tremendously on its drilling and develop-

ment program. This expansion was made in spite of the tremendous risk involved and the decline in domestic earnings.

What this country needs is to encourage more growth and development in the oil business. Otherwise, the energy shortage that hit us a few months ago will come back with increased severity in a couple of years. America must become self-sufficient and America must develop more and more of its energy reserves. Texaco is to be congratulated on the aggressive leadership they are taking in meeting America's energy crisis.

RACISM—APPROVED AND DISAPPROVED

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD an article from the July 25 New York Times about the Onondaga Indian tribe in upper New York State. Racism comes in all colors: black, white, red, and yellow. Yet it is only white racism that is disapproved by the mass media and the liberal intellectuals. All other forms of racism are praised by the liberals as progressive, if not entirely virtuous. I think that the result of racism and radicalism among the blacks and the Indians has been largely ignored by the media. The ruthlessness with which the radical racists of all races oppress those who do not share their "progressive" and "liberal" views ought to be given much greater coverage in the press than it has been.

The article follows:

DEFYING INDIANS, FAMILY BURNS HOME RATHER THAN TURN IT OVER TO CHIEFS

(By David Bird)

NEDROW, N.Y.—A white woman and her Indian husband last night burned the house in which they reared their 11 children, rather than turn it over to chiefs of the Onondaga tribe.

The burning came after three days in which Indians raided and harassed white and mixed-blood families that were resisting a three-month-old ultimatum by the chiefs to vacate the Onondaga reservation near Syracuse. White families have reportedly been menaced and beaten and their homes vandalized.

The chiefs insist that local authorities are powerless to abrogate their sovereignty, although today they agreed to meet with a black Federal mediator, whom they accepted as the representative of another sovereign entity, the United States of America.

The couple who burned their home, Calvin and Ruth Gibson, had built the house themselves over a period of 25 years. They were among seven families who had resolved to challenge the chiefs' eviction notice. Twenty-two other families had left within the last two months, bowing to the wishes of the Indian council, which said the reservation was becoming too crowded.

Yesterday afternoon, Mrs. Gibson said, a group of Indians drove to her home overlooking a broad valley and tormented her family. Her husband, a full-blooded Onondaga, is crippled.

"They crashed the doors, beat us and said we had to get out because they were going to move a chief into our house," Mrs. Gibson said tearfully as she sat in the fire station of this town on the edge of the Indian lands. The station serves as the command post for Sheriff Patrick Corbett of Onondaga County, who had 110 deputies working through the night to keep order on the tense reservation.

FRIENDS AIDED EVACUATION

Mrs. Gibson said that after the raiding Indians left, she and her husband had decided that if they could not keep their home, they did not want their tormentors to have it. Hurriedly, they cleared out their belongings, loading them into cars and trucks driven by friends.

Then they set a match to a gasoline-soaked mattress and watched as the house burned down to the basement and concrete-block foundation.

This afternoon, one of the Gibsons' sons, 19-year-old Gary, poked through the still-hot ruins of the house to salvage bits of copper tubing and pipe. The rest of the family is split up, staying temporarily with relatives and friends.

"I want to make sure we get everything," Gary said as he worked, occasionally burning his hands. "I sure as hell don't want the chief to get anything. They're too lazy to fix up their own houses, so they just try to take someone else's."

For the Gibson's the question of staying on the reservation has been settled with grim finality. But a few of the other white and mixed families still hope to be able to remain.

The Indians have spurned the idea of negotiations, suggested by the local District Attorney. Moreover, the issue is complicated because treaties with the Federal Government have guaranteed the Onondaga chiefs sovereignty over the area.

CIVIL LIBERTIES CONCERN

Local civil liberties groups are concerned about the legal rights of the Indians and also about the basic protection of law for the whites. "We're torn between our support of sovereignty and our insistence on due-process protection," said Clifford Forstadt, director of the central New York chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Forstadt said that a group of Indians had pushed him down a flight of stairs as he tried to block a summary eviction yesterday.

"I am appalled by the denial of due process," he said, adding that the Indians might have the right to banish people from the reservation but that each case must be weighed legally.

District Attorney Jon K. Holcombe made no headway with his suggestions that he intercede legally to press the chiefs' claims in court.

Leon Shenandoah, one of the chiefs, rejected this offer, holding to the view that no one but the Indians had authority on the reservation.

Mr. Holcombe was reduced to such gestures as pleading for the rights of one white man to return to his home to pick up some clothes before leaving for good.

The man was George Dimler, who has lived on the reservation with his Onondaga wife for 30 of his 63 years.

"I'll get out," said Mr. Dimler with tears welling. "I don't want my wife or anybody to get hurt."

Some of the worried residents here said that before the trouble had flared openly this week, they had been assured that state troopers would respond when summoned for help.

But, they said, no troopers came when they called yesterday. Today, Sgt. Fred Fessenger of the Lafayette station of the state police acknowledged having received the calls. He said the information had been routed to the sheriff's office because "eviction is a civil process."

The sheriff's office disputed this interpretation, asserting that the state police wanted to avoid a ticklish job.

"I think we were thrown a hot potato and had to grapple with it," said William Lynn, the deputy on duty at the command post here.

Not all the reservation Indians have agreed with the Chiefs' position, and some say they have been threatened and driven off.

"They accused me of being a defender of whites and Christianity, and they said those two things have to go," said Alice Thompson, an Onondaga, as she rested in the bingo hall of the fire station.

Miss Thompson said she had wanted to see more democratic involvement on the reservation, adding that the Chiefs had dispersed tribal money as they wanted, without accounting to anyone.

"It's my nation," Miss Thompson said, "but it's become a dictatorship with just one group of families—the Shenandoahs, the Cooks and the Powlesses—deciding everything themselves in the Long House.

The Federal official who joined the discussions with the Indian leaders was Edward Cabell, a mediator with the Department of Justice. He flew in last night. By late afternoon he was called into the Long House for an hour of discussion. His only comment was that "discussions are being held."

Oren Lyons, one of the chiefs, took the opportunity to reiterate what he said was the right of the chiefs to take over property and evict whites. He showed a letter written on July 2 to President Nixon stating that if the United States did not evict the whites, the chiefs would. He said the United States did not act, therefore, the chiefs' hands were forced.

IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, the revelation that the President held back evidence and deceived not only his own counsel and staff but also the Congress and the American people as well, has gravely shaken public confidence in him and wounded his ability to continue to lead our Nation. The June 23, 1972, transcript clearly demonstrates that he knew of the break-in into Democratic Party headquarters long before the March 21, 1973 date he previously stated, and worse, that he was personally involved in the coverup and misused the FBI and CIA for these purposes. On the basis of his own admission of August 5, 1974, and my examination of all the evidence, I have arrived at the unhappy judgment that the President is guilty of obstruction of justice under article I of the charges leveled by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

In addition, the new evidence made available August 5 may well cause me to vote "aye" on article II which charges that the President misused his power.

The most important aspect of our entire system of government is equal justice under the law—the principle that

no person—whether he be rich or poor, black or white, ordinary citizen or President—is above the law. Coverup of criminal activity and misuse of Federal agencies can neither be condoned nor tolerated. And as long as we adhere as a Nation to this principle, our Nation will remain great and strong.

A PERCEPTIVE COLUMN ON THE FISCAL YEAR 1974 ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE RESULTS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, George Will's newspaper column has proved to be a source of commonsense and good advice to a nation in need of wise counsel. A topic on which he is particularly knowledgeable is the all-Volunteer Armed Force.

Recently, he noted the results of the 1974 program particularly in terms of manpower quality and socioeconomic composition. The success of the first year without the draft, as he states, demonstrates that "the all-Volunteer Force stands out as the rarest kind of Government achievement. It is a program that is and ought to be popular."

I shall insert this item in the RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Aug. 4, 1974]

NIXON DESERVES CREDIT FOR THE ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCE

(By George F. Will)

WASHINGTON.—As the rafters crash down around him, let us pause to praise one of Mr. Nixon's finest achievements, the all-volunteer armed force.

The evidence from fiscal year 1974, which ended June 30, is that the three major worries about the all-volunteer force—that there would not be enough volunteers, that they would not be of sufficiently high quality; that they would include "too many" blacks—were unwarranted.

The four services were authorized to have a strength of 2,174,000 on June 30. They had 2,163,000.

Determined critics of the all-volunteer force, disappointed that there have been adequate numbers of volunteers, now are claiming that today's volunteers are of a lower quality than yesterday's conscripts.

It is standard and sensible practice to compare today's force with the 1964 force. That was the last year of the pre-Vietnam era, and total strength of the forces was approximately the size it is today.

In 1964, 68 percent of all new entrants had high school diplomas. Today 66 percent do. The percentages of new entrants who are high school graduates has risen since 1964 in the Air Force. But the statistics about high school diplomas are not significant.

There is no clear correlation between an enlistee's possession of a high school diploma and his ability to acquire and perform a military skill. The relevant statistics are these: In 1964, 85 percent of all new entrants scored "average" or "above average" in trainability testing. The figure today is 90 percent.

People who say today's recruits are of low quality do not understand the facts. People who say there are "too many" blacks in the armed forces do not understand the facts, or the Constitution.

The American military age population is 13 percent black. The most recent statistics on blacks as a percentage of the military's total enlisted strength showed that blacks comprise 15 percent of that total.

Blacks comprise 21 percent of new enlistments in fiscal 1974.

The percentage of black volunteers is higher than the percentage of blacks in the population for the same reason that for years, the percentage of rural and Southern volunteers has been higher than the rural and Southern percentage of the population. Enlistment is especially attractive to people whose opportunities in the civilian economy are limited.

That is why Army Sceretary Howard Calloway, a Georgian, is correct in insisting that the number of black recruits is "a success story. Blacks see the Army as a place where they get a fair shake, and they do."

Thus in the irremedial confusion of Washington today, the all-volunteer force stands out as the rarest kind of government achievement. It is a program that is and ought to be popular.

THE NATIONAL POWER AGENCY

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill to establish a national power grid and a series of bulk power supply agencies. The purpose of this legislation is to assure an adequate, reliable, and low-cost electric power supply consistent with the enhancement of environmental values. It will concomitantly promote competition in the electric power industry and preserve a semblance of equilibrium in our balance of payments through reduced demand on foreign oil.

I have previously spoken to the Congress at length on the environmental and cost benefit justifications for a national power grid. Today I will concentrate on reasons why, from a standpoint of high foreign oil prices and our precarious balance of payments situation, my legislation should be acted upon by the Congress immediately.

The shortage of low-cost fuel known as the "energy crisis" has taught us that we can no longer afford to waste our precious fuel reserves. The horrendous increases in foreign oil prices and the resulting havoc in our balance of payments has made energy conservation a paramount objective in the years ahead.

There is a substantial amount of waste in our production of electric power. In particular it has been estimated that we produce 27 percent more power than we consume. Why? Because each utility company has the burden of maintaining power reserves to compensate for equipment breakdown and other emergencies. An interconnected grid system in this country would obviate such a surplus power reserve, produce a cost saving factor of about one-third, and most importantly, would dramatically reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

How does this system work? Say New York experiences an equipment breakdown at the peak load time of 5 o'clock and has no power reserve. With my grid system, power could be transported from Los Angeles, which is 3 hours behind New York and not at peak load time, to New York. Thus New York would not have to maintain a reserve load of wasted power.

Is it really important to reduce our demand on foreign oil? Yes, not even considering the possibility of an oil embargo by the Arabs, simply too much money is leaving this country to pay for imported oil. We must accept the admonition of Gerald Pollack in "The Economics of the Energy Crisis," Foreign Affairs, April 1974, that:

If demand does not fall off appreciably when prices rise and if supplies remain tight, import bills will keep rising. By 1985 they might well approach $200 billion, some $150 more than in 1973.

A national power grid would do much to appreciably reduce this country's reliance on foreign oil through the efficient and rational allocation of our electric power.

I would also like to point out for the record that if we are ever to have the large-scale implementation of solar energy and/or tidal power, we must have a national power grid. The aforementioned power sources will be in remote areas, and unless we have an interconnected system of extremely efficient high-powered transmission lines, we will never be able to utilize these clean, inexhaustible power sources.

The bill that I am reintroducing today would establish a National Power Grid Corporation, financed by tax exempt bonds. This corporation would be responsible for the bulk supply of electric power. It could generate power either by contracting with existing utilities or by construction and operating its own large-scale plants. The corporation would move this power throughout the country using a "grid" system of extra high voltage transmission lines.

In each of the regions of the United States there would be established a Regional Bulk Power Supply Corporation. These corporations would be largely independent of the National Corporation. Direction would be by a three-man board, one member representing private power companies, one representing public companies and one representing consumers. They would market the National Grid's power to the utilities in the region but would not be in the business of distribution. Rather, they would sell their power through a series of transmission lines to the utilities in the region, private and public, who would then market the power to the consumer.

Further the system of the grid will eliminate the burden utilities now have of maintaining reserves to compensate for equipment breakdown and other emergencies. The resulting operating efficiencies could produce a cost/saving factor of one-third which would be passed on to the consumer.

RELIEF OF "SQUALUS" CREW

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would provide for the relief of the officers and crew of the U.S.S. *Squalus*. This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay each person who was an officer or an enlisted member assigned to duty aboard the U.S.S. *Squalus* at the time of its sinking on May 23, 1939, an amount equal to the submarine pay he would have received, pursuant to the act entitled "an act to provide additional pay for personnel of the U.S. Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty"—(45 Stat. 412, approved on April 9, 1928—as amended, if the U.S.S. *Squalus* had not sunk.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S.S. *Squalus* sank on May 23, 1939, as the result of mechanical failure. Of the 59 crew members and civilian employees on board, only 33 survived. From May 23 to November 13, 1939, surviving members of the crew were assigned to the salvaging and drydocking of the submarine. During this period these men continued to receive submarine pay. After they had been reassigned to other ships, the Comptroller General ordered repayment of the submarine pay on the grounds that they were not on active submarine duty. It is my understanding that this period of not being on active submarine duty includes the period of time that the submarine was on the bottom with all hands on board. Since the payments had already been made, the crewmen were required to make repayment from their subsequent salaries, adding financial hardship to the physical and emotional damage already inflicted.

When this situation was brought to my attention, I took the matter up with the Secretary of the Navy. I informed him that I thought it was disgraceful that these men were docked their pay, although they were still in the Navy and worked for the Navy during all that time. I have received this reply from J. William Middendorf II, Secretary of the Navy:

The Comptroller of the United States ruled in his decision B–4764 of July 21, 1939 (19 CompGen 90), that neither officers nor enlisted members were entitled to receipt of submarine pay after the sinking. As indicated in this decision, the law authorized payment of such pay to officers while serving on duty on board a submarine, and to enlisted members while assigned to duty on board a submarine. In an earlier decision (A–84974 of April 13, 1937), the Comptroller General ruled that, in the case of an enlisted member, a temporary omission of actual service up to 30 days is permissible without a loss of submarine pay. The Comptroller General concluded by deciding that it was impossible for the officers of the U.S.S. *Squalus* to actually perform duty on board the vessel and that the omission of service on the part of the enlisted members exceeded 30 days; therefore, payment of submarine pay was not authorized.

Unfortunately, decisions of the Comptroller General are conclusive and binding on the Navy. Since this injustice resulted from such a decision, the only remedy would be enactment of relief legislation.

Mr. Speaker, since it is obvious this wrong can only be righted by legislation, I am today submitting this bill. I hope that this matter will be given the careful, sympathetic attention that it deserves.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE HANDICAPPED

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last week the House gave overwhelming bipartisan support, by a vote of 323 to 83, to the conference report on H.R. 69, a bill to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Included in that bill, Mr. Speaker, as I told my colleagues at the time were provisions of vital importance to 7 million handicapped children in our society: an extension of the title I ESEA set-aside for the handicapped as well as an extension of the Education of the Handicapped Act.

The conferees on H.R. 69, Mr. Speaker, agreed to accept in modified form an amendment first offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland, the Honorable CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, which would significantly increase for the fiscal year 1975 only, the amounts of money the Federal Government provides to the States for educating the handicapped.

This 1-year increase was accepted in order to provide States under court order to make available the educational services the handicapped need, immediate relief pending the approval of H.R. 70, a bill to enable the Federal Government to pay up to 75 percent of the excess costs involved in educating the handicapped, which is now under consideration before the Education Subcommittee I am privileged to chair. The 1-year increase, Mr. Speaker, is in effect, a stopgap provision to help handicapped children until a more comprehensive bill can be passed.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 19, 1974, the New York Times published an excellent article by Richard Flaste describing the current practice of "mainstreaming" handicapped children—placing them in classrooms with their nonhandicapped peers—and the educational and financial difficulties involved in providing services for the handicapped.

Because I believe this article accurately describes the problems involved with special education as well as the need for additional money for teachers and equipment, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Sunday, May 19, 1974]

HELPING HANDICAPPED INTO EDUCATION'S MAINSTREAM

(By Richard Flaste)

At least one out of 10 school-age children is handicapped, suffering from deafness, blindness, speech impairment, mental retardation, physical deformity, an emotional disorder or some other potential obstacle to performing effectively as a student.

These handicapped children are at the heart of a change, in philosophy and practice, that is affecting school systems throughout the country. There is a movement to "mainstream" many of these children, to put them into classrooms with their nonhandicapped peers.

A century ago the school systems' principal method of dealing with most handicapped children was to ignore them. The systems left it up to the Helen Kellers of the country to rise through extraordinary courage, while others remained in limbo.

Later, efforts were made, with both humanitarian and educational rationale, to give these youngsters "special education in classes of all handicapped students. They could learn at their own rates and not feel peculiar. There were—and are—good segregated classes for the handicapped, classes offering specialized, individual instruction. For some of the severely disabled, this may be the only possible form of education.

But in the minds of many educators and government officials, this system means segregation. In many instances, there has been neglect of children and low-quality instruction. A child diagnosed as less competent than his "normal" peers might be assigned to a "special class" and life there, out of sight and out of touch with society.

So today there is the movement to integrate handicapped children from preschool through high school, all the while providing them with support services. The movement has taken on such force and speed that some educators fear that the welcome opportunity may be lost through hasty implementation.

Ten states—Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Colorado, Florida, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, Tennessee and Texas—have used the law and special executive decrees to mandate a general thrust toward "mainstreaming." In many other states (New York among them), the movement is more amorphous, but the philosophy clearly exists.

The drive toward mainstreaming is intertwined with the declared desire to provide adequate education for all children. There is wide agreement that perhaps 50 percent of the nation's 7 million handicapped youth are not having their educational needs met. Some are not in school at all; others are in classes where they trail behind, with no recognition of their problems.

A state well established in mainstreaming is New Jersey. There, for the last several years, educators have leaned heavily on a formalized team-evaluation approach. Psychologists and other specialists give each pupil psychological and medical examinations, and they study the social and learning histories of the child. Then the child, whenever possible, is given a regular classroom as his base of operations.

The child may leave that base periodically to get special help so he can keep up with everybody else: He may attend a "resource room" where he joins other handicapped children for instruction and help with emotional problems, or he may get assistance on a one-to-one basis from a teacher whose job it is to keep him on the right track. Some 15,000 children who in other times might have been segregated are being served in this program.

Children who cannot tolerate full-time mainstreaming, or whose learning capabilities are too low to deal with it, are integrated only part of the time, perhaps attending gym or shop with normal peers.

Massachusetts will begin a similar program next fall, but with a different approach. Teams of evaluators will assign a child to a position on a continuum of services that includes nine categories: from totally separated—for those so severely handicapped, say, the schizophrenic, that no integration seems feasible—to totally integrated.

Mainstreaming frequently calls for educational ingenuity, even though an integrated class usually has only two or three handicapped children. The deaf child with concomitant speech difficulties, for instance, doesn't have a problem in learning so much as he has a communication problem. So a teacher might be equipped with an overhead projector to use instead of a blackboard. The projector allows the teacher to write instructions and information for the whole class, keeping up the usual stream of talk—but without turning away from the deaf child who must see her lips at all times. Blind children are provided braille materials.

One difficulty is that some regular teachers who suddenly find themselves with handicapped children lack the insight to deal properly with the situation. This has happened in Pennsylvania, and this summer there will be a special program to train regular teachers for these situations.

While the movement is expanding, at the same time it is being criticized for poor coordination and inequitable administration. There is no coordinated "battle plan", or standardized guidelines, for mainstreaming, and no significant data on its efficacy, or on the number of children involved.

Martin Kaufman, a prominent researcher with the United States Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, complained recently, with some frustration, that mainstreaming is "a groovy word, but an ill-defined concept."

The bureau will be funding research in at least 15 states to determine for whom and under what circumstances mainstreaming is beneficial. And this summer, data should be available from earlier research done on mainstreaming in Texas.

As an example of administrative problems, in Arizona, where all school districts will have to integrate the handicapped to the extent possible by 1976, there is an estimated need for 3,000 more specially trained teachers.

Parents of normal children frequently pose a problem because they are uncomfortable with the thought of having handicapped children in a class with their own. Sometimes there must be discussions to foster understanding, and these parents are assured that the handicapped children would not be allowed to disrupt the education for everyone else.

There are other problems: For example, where does a child go if he has been integrated as a preschooler and there is no elementary school prepared to take him?

COST IS A MAJOR FACTOR

Another controversial aspect is cost. There is one view that mainstreaming may be cheaper for a school district because it avoids transportation and other special arrangements necessary for segregated schools. This view raises the question of how significant a factor finances is in the movement.

A second view is that mainstreaming, if it is done properly, can be as expensive as segregating the handicapped. Dr. Alan Abeson of the Council for Exceptional Children says that on the average it costs $35,000 to provide a complete education for a handicapped child, with 85 per cent of that going to salaries. With mainstreaming, he says, "you may eliminate a lot of segregated classes, but you still need the personnel."

An example of mainstreaming done with a large support staff is Intermediate School 237 in Queens, where the handicapped poulation (100 out of a total of 1,100) has about one staff member for every three students.

I.S. 237 does not use the resource room model. It employs instead a special education division that gradually prepares pupils to enter the mainstream, first only in shop perhaps, then if they are able, the children enter academic classes such as social studies.

This year there were 15 handicapped youngsters in academic classes (next year there should be 30), including a dwarf who had always been in segregated classes and a boy who had such behavioral problems as compulsive stealing and fighting.

The boy with the behavioral problems explained after a recent eighth-grade social studies class how important it was to be trusted enough to be allowed to enter the regular class, to be able to say hello to normal children in the halls, "you know, the way friends do."

A girl with cerebral palsy, articulating her words laboriously but with skill, said she would be integrated into academic classes next year and that she couldn't wait because it meant she would be treated like a "real person." She said, "I . . . am . . . so . . . happy."

SIMULATORS TRAIN CADETS AT NATIONAL RIVER ACADEMY

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the old thinking on river navigation and training has given way to technology and the use of simulators to train modern-day river pilots.

I wish to share with my colleagues the third in a series of articles on the National River Academy which explains how technology has spread to river navigation:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, July 4, 1974]

(Third of a series)

NATIONAL RIVER ACADEMY: SIMULATOR USED TO TRAIN CADETS FOR FUTURE WORK

(By Clint Bolton)

It had been an idyllic way to go to Helena, Arkansas. Seventy-two relaxing hours aboard the MV Elaine Jones of the Canal Barge Co., Capt. Billy Turfitt, master.

I had gone aboard one afternoon early in May at the Hess Terminal in Marrero. A few hours later the tow (four 295-foot barges carrying "black oil" to Peoria) eased upstream through thick river traffic and we passed under the Huey P. Long Bridge.

Cap'n Billy said, "Know what happens now?"

"Yeah . . . north of the Huey P. Long bridge you operate on Western Rivers Rules. Below that it is Inland Waters."

"Correct, and step to the head of the class. So you're goin' to the River Academy?"

"Yeah . . . Sounds like a good idea but I still don't know how they're gonna teach a young man all about the river in 22 months."

"Me, neither. But they've got some pretty sharp people up there. I was up there a few days. Brushin' up on rules of the road and the like. You know all these new Coast Guard regulations about licensing had us all jumpin' . . . even with grandfather's clause. Funny in a way. Here I been on the river almost all my life. Gotta lotta years in right here with Canal Barge and I have to prove I know how to pilot. After all these years . . . Well, I know the Coast Guard isn't tryin' to shoot us oldtimers down. But there's a cryin' need for pilots and masters. Building more towboats by the dozens, every year. Somebody has to man 'em. Qualified Personnel? By working right here on the river. Learning ever' little twist and turn. Sure you can teach a young feller in a classroom the Inland and Western Rivers rules . . . International Rules . . . how to read a chart . . . some engineerin' and a lot of other things we all learned the hard way. But that simulator . . . that's something else again. How you gonna fake wind, current, length of tow, tonnage, all the other conditions?"

SIMULATED FLYING

"Well, the whole thing started back in War Deuce with something called the Link trainer. Simulated flying conditions."

"I know that. But a tow is something else. Look, I'm not sayin' it can't be done. They've put men on the moon and they've transplanted hearts. I'd be stupid to say you can't do this or that. Personally, I think the River Academy is a great idea. But that simulator. I just dunno."

"Neither do I. That's why I'm going up to Henela."

A foreign flag freighter came rippin' by just then and Cap'n Billy was busy for a spell.

Three days later we shook hands and said the usual "See ya next time" things and I stepped off Elaine Jones into the Helena Marine Serviceboat. Cap'n Bill was out on the bridge. The last thing I heard was his shout, "Will you please find out about that simulator?"

I did.

Here's the straight dope on an instructional feature which, like the National River Academy, will be the first and only thing of its kind in our world.

The NRA's simulator can be used not only for instruction on the Mississippi but via electronic application could be adapted to the Niger, the Amazon, the Rhine, the Dneiper.

Not that emerging countries in Africa or more sophisticated governments elsewhere will be in a big rush to start their own piloting academies and install their own simulators. In due course the National River Academy will be geared to accept qualified cadets from overseas. That day is well in the future.

JOBS FOR CADETS

At the present and on into the next two decades the American waterways industry can absorb every cadet graduating from the Helena institution.

With Cap'n Billy Turfitt's farewell injunction in mind I asked Capt. Pierre R. Becker, superintendent of the academy, the big question.

"What's all this about a simulator?"

The I'm-glad-you-asked-me look was an ear-to-ear grin and Capt. Becker said. "Let me introduce Mr. DePola of American Airlines."

Then they went to work on me. J. A. DePaola is titled "Manager Simulator Operational Support" which means he is the main man in the development and use of simulator devices for training air lines pilots.

American Airlines is an acknowledged leader in this form of aviation instruction and at Fort Worth pilots from other domestic and foreign airlines are trained or "refreshed" on that company's simulators.

The river pilot simulator trainer will offer a sophisticated program that produces a 90

percent-trained pilot through economy, safety, quality, convenience, and performance.

POTENTIAL PILOTS

A potential pilot who completes the simulator program will be professed in safety, casualty reviews, radio telephone techniques, radar interpretation, rules of the road, and numerous hours actually operating a tow (via simulator) through designated hazarodus areas.

The simulator will also serve to upgrade pilots from small to medium to large tows, as well as serve as a management tool for rechecks of present masters and pilots every six months.

The simulator will train pilots through realistic duplications of actual circumstances a pilot will experience as he controls a mock-up of a towboat and her tow.

To the man at the controls, he will stand in a "pilothouse" typical of most towboats, and the view he will see out of its windows will be very much like he would see in any one of several pre-selected "test areas."

The scene he sees will be projected onto screens surrounding the pilothouse mock-up.

As he controls his "tow," the scene will change in response to his controls and the external "forces" imposed by an instructor.

The instructor can vary such conditions as river currents, wind velocity and direction, targets, and visibility. Emergencies which can be simulated include engine failures, generator failures or the appearance of an unexpected tow.

Realistic simulation of radio communications and radar presentations will also be included.

COMPANY EXECS

The River Pilot Simulator Advisory Committee, composed of 25 executives from towboat companies and shipyards, experienced captains, etc., is chaired by Capt. Noble L. Gordon, president of the Mid-South Towing Co. The committee established basic characteristics of the training simulator.

Type of Simulation: Includes model board, vamp. light, and computer-generated images. The model board type is recognized as the system that will meet NRA needs.

Barge Tow Presentation: A downstream presentation is more important than an upstream presentation and fully loaded barges will be more meaningful for training purposes than empties.

Horsepower: Capability of controlling horsepower ranges from 700 to 10,000 hp. The pilothouse controls will have the provision for 1, 2, 3 and 4 throttles.

Visibility: Zero, unlimited, limited, day, and night. Intermittent views of astern, port and starboard sides are essential.

Color vs. Black and White: A colored presentation is essential for identification of appropriate lights.

Current Adjustments: One to nine miles per hour. The simulator will be capable of displaying one of two models in a high water condition.

Eddy Currents: Reflected through current adjustments.

Sound: Whistle capabilities, engine noise level, air release-throttle, and swing meter.

Vibrations: Maneuvering—ahead, astern.

Radar: Appropriate radar presentation duplicating modelboard configuration, navigational aids, bridges, etc. Single radar (3-CM) one-half to six miles in range.

Communication, Radio telephone—one VHF.

Winds: Zero to 30 miles per hour—gusts from any direction included.

Emergencies: Engine failure, steering failure, loss of electric power, loss of air, and fire alarm.

Collision and-or Grounding: Sensing element—signal, alarm, and a taped noise level simulating the breaking up of rigging.

Traffic Models: Image of large and single tows and pleasure craft.

Pilothouse Controls: Full scale mock-up—operable gauges, swing meter, two searchlights, air gauges, and tachometers.

The model board simulates areas along the Mississippi, Illinois and Ohio rivers and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURE CEILINGS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the constitutionality of several of the proposed changes in our campaign laws has been seriously questioned by Prof. Albert Cover of Yale University in the summer 1974 issue of Policy Studies Journal.

Professor Cover very cogently points out that public financing would necessarily involve coercing citizens through their taxes to support the propagation of ideas they may strongly oppose. Limits on campaign spending may also limit freedom of speech and expression and insofar as limits favor incumbents they may deny challengers the equal protection of the laws.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these issues need to be raised and carefully considered. As Professor Cover concludes:

The prospect of having major electoral rules rewritten by the courts should prod Congress into considering the constitutional issues likely to be raised there.

I should like to submit this article for the RECORD at this time:

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURE CEILINGS

(By Albert Cover, Yale University)

In 1972 Congress enacted the first significant campaign reform legislation since the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. The Corrupt Practices Act nominally limited political contributions, but its loopholes were numerous and they were commonly exploited. No candidate was ever prosecuted for exceeding the contribution limitations of the Act. With one minor exception the Federal Elections Campaign Act of 1971 (FECA) repealed all contribution limitations, but it imposed expenditure limitations for the first time. Realizing that overall spending limitations would be very difficult to enforce, Congress set ceilings only on communications media.

The 1972 election proved somewhat disappointing to those who had hoped that FECA would reduce campaign spending and fraud, so more comprehensive reform proposals were introduced in the 93rd Congress. Many of these proposed reforms linked overall spending limits with some kind of public subsidy for campaigns. The intent of these reforms is clearly praiseworthy. They presumably would foster the ability of less affluent citizens to run for federal offices, prevent some well-financed political viewpoints from drowning out all others, and limit the influence of major contributors. More generally, reforms are intended to imbue the electoral process with greater equality of political opportunity.[1]

Congress admittedly has broad powers to regulate the electoral process, but these powers are constitutionally limited ones. Unfortunately, currrent reform proposals raise a number of grave constitutional questions. These questions are particularly significant in view of a recent federal court's decision declaring unconstitutional the enforcement mechanism of FECA's limitations on media spending.

I. ACLU V. JENNINGS

Section 104(b) of FECA provides that no newspaper may charge for advertisements "on behalf of" a candidate until the candidate certifies to the newspaper that such charges will not cause the candidate to exceed his media spending limitation. Similar certification is required of the candidate who would benefit from an advertisement critical of another candidate. In 1972 the American Civil Liberties Union attempted to place an ad in the New York Times opposing legislation to limit court ordered busing. The ad included an "honor roll" of Representatives who had previously opposed this anti-busing policy. The Times declined to run the ad until the ACLU had complied with FECA's elaborate certification procedure. The ACLU refused to comply and then sought an injunction against enforcement of FECA's certification procedure on various constitutional grounds. In the fall of 1973 a three-judge federal court handed down its decision in the case, *ACLU* v. *Jennings*.[2]

The most egregious constitutional difficulty discussed in the court's opinion involved prior restraints on free speech arising under FECA's certification procedure. The court pointed out that—

"Candidates favorably named in ads . . . are provided with the opportunity of effectively blocking publication by refusing to make the requisite certification statements. They simply may not desire, for political reasons or otherwise, their names associated with certain organizations. . . . But the airing of opinion in a public forum must not be subordinated to political expediences."

A second problem pointed out in the opinion was the vagueness of certain crucial phrases used in FECA. A major loophole in the old Corrupt Practices Act was that candidates only had to report contributions made with their "knowledge or consent." To close the obvious loophole of limiting only expenditures made with the knowledge or consent of candidates, FECA included in its media limitations spending by or "on behalf of" candidates. In *ACLU v. Jennings* the court repeatedly castigated Congress for its failure to define clearly the crucial phrase. The court was particularly concerned lest nonpartisan and politically unaffiliated groups submit advertisements for print which would be viewed by the media as requiring certification even though the ads were issue oriented. It stressed that the "press is entitled to, and the Constitution demands, proper guidance free from ambiguity and vagueness" to exclude from coverage "expressions of opinion unintended and incapable of regulation." Considering FECA's ill-defined standards and its restriction on First Amendment rights, the court declared Section 104(b) "facially unconstitutional" and therefore enjoined its enforcement. FECA's media limitations were left intact, but they could not be effectively enforced.

Of course, the *ACLU* decision could be appealed to the Supreme Court, but it still raises thorny constitutional issues. If Con-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

gress engages in further electoral reform, it should face potential constitutional issues straightforwardly. Many such questions confront reform efforts, and clearly only a small number can be discussed here. This article will focus initially on the First Amendment issues discussed in the *ACLU* decision. In particular, can Congress enact enforceable spending limitations while still respecting traditional limitations on its power to regulate free speech? The article will then discuss spending limitations in light of the Constitution's guarantee that all persons shall enjoy equal protection of the laws.

II. FIRST AMENDMENT

Do spending limitations infringe on the First Amendment right of free speech? The question could be answered directly if the Supreme Court had ever considered Congress' power to enact general spending limitations, but there are no Supreme Court cases directly on this point. The Court has let stand prohibitions on the political activities of government employees and prohibitions on political contributions by unions and corporations.[3] The Court, however, has carefully exercised its prerogative of deciding cases on the narrowest of ground to avoid addressing major constitutional issues. It has done so repeatedly in cases involving limitations on political activity.

Even if the Court had upheld the constitutionality of political limitations on certain groups, it would not follow that the Court would approve blanket limitations on the political activities of the electorate. It is one thing to forbid unions to pool dues for political contributions but it is quite another to forbid individuals to use their own funds to support candidates of their choice.[4] The latter case raises much more sharply First Amendment problems.

Lacking any firm judicial guidance on Congress' power to enact spending curbs, we must determine less directly whether political expenditures are covered by the First Amendment's protection of free speech. As a preliminary point, "it is clear that the Amendment at times covers more than sheer verbal communications."[5] The protection of "symbolic speech" has been upheld on many occasions. Furthermore, debate on public issues would seem to be at the heart of what the First Amendment was intended to protect. The courts should be especially sensitive, therefore, to limitations on the amount of political information available to the electorate. Since spending limitations clearly restrict political communications, they are constitutionally suspect from the start.

This does not necessarily mean that expenditure ceilings are unconstitutional. Courts have not traditionally viewed First Amendment rights as absolute ones. Under a variety of circumstances their infringement has been sustained by the courts.

For example, under the "clear and present danger test" First Amendment rights can be abridged if laws are needed to forestall some imminent and substantial evil.[6] A second standard used by the courts, the "balancing test," provides a more appropriate way of assessing the constitutionality of spending limits. The balancing test weighs the government's interest in abridging constitutional rights against the individual's right to enjoy guaranteed freedoms. In balancing governmental and individual interests, the courts are often forced to determine whether there are any "less restrictive alternatives" or "less drastic means" by which the government's interest can be advanced.[7] The purpose here is to ensure that if First Amendment rights must be abridged, then they will be restricted as little as possible. This consideration raises the question of whether there are alternatives which do less violence to the First Amendment than do expenditure limitations.

Spending ceilings enforce a rough measure of political equality by reducing political communication to some arbitrary, maximum level. In contrast, a variety of other devices reduce inequality by increasing the flow of information to the electorate. Their intent is not to restrict the activity on behalf of some candidates but to ensure that all candidates have at least some opportunity to present their case.

The most commonly discussed device to guarantee at least a minimum amount of exposure for candidates is direct public subsidies for campaigns. A particularly attractive reform proposal is an expanded system of tax incentives for political contributions. Unlike direct subsidies, tax incentives do not require Congress to develop any formula for distributing funds. The flow of political contributions simply reflects the independent decisions of millions of taxpayers. Tax incentives thus avoid major constitutional issues.[8]

Other proposals would serve to increase equality of political opportunity to a lesser extent. The government could subsidize campaign information brochures; all candidates could receive a limited number of postal franks; broadcast advertising rates for political announcements could be reduced or subsidized. By themselves none of these proposals are likely to have great impact, but they do illustrate positive alternatives to expenditure limitations.

III. EQUAL PROTECTION

Although not often considered in this context, the equal protection doctrine raises further questions about the constitutionality of spending limitations. The crucial issue here is whether ceilings foster an invidious discrmination with respect to some class of candidates. If so, the proposed spending limitations would not be constitutional.

One could argue that spending limitations help challengers as a rule by preventing incumbents from exploiting fully their superior fund-raising capability. For example, in 1972 incumbent Representatives spent on average nearly twice as much as their challengers.[9] A strong counterargument, however, is that relatively few incumbents would actually be forced to curtail spending if Congress enacted "reasonable" ceilings ($90,000–$120,000). On the other hand challengers usually need to outspend incumbents by a substantial margin if they are to win. Only ten incumbent Representatives were defeated in the 1972 general election; on average they spent $40,000 less than their successful opponents. Given the enormous electoral advantage enjoyed by incumbents from other sources, spending ceilings probably discriminate against challengers. A study of campaign financing concluded that "to limit the amount of money which a candidate may spend does not equalize political opportunity; it simply aggravates other inequalities."[10] And these other inequalities favor incumbents.

The list of official allowances and subsidies available to members of Congress is long and diverse. Office equipment, district office rent and equipment, stationery, postage, telephone and telegraph service, travel, printing, government publications, radio and television recording studios, and mass mailing assistance are just a few of the perquisites of office. Between 1961 and 1973 the staff authorized for each Representative rose from nine to seventeen.[11] Since 1960 the volume of franked mail sent from congressional offices has tripled and now exceeds 250 million pieces annually.[12] The point is not that these resources are necessarily turned to overtly political ends but that using them will almost inevitably have beneficial political ramifications.

A neat example of this can be found in the timing of mass mailings from House offices. Many Representatives send out newsletters or questionnaires at the end of each Congress. This is a logical time to report on congressional affairs, but it also happens to mark the beginning of intensive pre-election campaigning. The pre-election increase in mass mailings is reflected in the work load of the House "folding room," more formally known as the Publications Distribution Service. The folding room has special facilities to handle mass mailings, so most of them are prepared there. Figure (not reproduced) 1 reveals the typical cycle of election and non-election year activity in the folding room. As we would expect, the peak work load occurs immediately before an election.[13]

By keeping in touch with constituents, members help overcome the chief political handicap that faced many of them initially—the fact that relatively few voters knew them at all when they entered politics. Members understand very well Stokes and Miller's conclusion that "recognition carries a positive valence; to be perceived at all is to be perceived favorably."[14] One of the greatest political advantages of incumbency flows from this quite straightforwardly. As a rule incumbents are much more widely known than are their challengers. To the extent that spending limitations prevent a challenger from overcoming this recognition advantage, limitations make incumbents less vulnerable at the polls.

The situation confronting challengers is illustrated in Table 1. In House districts contested by an incumbent, about half the adults were unable to recall either candidate's name shortly after the 1964 and 1968 elections; almost two-thirds of the adults recognized neither candidate after recent mid-term elections. At best only a third of those surveyed could recall the names of both candidates. Most importantly, while 20 per cent of those surveyed know only the incumbent's name, a mere 1 or 2 per cent recognized the challenger exclusively. These figures help explain why challengers must substantially outspend incumbents to defeat them and why spending limitations would operate to entrench incumbents even more deeply than they are now.[15]

TABLE 1.—RECOGNITION OF INCUMBENTS AND CHALLENGERS IN POSTELECTION SURVEYS

[In percent]

Year	Respondent recognized: Challenger only	Incumbent only	Both	Neither
1964	1.8	20.5	31.7	46.1
1966	1.0	18.1	19.6	61.3
1968	2.3	17.9	31.4	48.4
1970	1.0	21.5	11.9	65.9

IV. CONCLUSIONS

If further electoral reforms are enacted, the government's interest in fostering political equality must be reconciled with the right of individuals to exercise their constitutionally guaranteed freedoms. Unfortunately, current measures do not indicate that constitutional issues have been seriously considered. The problems are admittedly difficult ones; but if Congress ignores the substantial conflict arising from attempts to reform the electoral process, then the courts will be left with the task of fashioning an acceptable solution. The prospect

Footnotes at end of article.

of having major electoral rules re-written by the courts should prod Congress into considering the constitutional issues likely to be raised there.

FOOTNOTES

[1] J. Fleishman, "Freedom of Speech and Equality of Political Opportunity: The Constitutionality of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971," 51 *North Carolina Law Review* 455 (1973); I. Ferman, "Congressional Controls on Campaign Financing: An Expansion or Contraction of the First Amendment?" 22 *American University Law Review* 360 (1972).

[2] ACLU v. Jennings, —— F. Supp. —— (D.C.D.C., November 14, 1973).

[3] Fleishman, pp. 434–38.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 434.

[5] *Federal Election Reform: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration*, 93rd Cong., 1st Sess., p. 401. See further citations there.

[6] Ferman, pp. 351–52; H. Court and C. Harris, "Free Speech Implications of Campaign Expenditure Ceilings," *Harvard Civil Rights—Civil Liberties Law Review* 221 (1972).

[7] *Federal Election Reform*, p. 407; Court and Harris, p. 224; M. Redish, "Campaign Spending Laws and the First Amendment," 46 *New York University Law Review*, 923–24 (1971).

[8] A. Rosenthal, "Campaign Financing and the Constitution," 9 *Harvard Journal of Legislation* 330 (1972).

[9] "Common Cause: Incumbents Do Raise More Funds," *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, XXXI, 48 (December 1, 1973), p. 3130.

[10] Ralph K. Winter, Jr., "Money, Policies, and the First Amendment," in *Campaign Finances: Two Views of the Political and Constitutional Implications*, by Howard R. Penniman and Ralph K. Winter, Jr. (Washington: American Enterprise Institute, n.d.), p. 56.

[11] Harrison W. Fox, Jr. and Susan Webb Hammond, "Congressional Staffs and Congressional Change," Paper presented at the American Political Science Association (New Orleans: September, 1973), p. 8.

[12] Representative Bill Frenzel, "Election Reform Bill Expected in March," *Congressional Record*, vol. 19, pt. 33, p. 43602.

[13] *Ibid.* Representative Frenzel's remarks include monthly data from January, 1967 through December, 1972. A new franking law forbids most mass mailings immediately before elections, so presumably the peak work load will be somewhat earlier than in previous years. Work load data is in terms of "work units." A unit consists of one operation (e.g., folding or inserting) on one piece of mail.

[14] Donald Stokes and Warren Miller, "Party Government and the Saliency of Congress," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XXVI (1962), p. 541.

[15] The data was supplied by the Inter-University Constorium for Political Research. Of course, the ICPR is not responsible for any conclusions drawn from this analysis.

It may be useful to emphasize that data come from districts contested by an incumbent.

BAN THE HANDGUN—LII

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the absence of a national gun control law makes a mockery of city and State attempts to curtail the proliferation of lethal handguns. No local law can be effective if similar restrictions are lacking in nearby areas.

The grim consequences of this situation are frequently felt in New York City. Despite its unusually strong gun control regulations, New York is the scene of much tragic and unnecessary handgun violence due to the easy availability of firearms in bordering States and in illegal markets.

Last Wednesday another senseless tragedy occurred demonstrating once again the folly of inconsistent and inadequate gun control laws. A woman standing on a Bronx subway platform was shot and killed by an illegally acquired handgun which discharged when it was accidentally dropped to the platform by its owner. Incidents like this add further rebuttal to the dangerous reasoning of the National Rifle Association's favorite maxim, "Guns don't kill—people do." As long as handgun possession remains unchecked, accidents are inevitable. It is time the Congress acted to put the safety of the Nation's citizenry above the interests of the gun lobby. I include herewith an August 1 article from the New York Times describing the Bronx shooting:

WOMAN SLAIN ON IRT PLATFORM AS GUN IN FALLING BAG GOES OFF

(By Joseph P. Fried)

A woman standing on an IRT elevated platform in the Bronx was shot and killed yesterday morning when a fellow passenger dropped a shoulder bag containing a pistol that discharged when the bag hit the platform.

A suspect arrested several hours later at the Manhattan movie-equipment company where he works was charged by the police with homicide and illegal possession of a deadly weapon. The homicide charge was lodged even though the police said that they believed the shooting to be an accident. The victim and suspect, they said, did not know each other.

Meanwhile, the city's new program to curb nighttime crime on the transit system went into its second night last night and early this morning with Transit Authority officials saying that the first night "went extremely well."

The program, which includes closing cars in the rear half of subway trains in outlying areas, is in operation between 8 P.M. and 4 A.M. as an experiment for at least two months.

TWO ROBBERIES REPORTED

A Transit Authority spokesman said that during the first night of operation, from 8 P.M. Tuesday until 8 A.M. yesterday, there were two reported robberies in the subways, neither one on a train. During the same hours the previous night, the spokesman said, two robberies and a larcency—the latter not involving a threat—were reported. These incidents too did not occur on trains.

The spokesman, Louis Collins, said that there were no reports of "excessive delays" during the first night of the anticrime program's operation, even though passengers, often confronted by closed cars in an arriving train, took longer to board because they had to scurry up the platform to the open cars.

The major incidents reported on the subways Tuesday night and yesterday were the apparently accidental Bronx shooting and an incident, on an IRT platform at the Borough Hall station in Brooklyn, in which a woman was knocked to the ground by a man and forced to commit a sexual act.

The shooting, at about 8:30 A.M., and the sexual assault, about an hour earlier, occurred outside the anticrime program's hours. No transit policemen were patrolling the stations involved when the crimes occurred, Mr. Collins said.

The police identified the shooting victim as Gloria Brooks, 38 years old, of 2048 Mapes Avenue in the Bronx. She was hit by a single bullet in the station at East 174th Street and Boston Road. The man arrested in the case is Carl Johnson, 25, of 2001 University Avenue in the Bronx.

He was taken into custody shortly before noon at Cinemobile Systems, Inc., at 624 West 52d Street, where he was said to be an electrician and repairman. The police said they had traced him there because witnesses reported that the bag he dropped and quickly picked up before fleeing had the company's name on it.

DROUGHT IN AFRICA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker. I would like to insert, for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues, a letter which I recently sent to Miss Dorothy Height, president of the National Council of Negro Women, concerning the drought in Africa.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 5, 1974.

Miss DOROTHY HEIGHT,
President, The National Council of Negro Women, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS HEIGHT: I would like to take this opportunity to commend the National Council of Negro Women for its interest in national and world food problems, as expressed in the "Consultation on Food for People," currently being held at the Sheraton Park Hotel here. I heartily support your initiative to bring to public attention the urgent issues of famine, malnutrition, and severe food shortages. It is vital that we continue to seek common solutions for the immediate future, as well as for the medium- and long-term.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been particularly concerned with the plight of the many in Africa who are affected by a severe and prolonged drought. The nations concerned across the southern edge of the Sahara Desert are among the poorest in the world. In fact, four of the six hardest-hit nations are among 25 countries identified internationally as the poorest. These are countries where per capita income is less than $100 annually and the rate of literacy is less than 2 percent. Yet, these countries have, until recently, managed at least to feed their populations with small amounts of foreign aid.

Over the past year, the United States has been a generous donor to the most seriously affected countries: Senegal, Mauritania, Upper Volta, Niger, Chad, and Mali. The Foreign Aid Act of 1973 authorized $25 million for emergency and recovery needs to the Sahal, and the recently-approved Foreign Disaster Assistance Act provides $85 million in relief to the drought-stricken countries of Africa.

However, we must continue to focus on the development of U.S. support for a major long-term African Sahel Development Program to build up the resources of the six countries concerned to assist in their efforts to halt the advance of the desert and to render their land fertile and productive.

During my trip to the Sahel last year, government officials were unanimous in indicating that their major priority is the utilization of precious water resources. This includes irrigation schemes along the major rivers, the construction of dams to regulate the rivers and to conserve flood water, and

the use of underground water where appropriate. There is then a need for large-scale reforestation, livestock improvement programs and many other rural development projects together with the establishment of processing industries for agricultural produce.

The southward encroachment of the desert at nearly 30 miles per year must be halted and reversed. Transportation links must be expanded so that supplies may be moved from points of entry to points of need.

There is no easy or cheap answer to this problem of desert encroachment. The only practical approach is a carefully-planned program to stabilize and develop the water and other resources available in the area. It will require large injections of capital over many years; but even more important, there is a need for sensitivity on the part of concerned Americans to the overwhelming handicaps facing the people of Africa. We need a broadly-based commitment to cooperation with Africans according to their own aspirations for a life free from hunger, towards restoring this area to its ancient role as the bread-basket of Africa.

Again, I would like to thank you for your initiatives in this area.

Sincerely,

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Africa.

GENERAL AVIATION'S IMPORTANCE SOARS

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, most of us in the Congress are familiar with the man, Alex Butterfield. Most of his name identification is attributed to him being the first person to make known the existence of the Presidential tapes we have been listening to lately.

However, far afield from that, is his excellent administration of the Federal Aviation Administration.

Under Alex Butterfield's leadership, major steps toward greater safety, aviation modernization, and airport construction have been taken.

Because of his hard work in his present position, and because of the cogency of remarks he made recently, I would like to commend this speech to my colleagues in the Congress:

REMARKS BY ALEXANDER P. BUTTERFIELD, ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

I am particularly pleased to have been invited by your President, Paul Poberenzy, to talk with you this evening. Seeing so many convention participants gathered here—men and women truly dedicated to the advancement of aviation education and the development of sport aviation—is a great tribute to the fine work Paul is doing for us all. I know you are all proud of his record of achievement.

I am also pleased to have EAA's General Manager, Tom Poberezny, and your Vice President, Ray Scholler, here on the stage with me this evening. Since I plan to discuss what we're doing to better communications between the FAA and its constituency and the increasing urgency for professionalism among pilots, it's good to know that I've got at least three good listeners—and that they can't leave until I do.

As most of you know, I am sure, FAA's investment during the 70's concentrates on airport construction, expansion and modernization, and in providing vastly improved equipment to operate our airways facilities. But what is important to all of you here is that in connection with all of this work much of the effort will greatly benefit general aviation. We feel a real urgency for accomplishment in this area because of the great rate of growth in your segment of industry. It's very important to us because, on an annual basis, general aviation is now transporting nearly 60 million passengers on intercity flight.

By 1980 estimates are that general aviation will be moving more than 120 million persons intercity aboard a fleet numbering well over 230,000. What's more, and equally important to us, is the fact that these planes will be providing the only access to 92 percent of the nation's 12,000 airports.

Under these circumstances, you can readily understand why FAA has made a new commitment to help pilots develop new levels of professionalism. We've got to do this despite the fact that in some quarters FAA is taken to task for exercising "undue" concern over the comparatively few general aviation accidents in relation to, for example, the staggering totals of accidents on our nation's highways.

To the more erudite among our pilot community such comparisons are pointless, of course. And we agree. We think there are too many accidents and loss of lives in aviation and the full resources available to the FAA are being put to use in reasonable and, I believe, highly effective programs to attain the most effective degree of accident prevention possible.

As many of you are aware, industry and government have become deeply involved in the means of reducing the potential of midair collisions, particularly as traffic grows. In the recent past, two airborne collision avoidance systems—one known as CAS—and another, the proximity warning indicator—known as PWI—have been considered. Today, the increased capability and lower cost points strongly to CAS as the most attractive airborne system. But whether CAS can be brought to within the economic purview of general aviation remains to be seen. The decision between airborne and ground systems will be a difficult one. But, you may be sure, the entire subject will be fully considered and discussed before any decision is made.

But whatever system of collision avoidance eventually emerges, the potential for pilot error may remain the greatest danger. As a matter of fact, during the past several years the National Transportation Safety Board has conducted continuing analyses of midair collisions. Their findings support our conclusions on the need to upgrade flying skills and prerequisites for flying training and maintenance schools, as well as in other areas of expertise supporting flight.

Most collisions between general aviation aircraft—nearly three-fourths of them—occur in clear weather, outside high density areas, and in the immediate vicinity, or in the landing pattern, of an uncontrolled airport. I think we can all agree we've got to find better ways to avert such tragedies.

We're making progress. We've upwards of 80 well-trained accident prevention specialists at work throughout the country doing their part to help pilots improve flight skills. We're very proud of what these few—and I emphasize few—are doing for aviation safety. I say "few"—because they are trying to administer to the needs of nearly three-quarters of a million pilots. So as you can see, their talents are thinly spread to say the least. But they're doing an excellent job. I know, for we've heard nothing but praise for their work.

In 1973, for example, FAA accident prevention specialists conducted nearly 4,000 safety education clinics and seminars which were attended by nearly 284,000 airmen. In addition, the FAA specialists conducted more than 3,000 flight proficiency checks and counseled some 54,000 individual airmen in flight safety-related matters. In the first five months of 1974—January through May—FAA accident prevention specialists have conducted 1,938 safety clinics and seminars attended by some 117,000 airmen; they've conducted nearly 1,000 flight proficiency checks; and counseled 22,700 individual airmen in regard to flight safety matters.

Our partners in industry, upon whom we also depended heavily in developing pilot professionalism, so far this year have conducted 3,549 safety clinics and meetings attended by 52,349 airmen; they've conducted 7,981 flight proficiency checks and have individually briefed 34,664 airmen on flight safety-related matters.

In a related effort, we have just completed "Operation Ground Assist." This program was instituted on June 15 and was completed July 15. I hoped to be able to tell you some of our preliminary findings, but a complete report on this important effort won't be available for about two more weeks. Nevertheless, I would like to take a few minutes to tell you about what we had in mind when we initiated this project—what we hoped to learn, and what we believe pilots may have gained from the two-way informational exchange.

First off, the 30-day effort was designed to spark—not just for the 30 days obviously—increased vigilance in accident prevention by calling to everyone's attention the details they may be continually overlooking for personal flight safety. I am convinced that most accidents begin before the aircraft's engines are started. The Flight Standards Division personnel sought to identify those deficiencies that appear in most accident reports as casual factors. For instance, lack of currency in the aircraft on the part of pilots, airmen and aircraft records out of date deficiencies in maintenance shop procedures and record keeping and a myriad of other items that add up to a serious accident potential.

The sole purpose of operation ground assist has been to help spot these shortcomings and encouraging pilots and maintenance personnel to engage in a two-way exchange of safety information.

The response was, for the most part, enthusiastic. A great many airmen have written to me commenting on the program. They were in favor of the project and thought it timely, albeit of short duration. In their letters and telegrams, many reported unsafe conditions at various airports, alleged deficiencies in "the system" and other potential accident causes.

On the other hand, there were some who missed the point entirely, or who had not been made aware beforehand of the scope and purpose of the program. A few accused the FAA of engaging in gestapo-like tactics and worse.

Nevertheless, the consensus is that operation ground assist served a highly useful purpose and that more of this type of activity should be placed on the FAA agenda of "things to do in behalf of flight safety" in the future. Depending upon what is learned from the detailed reports of operation ground assist, I may, indeed, call for another. If and when I do, you may be sure you'll be among the first to know.

The Congress is providing the resources and support to build the finest aviation system in the world. But none of the improvements now under way can devolp pilot judgment or automatically upgrade flying skills. These are personal goals that a pilot must seek for himself in behalf of his fellow airmen, those who fly with him, and those whose safety on the ground may be affected by his actions. It is precisely this kind of professionalism in building and operating aircraft which makes the EAA such an outstanding organization.

Early in my career as Administrator of FAA, I decided it was necessary to confer, on a

continuing basis, with all segments of the aviation industry; that is, if I expected to do the right job for FAA and accomplish the right job for you. I needed, and continue to need, the confidence and understanding of all segments of our industry—manufacturers, air carriers, the many disparate elements of general aviation, airport operators, supplies—everyone.

To get things started, I asked our Office of Plans to arrange a series of meetings with various user groups. As you may know, a special sport aviation listening session just for this purpose was arranged at Hales Corners, Wisconsin, in February. I asked Paul Poberezny to get a representative group together to discuss their problems with our top FAA people.

We spent an evening and the next morning "listening" and discussing the major issues facing each of you—the experimentalist, the homebuilder, the acrobatic pilot, the soaring enthusiast, the antique and warbird restorers, and others who belong to this wonderful fraternity of sports aviation.

The group assembled by Paul included the President of the EAA Divisions; Bill Ross of the Warbirds; Verne Jobst of the International Aerobatic Club; and Buck Hilbert of the Antique and Classic Division. We also had Dick Schreder of the Soaring Society of America, Jim Bede of Bede Aircraft, Ken Brock of the Popular Rotarcraft Association, Charlie Hillard of the Aerobatic Club of America, and many other individuals who were representatives of the activity of sport aviation.

I won't take the time this evening to detail our discussions at this meeting, for I am sure Paul and his able staff have already summarized them for you in his reports to the membership. However, if you'd like a copy of our report on the session, write to the FAA and ask for a copy of the FAA Listening Session on Sport and General Aviation, Hales Corner, Wisconsin. We'll be glad to send you a copy.

In addition to bettering the lines of communication established through such meetings in general, you people now have the distinction of having a man assigned in FAA to serve as a focal point for all EAA contacts. Paul Poberezny asked that it be done and we were pleased to oblige. Charlie Schuck, who I believe all of you know well, serves in this capacity. Let him know your problems. I know he'll do his best to work them out to our mutual advantage. If he doesn't—let me know.

You, as a group, are receiving a fair portion of our time and I think Paul will verify that his business relations with FAA have greatly improved; that is, getting to the people who will have to initiate changes or take action on existing problems.

One such example was getting that P47 out on the field to Oshkosh for this Fly-In. The Aircraft was restricted from cross-country operations until it had a minimum of 50 hours of flight time. This was not within the intent of our policy. So a call from Bill Ross to Charlie Schuck, who, in turn, went to the Region, cleared the limitations, and that beautiful Thunderbolt got here for the Fly-In. The point is—and I really mean this—the FAA is dedicated to making flying more safe, more efficient and more accessible to all segments of the aviation community.

Incidentally, you will be interested to know, we have just issued an NPRM which, among other things, will establish a special certificate, outside of the experimental category, for aircraft fabricated and assembled by persons who undertook their construction solely for their own education or recreation. This has become tentatively identified as a "custom-built" certificate, and arose from a petition originally submitted by EAA June 29, 1971.

This proposed rule will provide more objective standards regarding what is required of the builder than is the case with the present "amateur-built" classification under the experimental category. A transition period of two years is proposed during which certification in either "experimental" or "custom-built" categories would be permitted, following which all such aircraft would be certificated. In the "custom-built" category, aircraft already certificated as "amateur-built" would not be required to change over to the new category (Jim Rudolph's presentation will go into the details), but can do so at their owners option.

In addition, proposals to amend Parts 43 and 65 to establish a new "repairman certificate (custom-built)" is included. These will permit a builder to perform maintenance on aircraft built by him, and establish standards for the issuance of this certificate.

Now that I have told you what we are doing, I would like to tell you what you could do for us. I like to regard our association as a two-way street as I emphasized in my recent letter to airmen and in my 30-day Operation Ground Assist project.

I want you to know that I personally am committed to the prevention of accidents. Every time I read of another aircraft accident—no matter what type of aircraft is involved—and I study the reports of each and every one, I am deeply saddened. Let there be no mistake about that. During 1973, there were a total of 4,180 general aviation accidents which resulted in 1,340 fatalities. Of these totals we suffered 2,340 personal flying accidents which resulted in 823 fatalities. This is 57 percent of all accidents for all segments of general aviation—57 percent. What's more, in the first six months of 1974, we have already experienced another 1,238 personal flying accidents with 413 fatalities. Sadly, in this category, to extrapolate for the entire year, we anticipate 2,476 accidents and 826 fatalities. But we don't need 2,476 personal flying accidents. We shouldn't have any of them. I'm sure such grim prospects are as unacceptable to you as they are to me.

I have set a national goal of reducing general aviation's accident rate by 5 percent this year and by 5 percent again next year. It's not much, I know, but it's a realistic goal to say the least. To achieve it—if we achieve it—it will only be accomplished with your help. If you will be honest with yourself and live within your capability we can reach this goal. True, we will always face some accidents as long as we defy gravity. Still, if we remember that our airspace forever remains a transportation medium unforgiving of pilot error, we can make good headway for flight safety for all of us.

In closing, I must say that I have been tremendously impressed with the professionalism displayed by general aviation and particularly the EAA membership. Along safety's centerline, you have taken the responsibility and have policed your flight activities to a remarkable degree. You deserve the flight freedoms afforded you. But remember this. Only through mutual understanding and a close working relationship can you continue to enjoy what you now have. Keep up the good work. Speaking for the Federal Aviation Administration we will continue to look to Paul Poberezny and the Experimental Aircraft Association as our focal point for the continued development of safe sport aviation activities.

Thank you.

PURGATORY ON WHEELS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend to the attention of my colleagues a very perceptive and well written article by Eugene Meyer entitled "Purgatory on Wheels." I believe Mr. Meyer has made an articulate and effective case for increased regulation of the mobile home industry. In a time when more and more of our citizens are finding mobile home ownership attractive we should all be looking for ways to insure that mobile homeowners are afforded the same rights conventional homeowners expect:

PURGATORY ON WHEELS

(By Eugene Meyer)

The mobile home community today is not unlike the small town of yesterday—a place where people think it's good to get to know your neighbor. A place where you can take a walk with a sense of security. . . . A community like this preserves the best in American life.—Burgess Meredith, narrating a mobile home industry film

The Nightingale-Woodley Hills trailer park is located off old U.S. 1 in Virginia, a few miles below Washington. It is hidden from the highway behind a Shaky's pizza parlor, a car wash and an old motel featuring nightly topless dancers. Rutted roads wind through the hilly park, where 500 or so vintage trailers are jammed together in an elegant exterior of tarnished metal and exposed wheels. Some perch precariously on cinder blocks. Throughout the park are signs, handlettered and printed, small but discernible: BEWARE OF THE DOG.

For the privilege of residing here, there's a $100 entrance fee, even though the used trailer is already in the park when you buy it. If you move one in, the neighbors say, it's $300 or $400. Nobody has leases. "It's one stop above the ghetto," observed one resident.

Maggie Thornton came to Woodley Hills 15 years ago from the mountains of Southwestern Virginia. A widow, she is 60 but looks much older. She lives cramped in a tiny 7-by-27 foot trailer that costs her $57.40 a month to buy. She pays another $70 to the park for "site rent," plus utilities.

Soon after she moved in two years ago, the furnace almost exploded. The toilet didn't flush. Her foot crashed through the rotten planks of the bathroom floor. Rain leaked inside through light sockets, most of them inoperative. Now, wood patches cover the rot on the bathroom floor, at the front door, by the kitchen sink. The ceiling is bare plywood.

She bought her home from AA Mobile Market, one of several trailer sales lots that dot The Richmond Highway (U.S. 1), blending into the strip of gas stations, hamburger drive-ins and fried chicken joints. "Everything we agreed to do was done," the firm's vice-president said. "She had a chance to inspect the home to see if it was good enough for her standards." At AA Mobile Market, salesman Hank Ridge says there is a 30-day guarantee, but that basically, "What you see is what you get."

Maggie Thornton's son, a carpenter, his wife and baby also live in Woodley Hills, in a 15-year-old trailer they rent for $140 a month. The three generations of Thorntons all seem trapped, like the black welfare family in the ghetto on the welfare treadmill with no way to get off. When new homes and used ones start at $40,000 with high down-payments and ten percent mortgages, when low-cost apartments are being wiped out by urban renewal and the government refuses to build subsidized housing for the Maggie Thorntons of this world, they are lucky to have *any* roof over their heads, even one that is bare plywood.

INSECURITY ON WHEELS

Not all trailer parks (or mobile home parks, as the industry prefers to call them) are as visibly depressing as Nightingale-Woodley Hills. But for many of the 8.5 million people living in these uniquely American

structures, reality is far from the glowing industry propaganda.

Most of the nation's mobile home dwellers live in 24,000 parks. The rest live in rural areas, in the hills of Appalachia, or on prairie reservations, all generally on land they own. California and Florida are the two leading mobile home states, with 2,200 and 1,300 parks respectively in 1968. In these two states are located 245 of the 290 industry-rated top parks. Young marrieds and retired couples predominate in all parks, with retirees especially filling the Florida parks, where 77 percent of mobile home dwellers are over 65 years of age.

Promising "security" against the outside world ("24-hour uniformed security guards," advertises one Florida "retirement village"), mobile home parks deliver insecurity from within. Tenant rights in city apartments are generous compared to the tyranny inflicted on mobile home owners. The mobile home owner who finds himself arbitrarily and summarily evicted will discover virtually no spaces available elsewhere reinforcing the reluctance to protest. In fact, a mobile home generally moves only once, from the factory to the park, where it is likely to change hands but not location.

Most mobile home parks sprouted when undeveloped land on the outer suburban landcape was cheap and plentiful. Yesterday's exurban frontier has become today's clutter. Whether as discrimination or sensible planning, county officials now restrict—through sewer moratoriums and zoning—the spread of what they consider the trailer blight.

While the lawmakers have tried to discourage new mobile home parks, they have done little to protect those already in them. In many states, mobile homes are classified as vehicles, and therefore exempt from local building and housing codes, even though studies have shown mobile homes more susceptible to damage from fires, tornados and hurricanes. According to one study, winds of 40 to 50 miles an hour will tip one over; at 70 m.p.h., "the unit explodes. And although industry spokesmen like to point out that states have adopted the American National Standards institute code for mobile home construction, critics say enforcement is minimal.

What state laws do exist are a hodge-podge. Fewer than ten states have laws regulating mobile home parks. Michigan protects owner-tenants from arbitrary and retaliatory eviction but requires no lease and allows entrance and exit fees. Florida requires that units be tied down, as hurricane protection, but allows entrance fees, reported as high as $2,500 at one Miami park. Delaware requires a written lease with a 120-day minimum, and bars retaliatory evictions. Maine bars eviction if the tenant-owner can prove the park owner wants the space to get entrance fees or to locate a new mobile home he just sold. Except in Michigan, where a state agency prosecutes violators, enforcement is generally left to the individual mobile home owner, who must file a civil court suit.

Such problems don't concern most Americans. And not just the general public but even the housing activists have generally ignored the problems of trailer people. The ripping-off of redneck America has never been a trendy cause, so mobile home owners largely suffer in silence. "For most people, to do otherwise would mean out and out eviction," says Lily Jarman of Ralph Nader's Center for Auto Safety. Tenant activism that has mobilized ghetto dwellers and luxury apartment tenants hasn't caught on with trailer people, Jarman says, "because of the flak that would ensue." The result is despair and resignation.

IT'S HARD TO FIND A PLACE

A mile below Laurel Raceway, midway between Washington and Baltimore, Rebecca Cooke was pouring change into a soda machine next to her home, Smith's Mobile Home Court. She was barefoot and pretty with a soft, Southern voice, blond hair and the sad look of white poverty. She and her husband, at 20, two years younger than her, were refugees from Charleston, West Virginia, where jobs were as scarce as filet mignon. She was "kind of home sick," she said. But in Laurel, he had found work in a gas station, she in a carryout, and they had high hopes.

They had one child, two years old, and another on the way. They were paying $48 a week to rent an aging trailer. It was less than ten years old, but that qualifies it as a relic among mobile homes, which deteriorate and depreciate faster than cars. "The handles are off all the doors," Rebecca Cooke said. "It looks like some folks who lived there before they didn't take care of it. The rent's a little high, too. But we're just staying until we can buy furniture and save up $185 for the deposit on an apartment." It takes no clairvoyance to know that months later, Rebecca Cooke will still be at Smith's, trying to scrape up that $185 for a downpayment on the good life.

Altogether, there are some 20 trailers at Smith's, five too many according to county officials. Howard County housing chief B. Harrison Shipley was surprised to learn Smith's had any rental units, the only ones the county inspects. "They had 11 at one time," he said. "We've had problems with the way they kept them, deteriorated and unsafe."

The trailers at Smith's lack "skirting," the metal facade of permanency that some parks require to hide the wheels. Except for patches of grassless earth between and underneath the trailers, Smith's provides no play space for children. The park is separated from U.S. 1 by a wide, rocky shoulder. A metal bin sits by the road, the receptacle for everyone's trash and garbage.

Behind the trailers bordering the highway the land drops sharply into bottomland by a stream. It is here that Rebecca Cooke's trailer is located. There used to be a dozen more, parked in a circle, flooded from time to time by the rain-swollen creek. They remained there anyway, the only land at Smith's legality zoned for trailers, until the local power company acquired the property.

Families living by the creek could move to high ground or leave. John Lowell, a retired bricklayer with a grizzled, unshaven face, moved his 1968 trailer to the high ground. His rent doubled, from $60 to $120 a month. "You got to put up with the high rent," he said. "It's hard to find a place."

Helen Patterson, manager of Crane's Trailer Court in Laurel, Md., knows the mobile home industry from the inside, and she despises it. Crane's is roughly 30 years old one of three adjacent parks that sit in the median of U.S. 1 like small islands in a raging river of cars. Helen Patterson has lived there for eight years, five as park manager. An American flag decal decorates the door of her 1971 three bedroom mobile home. Country music from the radio fill the kitchen and living room.

Helen Patterson is outraged at most park rules, extra charges, admission fees and intimidation of residents—all of which she says are almost endemic to the industry. In most parks, she says, "If you're a friend of the manager, you can do what you want." If you're not a friend, she adds, you are often to accept "fantastic rules and changes: If you have four kids, you pay extra. If your mother wants to stay overnight, you pay extra. If you have a second car, a washer-dryer, you pay extra. A park restricting people like that holds them down to a lower standard of living."

At Crane's, there is a single rent of $65 a month, plus $11.45 in county tax. The rules are few. "My most stringent ones have to do with health—no trash around the trailers; you're responsible for your own kids."

To Helen Patterson, trailer people are often "a better grade of people. Some of them are old. Maybe they don't look as nice." But they are mostly honest, hard-working people "who do about the same as everyone else." At Crane's, that means construction, carpentry, high tension work, sheetmetal work, trucking.

But outsiders, Helen Patterson says, "well, they seem to sit back and look at us as if we were some kind of roving strangers, trash. It's a hangover from the days when everything in trailers was carnies. Even now, when you go to borrow money, and you put down a mobile home court as your address, they look at you and go, 'Ah-hem.' Automatically, you're inferior. They seem to take the attitude if you live in a mobile home, you can't afford anything else."

WELCOME TO FRIENDLY VILLAGE

Friendly Village of Dulles, 20 miles from Washington and within earshot of Dulles Airport in Virginia, is to the U.S. Route 1 trailer parks what a luxury high-rise is to red-brick housing projects. Three years old and determined to keep its fresh, unblemished look, it admits no mobile homes more than two years old. It is a socially self-contained community with its own swimming pool, tennis, volleyball and badminton courts, billiards room, clubhouse, men's and women's organizations, spaghetti dinners, classes in ceramics and knitting.

With 500 spaces on 94 treeless but well-manicured acres, Friendly Village is the largest park in the D.C. area. It separates families with kids from families without, on paved streets named after airlines. More than 20 miles from the urban core, it is patrolled nightly by an off-duty Fairfax County cop. Its residents include only a handful of blacks.

"I know all about the Route 1 parks—that's what's killing us with the garden clubs and the environmentalists," says big Bill Boisseau, 325-pound, 6-foot, 5½-inch general manager. "This is like a mansion compared to Route 1. We try to get into areas where you don't have to deal with the very low-income people." "What we're looking for is good families," adds second-in-command Dick Leisenring. "We will not allow it to become a 'trailer park.' If people don't want first class living, we have no room for them."

It costs $200 to $300 a month to live in Friendly Village. "Definitely not low-income," Leisenring says proudly. In addition to basic monthly rent—two months of it in advance Friendly Villagers must buy skirting ($375), two sets of steps ($325), an awning ($495), and a $10,000 liability-property damage insurance policy ($175).

Eighty-three percent of the residents live in double wides, two 12-foot wide units bolted together: status in the mobile home subculture. Friendly Village gets four stars from Woodall's Mobile Home & Park Directory, the Duncan Hines of the industry. It's not the top rating, but it's close.

Many residents are either newly moved in or in some way associated with the park; 46-year-old Harry C. Zimmerman, however, was a newcomer. He and Jessie, his wife, had moved from a $42,000 home into a $20,000 Vindale, the Cadillac of mobile homes. "With a 10-year mortgage and the Good Lord, this will someday be ours," said Zimmerman, a cargo supervisor at Dulles. Richard Cotten, also with a new Vindale, had been "driven" from his site-built house by high taxes. Cotten is a professional right-winger who buys radio time and publishes a newsletter. He likes "the security in the park" and its "responsible management."

Management means "no rules people can't live within," Leisenring says. Most of them, however, need a slide rule to be understood. For Sale signs are forbidden. Undefined "im-

moral conduct will not be tolerated." Once a family moves in, it needs management's okay to add to its number. Kids (limit of three) and pets (limit of two) cost $5 each a month. Pets may not be over 10 inches high "at the hips, measured when the animal is standing erect, and not over 26 pounds."

Break a rule and leave for five days, and you can lose your unit and everything in it. You are subject to eviction on 30 days notice with no reason required. Three days notice, if you default on site rent or "other charges," or fail to abide by all "rules and regulations."

There is no residents' association here, says Boisseau's secretary, Paul Douglas, because "they haven't found it necessary." Visiting Nader's Raiders concluded, however, "If carefully guided, there is potential for getting together an underground tenants union or grievance committee." The biggest obstacle: "Eviction phobia."

For, despite its name, Friendly Village isn't always friendly.

Consider the case of Douglas Schlacter, 30-year-old auto mechanic with a wife and three kids. Schlacter bought his home through the park for $7,200 in April 1972. "Everything was made to look great," he recalls. "But after we paid for the trailer, everything changed—right from the beginning." When the new mobile home was moved to its site, the trailer hitch broke, puncturing the insulation and causing water leakage. Electrical wires were loose, plumbing defective. "They just didn't care," Schlacter says. "The salesman told my wife, 'You know, you didn't buy a Cadillac.' If you complained, that's when you had trouble. They tried to evict us."

Before he was evicted, Schlacter got a lawyer and moved out. The park bought back his defective year-old trailer, for $6,000—a loss of $2,400, including the cost of extras Schlacter had purchased.

Paul Douglas said the Schlacters' problem was "they couldn't accept the fact they bought a cheap unit. Due to the fact that he was such a troublemaker and created such a distubrance up and down the street, we tried to evict him. Our decision was that troublemakers we don't need."

TIN-CAN SUBURBIA

Back in 1930, a mere 1,300 trailers were built by the infant industry and nobody called them mobile homes. Most of the trailers in those days were home-made boxes on wheels, pulled by cars and used exclusively for recreation. By 1936, there were some 250,000, according to one estimate, but it was still a cottage industry. In 1937, the four major commercial producers made only 9,900.

The Depression changed the picture. Trailers no longer symbolized leisure; they symbolized unemployment. The destitute families of Middle America, refugees from the Dust Bowl and from economic forces beyond their control and comprehension, took to the road in search of work. As unwelcome at each new town as the last, they camped together on the back roads, squatding on vacant land, their camps carrying the usual load of poverty ills.

"The tin can tourist," wrote the *New York Times* in 1937, "pays less for social services than any citizen of the United States." And so it was that the early laws, many still on the books, were written to control and isolate trailer people rather than to regulate an industry. So it is that the California trailer park law, as late as 1970, prohibited squtting camping along roads and congregating in informal campgrounds.

And so it is that the law also required one toilet, one shower, and one lavatory for each sex for every 100 lots—a requirement park owners have tried to turn into a marketing plus by making such facilities into community centers.

After World War II, recalls Vee Schulze, a 44-year-old maintenance worker who lives in a camp city just outside Washington, D.C., "they popped up because there were no other living facilities. Your lower class lived in them then because they were cheap. It was the bad apple in the bushel."

Veterans on the GI bill also lived, on college campuses, in government-donated trailers recycled during the early postwar years. By 1950, however, the veterans had graduated from both college and trailer living. Their dream was a conventional house in exploding suburbia, not more of the same. That year, only 60,000 mobile homes were built—one tenth the number built two decades later.

Today, mobile homes are a $4.5 billion a year business. In 1973, the 600,000 mobile homes accounted for about one-half of all new single family dwellings. By January 1974, although delivery of mobile homes had dropped by one-third, their share of all new single family homes had risen to 66 percent.

Five firms accounted for one-third of the mobile homes built. The largest producer, with nearly ten percent of the market, is Skyline Corporation. It is based in Elkhart, Indiana, apparently the mobile home capital of the world with 50 companies within a 26-mile radius of its city hall.

The mobile home industry in the 1960s and early 1970s has made rich men of hustlers who mostly live in stick-built houses. As the mobile home industry has expanded, so have mobile homes. Eight and ten-foot wide models are now obsolete. Twelve wides are standard, with 14-wides increasing (in states that allow such widths to be towed on highways) and double-wides gaining in popularity. Today's mobile homes are nearly three times larger than their World War II predecessors.

Mobile homes (except double wides) come furnished from the factory starting at about $6,000. The low price tag is, of course, deceiving. For mobile homes represent, as Boston economist Carol S. Greenwald put it, "low cost housing with high cost financing." Financing is short term at high interest rates, often 12 percent and as high as 21.5 percent in Michigan. Buying a mobile home is more like buying a car than a house. The final irony is that because of the nearly $1 per mile cost in moving a unit, mobile home owners are even less mobile than most Americans.

TIME FOR A BREAKTHROUGH

That mobile homes have become such a major share of the American housing market is reason enough to turn the industry, through legislation, into something more than an unregulated frontier caricature. There is no excuse for the abuses that exist. It is not enough to say, as Gerald Ford did last year before a mobile home manufacturers' meeting in Washington, that "This industry sort of epitomizes the free enterprise system."

There are obvious reforms that must be enacted: long-term leases of one year or more to provide the security within that mobile parks now promise from without, a ban on non-refundable entrance and exist fees; no rules that restrict lifestyles unless they invade the rights of others; no rataliatory evictions; no monopoly sales of mobile homes and accessories by park owners; creation of enforcement agencies to take offenders to criminal court, rather than leaving mobile home owners the more difficult, costly, and protracted route of filing their own civil suit for damages or relief.

More for reasons of regulation than taxing policy, the contradiction between mobile homes as vehicles and mobile homes as houses must be resolved, so that local officials can inspect the units before they're sold. Especially in need of closer supervision are second-hand sales. All parks should be inspected regularly to enforce health and safety standards. And as long as park owners are responsible for roads and utilities in a park, they must be made legally responsible as well, or else municipalities must provide such services.

Warranties must be extended from 90 days to one year, and service must be rendered where the mobile home is parked, not at the factory (a stipulation in some warranties which makes them worthless). There is another reason for extending the time limit. Federally-insured financing for mobile homes demands a one-year warranty. The lack of it largely explains why such programs go virtually unused, and are, in effect, meaningless. The answer is not to weaken the government requirement, but to force the industry, through legislation, to bring its warranty length into compliance.

Mobile homes will never become low-income housing until the financing period is extended, thereby reducing monthly payments. Currently, savings and loan associations are permitted to finance for 15 years, only if the mobile home is more than 14 by 68 feet, far bigger than most.

Banks are unlikely to make long-term investments in structures that literally fall apart after a few years. To build mobile homes better, the industry says, would simply jack up the price. But the total price tag alone is not what determines who can afford to buy; the monthly payment is paramount, and as long as mobile homes are financed over seven to nine years, the monthly payment for new models will remain high.

Mobile homes are low-cost housing if paid for in cash. The Nixon Administration has touted, but not begun on any large scale, a program of family housing allowances. Instead of providing monthly rent payments, the government could offer lump sums of cash for outright purchase of mobile homes. Beyond this, if former Housing Secretary George Romney's Operation Breakthrough failed to find new doors to cheaper mass-produced housing, at least one door has long been opened by the mobile home industry.

The United States has an enormous housing problem that extends beyond those we still call the Poor. Interest rates and construction costs are pricing what little new housing is being built beyond the reach of even middle-income Americans. Surely the depressing poverty of Nightingale-Woodley Hills and the 1984 double-speak of Friendly Village are not the final words on this one approach to new housing in America. In fact, the recent upsurge in mobile home construction is almost certain to continue. And as it does, the growing constituency of mobile home owners is likely to become a force that legislators cannot afford to ignore.

CIA INTERVENTION IN GREECE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Boston Globe, in an editorial of August 3, 1974, has spoken out strongly against revelations of CIA interference in Greece and other countries.

The editorial declared that—

It is as though the CIA is bound and determined to demonstrate that the United States has become the adversary to self-determination both at home and abroad and the buttress of autocratic governments the world over

It is encouraging that such respected newspapers as the Boston Globe are showing their outrage over CIA intervention in the affairs of foreign countries. In the last couple of months, particular attention has been given to un-

lawful CIA intervention into this country's domestic affairs. CIA intervention into the domestic affairs of foreign countries is simply the other side of the coin and deserves equal attention in the press and Congress. Such intervention is equally illegal and is a manifestation of the same drive for unchecked power on the part of the executive branch of Government.

The editorial follows:

CIA'S EXIT IN GREECE

It will come as a surprise to many Americans to learn that the Central Intelligence Agency apparently has closed shop in Greece, departing with lock, stock and bags of tricks. Despite persistent rumors, it has never been certain that the CIA has been operating in Greece at all.

But according to authoritative news reports, the clandestine espionage agency not only has been operating in Greece, but, at least since the advent in 1967 of the now-deposed military junta, practically has been masterminding Greek politics as well.

According to an account this week in The New York Times, the CIA has meddled extensively in Greek domestic politics, shifting its allegiance among various factions. For a while in the mid-1960s, the agency reportedly even backed the leftward government of former premier George Papandreou. But mostly it has aided conservative figures.

The agency, for instance, reportedly subsidized and shepherded George Papadopoulos, the Greek colonel who led the 1967 coup overthrowing Papandreou. CIA operatives also worked closely with Brig. Gen. Demetrios Ioannides, who acceded to the head of the military dictatorship in another coup last year.

The Observer, the London newspaper, last year revealed evidence suggesting that the CIA engineered the downfall of the democratically-elected Greek government in 1967. Similarly, it now has surfaced that the CIA operative closest to Ioannides returned to Greece to confer with the general shortly before the July 15 rebellion in Cyprus, which was headed by Greek officers.

Taken together, the circumstances indicate that the CIA has been pulling the strings for some time in the puppet show in Greece, where democracy originated many centuries ago. The failure of the rebellion on Cyprus has toppled the army junta that ruled Greece for seven years and may have uprooted the CIA there as well.

In any case, it is heartening that the American sleuths are disengaging themselves from Greek internal affairs. CIA antics have proved as indefensible in Greece as in the agency's illicit part in the Plumber's Watergate capers.

It is as though the CIA is bound and determined to demonstrate that the United States has become the adversary to self-determination both at home and abroad and the buttress of autocratic governments the world over.

As Victor Marchetti and John D. Marks, former US intelligence agents, said in their book, "The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence:" "The CIA is not defending our national security. It seeks rather to maintain the status quo, to hold back the cultural clock, in areas that are of little or no significance to the American people. These efforts are doomed to failure."

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15264

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, when the House considers the Export Administration Act (H.R. 15264), I will be offering an amendment which is designed to give Congress and the American people advance warning to head off potential shortages of important raw agricultural commodities.

This amendment would require the Secretary of Agriculture to look ahead and determine whether certain raw agricultural commodities, now subject to the reporting requirements of the 1970 Agricultural Act, will be in short supply during the crop year. If the Secretary finds that a commodity will be in short supply, he is required to transmit this information to Congress, together with a detailed plan for coping with the shortage. The Secretary of Commerce would have input into developing this plan.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment does not require the imposition of export controls. What it does seek to require is a responsible and planned approach to dealing with food commodities that are in short supply. Such an approach is essential if we are to guard against the kind of economic damage that accompanied the Russian wheat deal and if we are to avoid hastily contrived export controls that alienate traditional trading partners.

An identical amendment, offered by Senator JAVITS, was adopted in the Senate. The other body has recognized the need to give the American people some assurance that we will have adequate food supplies and that we will not experience the drastic fluctuations in price and supply that marked last year's food dilemma. I hope the House will recognize the need for this assurance and support my amendment on Friday.

The complete text of my amendment to H.R. 15264 follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF TO H.R. 15264, AS REPORTED

Page 3, immediately after line 7, insert the following:

"(3) Within ninety days after the beginning of the crop year the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine which commodities, if any, subject to the reporting requirements of section 812 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, are likely to be in short supply. A commodity shall be determined to be in short supply if the Secretary of Agriculture estimates that the total quantity of the commodity that will be produced in the crop year will be insufficient to provide for anticipated domestic consumption, commercial exports, programed food assistance commitments, disaster relief assistance and other emergency assistance, and a reasonable carryover at the end of the crop year. The Secretary of Agriculture with the concurrence of the Secretary of Commerce shall submit his findings to Congress together with a plan or plans to cope with the anticipated shortage."

Page 3, line 7, strike out the quotation marks.

CONGRESSMAN CARNEY SPEAKS OUT ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am quite impressed and in complete accord with the remarks of my colleague, the Honorable CHARLES CARNEY of Ohio, delivered during the debate on the Department of Defense appropriations bill.

It is an incredible state of affairs when a military bill of this magnitude is so readily approved while the country's serious domestic ills remain unaddressed. I look forward to working with CHARLES CARNEY and other Members who can no longer tolerate this shameful ordering of our national priorities.

In hoping that the maximum number of people will review his straightforward statement, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this time:

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, do the Members remember a great General of the United States, a great American President, General Eisenhower; President Eisenhower? Do the Members remember his farewell message: "Beware of a military-industrial complex"?

This was a man who devoted his whole life to the military. We should remember what he told us.

Members get their mail from back home, and they tell us to save the American people some money. It is a funny thing that I see some Members here today, whenever a military bill comes up to kill people, to blow people up, say that we cannot afford not to do it.

The very same Members, when school lunches for kids comes up, when the safety of workers comes up, when it is something for the American people, something to fill hungry bellies, something to make America stronger here at home, those very same Members will always say—some Members of this committee and some on the other side—will say, "Oh, we cannot afford it. We cannot do this."

But, we can spend billions and no one raises any objection.

I made this request a few weeks ago when we had a school lunch program here, and I got up and talked along these lines. They said that we could not afford to do it.

I say, are we going to go that way? We have the money to spend billions, but the American people want money saved.

The gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, is a great American and member of this committee. He says it can be saved safely. The American people are looking at this. They want some action, and we had better give it to them or things are going to change.

No wonder Congress is in such low esteem with the American people. We have billions to spend to kill people, but nothing for the American people. We had better shape up, because the time is getting late.

HOUSE-APPROVED MILITARY BUDGET SHOWS LACK OF FISCAL RESTRAINT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly disappointed in the failure of this body yesterday to make responsible reductions in the Department of Defense appropriations bill (H.R. 16243). At a time when the grave economic situation demands fiscal restraint, I am unable to justify to my constituents the expenditure of more than $83 billion for the military.

The House did adopt two excellent amendments which I was pleased to support. The first eliminated a $5.8 million

appropriation for the development of a new binary nerve gas program. We already have approximately fifty million pounds of nerve gas in our military stockpiles. We should be working to ban weapons of chemical warfare, rather than inaugurating new and costly programs.

The second amendment approved by the House reduced the appropriations for military aid to South Vietnam from $1 billion to $700 million. Americans are no longer being killed in Southeast Asia; but the war continues to rage, fueled by American planes, bombs, guns, and ammunition. Contrary to the repeated assurances of the administration, the United States has not yet gotten out of Vietnam. We remain involved to the tune of billions of dollars in military aid which helps to support the dictatorship of President Thieu. The $300-million reduction in the appropriations level imposed by the House yesterday represents an important step in the right direction.

Unfortunately, the House failed to make more substantial cuts in the proposed budget. I voted for unsuccessful amendments to delete funding for the obsolete Safeguard missile system and for the dangerous new program of counterforce first-strike weapons development. An amendment to reduce the entire budget by $2.2 billion, which I supported, was rejected by a narrow margin.

In its final form, the budget approved by the House last evening provided $83.4 billion to the Department of Defense for fiscal 1975. We in the Congress have been urged to help slow inflation by exercising fiscal restraint. Apparently, the military budget, which represents our largest Federal expenditure, is not subject to this same standard of responsible spending. Increased spending for the military at a time when crucial domestic programs are being curtailed strikes me as a tragic confusion of priorities. I could not join a majority of my colleagues in approving this excessive Defense Department appropriation.

ATTORNEY GENERAL SAXBE SPEAKS OUT FOR ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Task Force on Antitrust and Monopoly Problems is deeply concerned over the problems of enforcing existing antitrust laws. Enforcement of the antitrust statutes not only is a necessary ingredient in the running of our free enterprise system, but also would benefit the consumer in many ways by creating more competition in the market place.

Currently, the task force is studying competition in the agriculture field. In a series of hearings, the task force members have heard the views of representatives from the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Broiler Marketing Association, Consumers Union, the National Consumers Congress, and the Honorable Thomas E. Kauper, Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust. The Honorable Lewis A. Engman, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, the National Association of Food Chains, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Earl L. Butz are scheduled for later meetings.

The task force's goal is to propose legislative changes to rectify anticompetitive situations, keeping in mind a general philosophy that when the marketplace is open and competitive, it is the best regulator of industry and the best insurance against inflation.

The Honorable William B. Saxbe, Attorney General of the United States, in a recent address before the National Conference for State, County, and City Consumer Office Administrators, discussed his views on antitrust enforcement and other matters of concern to consumers. I include here Mr. Saxbe's thought-provoking remarks, and I urge my colleagues to read them carefully:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. SAXBE, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

I very much appreciate the opportunity to be with you today as you conclude the work of this important conference.

In one way or another, your efforts touch the lives of all Americans, and I hope that this conference will lead to a substantial increase in the level of public service that we can provide.

The range of your efforts should be exceptionally broad for the common definition of a consumer is, very simply, one who consumes.

But the consumer today is all too often in the perilous position of himself being consumed by forces which he may seldom understand and over which he has precious little control.

It is our job to see that the consumer is given not merely a better break but rather is given all of the rights to which he is entitled. In short, the consumer must receive the full protection of the law.

For centuries, the creed in the marketplace has been to let the buyer beware. I think it is about time that we begin to insist on some new responsibilities on the other side of the fence.

It is time for a change: To also let the seller beware, and let the manufacturer beware as well. The public should insist on honest value received for honest dollars paid.

And perhaps even more important, the white collar criminal should be on notice that his illegal business practices will not be tolerated either.

When government fails in the consumer area, and it has failed far too often, a wide range of costs is extracted from the public. It may be in the health hazards of the polluted air we breathe or in the outright theft of our money when we purchase a product whose price has been fixed.

Consumers should be on guard at all times to make sure they receive the goods and services for which they pay. But in a society as complex as ours, government has a responsibility to help inform them about the potential problems they face—and teach them how to protect themselves.

Law enforcement and consumer agencies also have a duty to help resolve conflicts. And when voluntary compliance fails, there must be prompt and vigorous prosecution for violations of the law.

In addition, new statutes and new programs are vital—as are joint efforts by the Government, the business community, and the public to help elevate the ethical conduct of the marketplace.

Much more is involved in this matter of consumer affairs than, for instance, the failure of a store to honor the warranty on a faulty television set. In an astounding number of cases, human life is involved.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission reports that an estimated 20 million Americans are injured each year by products used in and around the home. About 110,000 are disabled permanently and 30,000 are killed.

No one suggests that the manufacturer is to blame in each and every case. But the bare statistics alone should compel us to reach the conclusion that something has gone wrong and that at least part of the blame might be placed on the producer.

An unsafe product can be potentially as bad as a robber holding a pistol to your head—and then pulling the trigger. All too often, the result is the same, as the Consumer Product Safety Commission statistics so graphically show.

In a book called "The Incurable Wound," Berton Roueche wrote an account of a three-year-old boy who easily opened a bottle of aspirin and ate the contents while his mother slept. Within a fairly short time, the child was dead. The author included the incident while tallying up the deadly perils that lurk in nearly every home medicine cabinet and in cleansers and other materials used by nearly every housewife. He summed it up by quoting a young scientist at a poison control center who said:

"Most people take life for granted. In fact, it's the most delicate thing in the world. One false step and it's over."

Those words should be engraved in the minds of every person who has anything to do with goods used by the public—As well as those of us whose duties include protection of the public.

Some businessmen complain about new laws passed by the Government and new regulations imposed on the quality and safety of commonly used products.

But I often wonder why more of them don't make improvements on a voluntary basis intead of letting the problems become so gross that the Government has to act—and then only after enormous suffering has occurred.

The industrialist watching smoke belch from the chimneys of his factory should have had a glimmer that the air was being poisoned. The drug manufacturer should have had an inkling that child-proof containers for his product might have been a prudent step to take.

All of us should be more alert to products and practices which may pose a clear and present danger. Some years ago, manufacturers were required to print a warning of health hazards on cigarette packages. But there are no similar warning required, for instance, on alcoholic beverages—despite the fact that an estimated nine million Americans suffer from alcoholism, and alcohol-related problems cause more than 85,000 deaths a year.

In considering consumer matters, it is apparent that the problems are of such magnitude that no one sector of our society can hope to solve them by itself.

Every member of the consuming public will have to become much more aware of the threats posed to both his pocketbook and his health, and where possible join fellow citizens in responsible civic action programs to protect his interests.

The worlds of business and finance are going to have to engage in deeper soul-searching that hopefully will lead to self-policing on a much broader scale.

The businessman, like the physician, has humanitarian responsibilities—whether he recognizes it or not.

And government at every level simply must begin to realize some time-honored truths—starting with the basic principle that it exists to serve the people, not to thwart them through subservience to special interests.

Greater levels of cooperation also are needed among all of the groups in the public and private sector. Whatever else is done, none of us can afford to let the steam go out of the consumer movement. The toll already is too great, and it would be immeasurably greater if apathy allows old ways to reassert themselves.

For its part, the Department of Justice is faced with a number of problems as it attempts to carry out its responsibilities in the consumer area.

In the few months that I have been Attorney General, I have found that consumer resources in the Federal government are not adequate and that there is fragmentation of existing programs which hamper their effectiveness.

The Department of Justice has statutory responsibility to represent the Government in a variety of criminal and civil actions related to consumer problems. These include enforcement of the food and drug laws, statutes on unsafe products and dangerous substances, and mail fraud and related laws.

There is another area of our responsibility which transcends the individual consumer, though it is one which affects all of us—no matter what our occupation, no matter what our income.

I am referring to the antitrust enforcement program of the Department. The antitrust laws have been called the original consumer legislation. But more to the point, the vigorous enforcement of those statutes can have a major and beneficial impact on the entire economy and the whole free enterprise system.

One might hazard a guess that a nation that spends as much time as we do talking about the virtues of free enterprise really believes in the vigorous tugging and hauling of the marketplace. But just mention antitrust enforcement to business and industrial leaders and see what kind of a reaction you get.

As long as it is directed against somebody else, they favor it. But if they are the target of enforcement efforts, then the complaints begin, and so do the dire predictions that their companies will be ruined and whole segments of the economy shattered. And their supporters pop up all over: consumers who are also stockholders; labor unions; and often even Congressmen who are otherwise vocal in their support of strong enforcement.

To their dire predictions that antitrust means disaster, I can only say that it is nonsense.

I am convinced that the opposite is true: That we will be in for some very tough sledding if we do not enforce the antitrust laws and stop a wide range of practices detrimental to the economy and to the citizens of this country.

If businessmen insist on cutting corners and breaking laws in their quest for profits, then they will set us on a course that could wreck the entire free enterprise system.

The bottom line on any firm's ledger book should certainly show profits. But it also must include ethical conduct and a sense of responsibility to the larger society.

If businessmen refuse to obey the antitrust laws, then we have no recourse but to prosecute them as vigorously as we prosecute anyone who commits fraud, or sells narcotics, or violates the civil rights of another. Those laws are designed to assist the consumer by encouraging lower prices for goods and services. When firms compete freely, prices do tend to go down as the companies become more creative and more efficient.

When there is a monopoly, however, or when firms join together to fix prices or restrict competition, the cost of goods to the customers tends to rise substantially. Given enough illegal activities, profound influences begin to make themselves felt in the entire economy, which also impact adversely on the consumer.

Faced with these problems, I believe it is my responsibility as Attorney General to see that the antitrust laws are vigorously enforced.

Let me say here that I feel the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has done an excellent job in this Administration. It is functioning more effectively now than at almost any time in its history. Its attorneys are highly motivated and dedicated to the fair enforcement of the laws. But that is not to say that there is no room for improvement in the Division's operation.

One action, which I intend to put into effect July 1, is to end the long-standing procedure whereby the Attorney General must personally approve or disapprove each complaint proposed by the Antitrust Division.

I will of course retain responsibility for antitrust policy and make my views on antitrust enforcement known to the Division, but I feel my basic role is to help develop overall policy and leave the individual cases to the staff.

As it stands now, a potential complaint is subject to as many as eight separate and time-consuming reviews, including that of the Attorney General, before it is filed in court. By eliminating the Attorney General from that review procedure in non-policy type complaints, the Division will be able to process cases more rapidly within the Department.

In the absence of statutory requirements, other legal divisions normally bring such cases on their own and I see no reason why Antitrust should not conform to that practice.

Even as procedures are being streamlined, however, we are still faced with the problem of adequate resources. The proposed budget for the Antitrust Division for fiscal 1975 is about $16 million. That is only slightly more than the budget for the River Basins Surveys program of the Federal government. I don't suggest for a moment that river basin surveys are not important, but I do think that antitrust should have a somewhat higher priority.

In the current fiscal year, there is an authorized level of 327 attorneys in the Antitrust Division, and for the coming year we are seeking 40 additional lawyers.

Even this modest increase was severely cut by the House Appropriations Committee, but I was extremely pleased that the original request was restored on the floor of the House this past Tuesday. The 216 members who voted in favor of restoring funds for these badly needed lawyers deserve the respect of all consumers.

We are also studying other new approaches that might be implemented in the Antitrust Division, including additional field offices and a roving strike force that would move around the country developing priority cases.

I will shortly ask the National Association of Attorneys General and the National District Attorneys Association to develop closer levels of cooperation with the Department on enforcement of antitrust laws. The Antitrust Division already is giving some assistance to state and local enforcement agencies, but I believe it should be greatly increased.

I also will instruct the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to increase its assistance to states and localities for reduction of white collar crime—including antitrust violations. LEAA recently awarded more than $1 million to the District Attorneys Association to continue a consumer fraud program being carried out on a pilot basis by 15 local prosecutors. That program should be expanded to every state, with antitrust enforcement being an integral component.

Fraud has become an enormous problem throughout the Nation but Federal enforcement efforts are handicapped because of the limited scope of the mail fraud statute. I believe the Congress should consider enacting a general fraud statute that would give the Department the power to prosecute a wide variety of offenses that now go largely unchallenged. Tough criminal penalties are needed rather than civil sanctions which too often are toothless.

Finally, the Department has major responsibilities in the field of public education. We will shortly publish a new brochure which explains antitrust and tells the consumer what he can do to support proper enforcement. The message is simple: Be alert to possible violations, and when you find something suspicious call it to the attention of enforcement agencies listed in the booklet. It is only a small, initial step—and we will have to build on it.

Public education programs are essential because, on the Federal level, about 95 per cent of all antitrust actions that are initiated stem from citizen complaints.

Substantial benefits can result from responsible and widespread citizen support for the consumer movement. I hope that they let us all know what is on their minds, as well as inform enforcement agencies of possible violations of the law.

In closing, let me say that what the consumer needs is an epidemic of competition, of truth, and of quality. He will be the better for it, and so will the country.

Thank you.

GOLD AND ECONOMIC FREEDOM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, amidst the ever-growing evidence of the seriousness of our economic problems, two recent events give cause for optimism: the nomination of Alan Greenspan to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and the passage of legislation legalizing ownership of gold effective January 1, 1975.

For years Mr. Greenspan, president of Townsend-Greenspan & Co., a New York economic consulting firm, has sounded warnings of the dangers that lie ahead as long as the rate of increase in Federal expenditures and credit guarantees is allowed to run in excess of the revenue-raising capacity of our tax system. Inflation, Mr. Greenspan argues, is the inevitable result of such a policy and can be checked only by balancing the U.S. budget.

Thus the appointment of Mr. Greenspan, who is a staunch advocate of free enterprise, indicates that the administration seriously intends to follow a policy of fiscal and monetary restraint, and abandon—forever, I hope—interventionist policies such as wage-price controls.

The legalization of ownership of gold is likewise good news to everyone suffering the effects of inflation. Gold cannot be inflated and thus can serve as a store of value to protect one's savings from inflation.

While these two events may appear to be unrelated, there is a sense in which their happening now is not accidental. It is the rapidly rising inflation of the past several years that led to the public pressure which has resulted in the legalization of gold ownership.

This same inflation has generated economic conditions so serious as to threaten our basic political and economic freedoms which in turn has led Government leaders now to call on the advice of the man who predicted it and knows how to correct it.

Therefore it is particularly appropriate to call to the attention of my colleagues an essay by Mr. Greenspan entitled "Gold and Economic Freedom." This essay appeared in Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal by Ayn Rand, New York: the New American Library, 1966; and in the July 1966 issue of the Objectivist, copyright 1966 by the Objectivist, Inc. It is reprinted here with permission:

GOLD AND ECONOMIC FREEDOM

(By Alan Greenspan)

An almost hysterical antagonism toward the gold standard is one issue that unites statists of all persuasions. They seem to sense—perhaps more clearly and subtly than many consistent defenders of laissez-faire—that gold and economic freedom are inseparable, that the gold standard is an instrument of laissez-faire and that each implies and requires the other.

In order to understand the source of their antagonism, it is necessary first to understand the specific role of gold in a free society.

Money is the common denominator of all economic transactions. It is that commodity which serves as a medium of exchange, is universally acceptable to all participants in an exchange economy as payment for their goods or services, and can, therefore, be used as a standard of market value and as a store of value, i.e., as a means of saving.

The existence of such a commodity is a precondition of a division of labor economy. If men did not have some commodity of objective value which was generally acceptable as money, they would have to resort to primitive barter or be forced to live on self-sufficient farms and forego the inestimable advantages of specialization. If men had no means to store value, i.e., to save, neither long-range planning nor exchange would be possible.

What medium of exchange will be acceptable to all participants in an economy is not determined arbitrarily. First, the medium of exchange should be durable. In a primitive society of meager wealth, wheat might be sufficiently durable to serve as a medium, since all exchanges would occur only during and immediately after the harvest, leaving no value-surplus to store. But where store-of-value considerations are important, as they are in richer, more civilized societies, the medium of exchange must be a durable commodity, usually a metal. A metal is generally chosen because it is homogeneous and divisible: every unit is the same as every other and it can be blended or formed in any quantity. Precious jewels, for example, are neither homogeneous nor divisble.

More important, the commodity chosen as a medium must be a luxury. Human desires for luxuries are unlimited and, therefore, luxury goods are always in demand and will always be acceptable. Wheat is a luxury in underfed civilizations, but not in a prosperous society. Cigarettes ordinarily would not serve as money, but they did in post-World War II Europe where they were considered a luxury. The term "luxury good" implies scarcity and high unit value. Having a high unit value, such a good is easily portable; for instance, an ounce of gold is worth a half-ton of pig iron.

In the early stages of a developing money economy, several media of exchange might be used, since a wide variety of commodities would fulfill the foregoing conditions. However, one of the commodities will gradually displace all others, by being more widely acceptable. Preferences on what to hold as a store of value, will shift to the most widely accepted commodity, which, in turn, will make it still more acceptable. The shift is progressive until that commodity becomes the sole medium of exchange. The use of a single medium is highly advantageous for the same reasons that a money economy is superior to a barter economy: it makes exchanges possible on an incalculably wider scale.

Whether the single medium is gold, silver, seashells, cattle or tobacco is optional, depending on the context and development of a given economy. In fact, all have been employed, at various times, as media of exchange. Even in the present century, two major commodities, gold and silver, have been used as international media of exchange, with gold becoming the predominant one. Gold, having both artistic and functional uses and being relatively scarce, has always been considered a luxury good. It is durable, portable, homogeneous, divisible, and, therefore, has significant advantages over all other media of exchange. Since the beginning of World War I, it has been virtually the sole international standard of exchange.

If all goods and services were to be paid for in gold, large payments would be difficult to execute, and this would tend to limit the extent of a society's division of labor and specialization. Thus a logical extension of the creation of a medium of exchange, is the development of a banking system and credit instruments (bank notes and deposits) which act as a substitute for, but are convertible into, gold.

A free banking system based on gold is able to extend credit and thus to create bank notes (currency) and deposits, according to the production requirements of the economy. Individual owners of gold are induced, by payments of interest, to deposit their gold in a bank (against which they can draw checks). But since it is rarely the case that all depositors want to withdraw all their gold at the same time, the banker need keep only a fraction of his total deposits in gold as reserves. This enables the banker to loan out more than the amount of his gold deposits (which means that he holds claims to gold rather than gold as security for his deposits). But the amount of loans which he can afford to make is not arbitrary: he has to gauge it in relation to his reserves and to the status of his investments.

When banks loan money to finance productive and profitable endeavors, the loans are paid off rapidly and bank credit continues to be generally available. But when the business ventures financed by bank credit are less profitable and slow to pay off, bankers soon find that their loans outstanding are excessive relative to their gold reserves, and they begin to curtail new lending, usually by charging higher interest rates. This tends to restrict the financing of new ventures and requires the existing borrowers to improve their profitability before they can obtain credit for further expansion. Thus, under the gold standard, a free banking system stands as the protector of an economy's stability and balanced growth.

When gold is accepted as the medium of exchange by most or all nations, an unhampered free international gold standard serves to foster a worldwide division of labor and the broadest international trade. Even though the units of exchange (the dollar, the pound, the franc, etc.) differ from country to country, when all are defined in terms of gold the economies of the different countries act as one—so long as there are no restraints on trade or on the movement of capital. Credit, interest rates and prices tend to follow similar patterns in all countries. For example, if banks in one country extend credit too liberally, interest rates in that country will tend to fall, inducing depositors to shift their gold to higher-interest paying banks in other countries. This will immediately cause a shortage of bank reserves in the "easy money" country, inducing tighter credit standards and a return to competitively higher interest rates again.

A fully free banking system and fully consistent gold standard have not as yet been achieved. But prior to World War I, the banking system in the United States (and in most of the world) was based on gold; and even though governments intervened occasionally, banking was more free than controlled. Periodically, as a result of overly rapid credit expansion, banks became loaned up to the limit of their gold reserves, interest rates rose sharply, new credit was cut off and the economy went into a sharp, but short-lived recession. (Compared with the depressions of 1920 and 1932, the pre-World War I business declines were mild indeed.) It was limited gold reserves that stopped the unbalanced expansions of business activity, before they could develop into the post-World War I type of disaster. The readjustment periods were short and the economies quickly reestablished a sound basis to resume expansion.

But the process of cure was misdiagnosed as the disease: if shortage of bank reserves was causing a business decline—argued economic interventionists—why not find a way of supplying increased reserves to the banks so they never need be short! If banks can continue to loan money indefinitely—it was claimed—there need never be any slumps in business. And so the Federal Reserve System was organized in 1913. It consisted of twelve regional Federal Reserve banks nominally owned by private bankers, but in fact government sponsored, controlled and supported. Credit extended by these banks is in practice (though not legally) backed by the taxing power of the federal government. Technically, we remained on the gold standard; individuals were still free to own gold, and gold continued to be used as bank reserves. But now, in addition to gold, credit extended by the Federal Reserve banks ("paper" reserves) could serve as legal tender to pay depositors.

When business in the United States underwent a mild contraction in 1927, the Federal Reserve created more paper reserves in the hope of forestalling any possible bank reserve shortage. More disastrous, however, was the Federal Reserve's attempt to assist Great Britain, who had been losing gold to us because the Bank of England refused to allow interest rates to rise when market forces dictated (it was politically unpalatable). The reasoning of the authorities involved was as follows: If the Federal Reserve pumped excessive paper reserves into American banks, interest rates in the United States would fall to a level comparable with those in Great Britain; this would act to stop Britain's gold loss and avoid the political embarrassment of having to raise interest rates.

The "Fed" succeeded: it stopped the gold loss, but it nearly destroyed the economies of the world, in the process. The excess credit which the Fed pumped into the economy spilled over into the stock market—triggering a fantastic speculative boom. Belatedly, Federal Reserve officials attempted to sop up the excess reserves and finally succeeded in braking the boom. But it was too late: by 1929 the speculative imbalances had become so overwhelming that the attempt precipitated a sharp retrenching and a consequent demoralizing of business confidence. As a result, the American economy collapsed. Great Britain fared even worse and rather

than absorb the full consequences of her previous folly, she abandoned the gold standard completely in 1931, tearing asunder what remained of the fabric of confidence and inducing a worldwide series of bank failures. The world economies plunged into the Great Depression of the 1930's.

With a logic reminiscent of a generation earlier, statists argued that the gold standard was largely to blame for the credit debacle which led to the Great Depression. If the gold standard had not existed, they argued, Britain's abandonment of gold payments in 1931 would not have caused the failure of banks all over the world. (The irony was that since 1913, we had been, not on a gold standard but on what may be termed "a *mixed* gold standard"; yet it is gold that took the blame.)

But the opposition to the gold standard in any form—from a growing number of welfare-state advocates—was prompted by a much subtler insight: the realization that the gold standard is incompatible with chronic deficit spending (the hallmark of the welfare state). Stripped of its academic jargon, the welfare state is nothing more than a mechanism by which governments confiscate the wealth of the productive members of a society to support a wide variety of welfare schemes. A substantial part of the confiscation is effected by taxation. But the welfare statists were quick to recognize that if they wished to retain political power, the amount of taxation had to be limited and they had to resort to programs of massive deficit spending, i.e., they had to borrow money, by issuing government bonds, to finance welfare expenditures on a large scale.

Under a gold standard, the amount of credit that an economy can support is determined by the economy's tangible assets, since every credit instrument is ultimately a claim on some tangible asset. But government bonds are not backed by tangible wealth, only by the government's promise to pay out of future tax revenues, and cannot easily be absorbed by the financial markets. A large volume of new government bonds can be sold to the public only at progressively higher interest rates. Thus, government deficit spending under a gold standard is severely limited.

The abandonment of the gold standard made it possible for the welfare statists *to use the banking system* as a means to an unlimited expansion of credit. They have created paper reserves in the form of government bonds which—through a complex series of steps—the banks accept in place of tangible assets and treat as if they were an actual deposit, i.e., as the equivalent of what was formerly a deposit of gold. The holder of a government bond or of a bank deposit created by paper reserves believes that he has a valid claim on a real asset. But the fact is that there are now more claims outstanding than real assets.

The law of supply and demand is not to be conned. As the supply of money (of claims) increases relative to the supply of tangible assets in the economy, prices must eventually rise. Thus the earnings saved by the productive members of the society lose value in terms of goods. When the economy's books are finally balanced, one finds that this loss in value represents the goods purchased by the government for welfare or other purposes with the money proceeds of the government bonds financed by bank credit expansion.

In the absence of the gold standard, there is no way to protect savings from confiscation through inflation. There is no safe store of value. If there were, the government would have to make its holding illegal, as was done in the case of gold. If everyone decided, for example, to convert all their bank deposits to silver or copper or any other good, and thereafter declined to accept checks as payment for goods, bank deposits would lose their purchasing power and government-created bank credit would be worthless as a claim on goods. The financial policy of the welfare state requires that there be no way for the owners of wealth to protect themselves.

This is the shabby secret of the welfare statists' tirades against gold. Deficit spending is simply a scheme for the "hidden" confiscation of wealth. Gold stands in the way of this insidious process. It stands as a protector of property rights. If one grasps this, one has no difficulty in understanding the statists' antagonism toward the gold standard.

FAST BREEDER REACTOR

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Atomic Energy Commission's draft environmental impact statement on the fast breeder nuclear reactor is totally inadequate. The President's Council on Environmental Quality should force the AEC to withdraw the present draft statement.

The Council on Environmental Quality oversees the preparation of environmental impact statements and their evaluation. The AEC has done such an incredibly sloppy job that the present draft should be withdrawn and an entirely new draft impact statement be written. Of course, the Council on Environmental Quality has no specific authority to require withdrawal of the statement but they sure can jawbone and they should in this case.

Recently, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas halted a Corps of Engineers dam project based on CEQ's disapproval of the draft environmental impact statement. Based on Mr. Justice Douglas' decision I believe that CEQ should pressure the AEC to withdraw this statement.

In the decision Justice Douglas wrote:

The Council on Environmental Quality, ultimately responsible for the administration of NEPA and most familiar with its requirements for environmental impact statements, has taken the unequivocal position that the statement in this case is deficient . . . that agency determination is entitled to great weight.

Mr. Justice Douglas concluded, based on CEQ's opposition, that the Warm Springs Dam project in California should be halted.

Mr. Speaker there are a number of deficiencies in the current draft environmental impact statement which require rewriting of the current draft statement. The present statement fails to consider the hazards involved in a nuclear reactor which produced large amounts of plutonium. The AEC has failed to consider the adequacy of safeguards to prevent theft of highly poisonous plutonium by terrorist groups or the possibility of someone stealing enough plutonium to build a crude nuclear bomb.

The impact statement provides no policy options to the development of the fast breeder reactor. Although some alternative source of energy such as solar energy and light water nuclear reactors were discussed at length in the statement, specific policy options or alternatives were never developed by the AEC in the draft environmental impact statement.

Similarly, the economic analysis of the fast breeder reactor prepared by the AEC is misleading at best. The cost-benefit analysis assumed that the cost of the fast breeder reactor will decrease because of so-called learning curves lowering the cost of reactors over time. But, at the same time, the study assumed that there is no decrease in the cost of conventional or light water nuclear reactors as a result of learning curves. Based on the alleged decrease in cost of the fast breeder reactor, the AEC claims the fast breeder is more economical. Mr. Speaker, this is phony economics. In addition, the cost-benefit analysis assumed growth rates in electricity demand are simply too high. The study says that the United States would double its consumption of electricity every 10 years and based its conclusions that the fast breeder reactor is economically sound on that assumption.

A number of Federal agencies including the Federal Energy Office and the National Science Foundation have not reviewed or commented on the draft statement in apparent violation of the National Environmental Policy Act. These agencies have primary responsibility for Project Independence and the development of alternatives. No final statement should be issued until they have commented on the draft.

In order for the AEC to conform with the spirit and the letter of the NEPA, this draft environmental impact statement should be withdrawn, rewritten and resubmitted for comments. I am enclosing a copy of my letter to CEQ Chairman Peterson. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1974.

Mr. RUSSELL W. PETERSON,
Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PETERSON: I am writing to you today in order to request that the Council on Environmental Quality take the necessary steps to obtain the withdrawal of the current draft environmental impact statement on the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR) program. I believe an entirely new draft environmental impact statement should be written by the AEC and reviewed by all relevant governmental agencies.

I am aware that the Council on Environmental Quality has no specific statutory or regulatory authority to require withdrawal of the statement. But I would like to draw your attention to a recent decision by Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas in the case *Warm Springs Dam Task Force et al.* v. *Lt. General William C. Gribble, Jr., et al.* Mr. Justice Douglas wrote: "the Council on Environmental Quality, ultimately responsible for the administration of NEBA and most familiar with its requirements for environmental impact statements, has taken the unequivocal position that the statement in this case is deficient . . . that agency determination is entitled to great weight."

Based on this recent decision by Supreme Court Justice Douglas and the inadequacy of the current draft statement, I hope that the CEQ will make every effort to persuade the AEC to withdraw and rewrite the LMFBR draft environmental impact statement.

I believe that the current draft environmental impact statement is deficient since it fails to consider the hazards involved in a nuclear reactor which produces large amounts of plutonium. The AEC has, in fact, failed to consider the adequacy of safeguards

to prevent the theft of highly toxic plutonium by terrorist groups or the possibility of someone stealing enough plutonium to build a crude nuclear bomb. The impact statement also provides no policy options to the development of the Fast Breeder Reactor. Although some alternative sources of energy such as solar energy and light water nuclear reactors are discussed at length, specific policy options or alternatives were never fully developed by the AEC in the draft environmental impact statement.

Similarly, a cost-benefit analysis prepared for the Fast Breeder Reactor draft environmental impact statement is misleading at best. The study assumes the cost of the Liquid Metal Fast Breeder Reactor will decrease because of a so-called learning curve lowering the cost of reactors over time. But, at the same time the study assumes that there is no decrease in cost for the conventional or light water nuclear reactor as the result of the learning curve. Based on the alleged decrease in cost of the Fast Breeder Reactor, the AEC claims that the Fast Breeder is more economical. Also, the cost-benefit analysis assumes growth rates of electricity demands are simply too high. I am sure that you and the staff of the CEQ will agree that the U.S. should avoid doubling its consumption of electricity every ten years.

Finally, a number of federal agencies including the Federal Energy Administration and the National Science Foundation have not reviewed or commented on the draft environmental impact statement in apparent violation of the National Environmental Policy Act. These agencies have primary responsibility for Project Independence and the development of one alternative—solar energy. No final statement should be issued until they have commented on the draft statement.

In view of the total inadequacy of the current draft environmental impact statement and the CEQ's responsibility to oversee the proper implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act, I hope that you can persuade the AEC to withdraw its current draft environmental impact statement.

I hope that you could arrange for members of your staff to meet with members of my staff regarding this problem before any final decision is made by the CEQ concerning the disposition of the current AEC draft environmental impact statement.

Thank you very much for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the limitations which the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1974 (H.R. 16090) sets on individual contributions may make it even more difficult than it now is for a challenger to unseat an incumbent candidate.

An unknown challenger often may not have access to the large number of potential contributors to which the incumbent has access. The challenger may be dependent for initial "seed" money on a few contributors, and, accordingly, may compensate for this disadvantage only by initially soliciting relatively large sums from these few contributors. Three or four contributions of $2,500–$3,000 each may often determine whether the challenger's campaign even gets off the ground.

Therefore, under House Resolution 1292 I wish to give notice of the following:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MS. HOLTZMAN

Page 2, line 12, strike out "$1,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 16090, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MS. HOLTZMAN

Page 2, line 12, strike out "$1,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500".

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY ARCHIBALD COX DELIVERED AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last few days have produced a great deal of dismay on both sides of the aisle. It may be of particular value, therefore, to note some optimistic and affirmative comments on the system, delivered recently by a great American student of our system of government.

These comments were made in an address to the graduating class of Stanford University on June 16, 1974, by the Honorable Archibald Cox, former Special Prosecutor:

CAN THE SYSTEM WORK?

(Commencement address by Archibald Cox, Williston Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, delivered at Stanford University June 16, 1974.)

I am very greatly honored by the invitation to join in your Commencement. Pleased also, but a little taken aback. Taken aback because of uncertainty about the function of a commencement address by a professor. If four or more years of professional lectures have failed to do the trick, what can one more professor—dare I say, "even a Harvard professor"—add in 20 minutes?

Let me explain the orgins of my talk.

Last October during the press conference which preceded my departure from Washington I was asked why I accepted the post of Special Prosecutor. I gave my explanation and then observed:

Besides, I have a sort of naive belief that right will prevail in the end. Later a young woman at Columbia demanded to know the ground for this belief.

A little later President Lyman's invitation arrived, and it occurred to me that this might be a good occasion to explain my confidence that the little bit one can do in his own time makes it worth preserving in the effort.

Let us begin with the immediate and then gradually broaden the focus.

The immediate is Watergate. If one's attention becomes transfixed by the seamy side, he is likely to conclude that passion arrogant grasping for power, cynicism and distrust have eroded self-government, while obstructionism and the misdeeds of lawyers are destroying confidence in the administration of justice. I am one of those who also sees at stake two ancient principles of liberty: 1) that the law applies to all men equally, the judges as well as the judged, the governors no less than the governed; 2) that the Executive, which means the President, be under the law. But there is another side to Watergate. It proved that the nation has a conscience. It is more important that our idealism is a live and vital force than to learn once again that some men have proved untrustworthy.

I would also mention that there is another side to government. Hugh Sloan of the Committee to Re-Elect the President was entirely wrong when he said:

If you go into politics . . . then sooner or later you have to compromise. You either compromise or get out. It just, sooner or later, takes the edge off your values.

Hugh Sloan was wrong because he could not distinguish—or did not distinguish—political aims and political opinions from judgments of right and wrong, from the moral limitations whose observance is essential in the long-run legitimacy of political power. In the realm of policy one must often take half-a-loaf or even a quarter-loaf with a view to coming back for more tomorrow. Compromise is unavoidable if conflicting goals and rival interests in any free society are to be merged. This kind of compromise in the interests of the whole society requires no surrender of moral values. Anyone who has been in government knows many men and women, in offices both high and low, who faithfully observe the line between policy and moral principle; and by their conduct they gain both respect and power. In Leland Stanford's time the widest scope for the exercise of a man's vital powers lay in taming the wilderness, in developing America's riches, and in building financial and industrial empires. Today without a doubt it lies in government, because government, in our kind of country, is simply all of us trying to live together.

Let us broaden the focus slightly.

This June brings my 40th reunion, and I cannot help making a few random comparisons which I think meaningful. In 1934 Hitler's storm troopers were moving toward their zenith with brutality and oppression for all but the master race. The scourge of infantile paralysis still killed tens of thousands of children and doomed more to lives with crippled limbs. The minimum factory wage was not yet 25 cents an hour. There was no social security, no medicare. Men were supposed to be independent and self-reliant, but 20% of the work force, one out of five, were unemployed.

During the past 40 years we have accomplished two social and political revolutions peacefully within the existing frame of government.

One was the New Deal. The practice and theory of government were revolutionized. Laissez-faire yielded to social responsibility. Industry and labor were brought under a measure of control. Industrial workers gained new opportunities and new protection. A vast transfer of economic and political power was accomplished. Some of the power has slipped back, I fear, but the transfer was nonetheless tremendous, and much of the transfer remains.

Next came the civil rights revolution—again within the rule of law. On May 17 this year we celebrated the 20th anniversary of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. After that State laws enforcing a caste system based upon race were invalidated, and enforcement gradually stopped. New doctrines were developed to extend the reach of the Equal Protection Clause. New federal statutes were enacted curtailing practices restricting equal voting rights, denying equal accommodations, denying equal employment opportunities, and assuring equal housing.

The application of the equal protection clause to the black people led to revived concern with other inequalities in our national life, especially discrimination based upon sex.

Granted that the tasks are unfinished, granted too that resulting bureaucracy seems remote and hard to mangae, still may we not

have confidence in a system that can peacefully produce two great egalitarian revolutions within 40 years and also within a framework of constitutionalism?

Let us expand the focus still further for a moment. Thursday I ask a friend whether he could lend me a ready-made commencement address. He replied, "Can you think of a better time to be alive?" And I ask you—can you?

In the Elizabethan Age perhaps. Those were years of boisterous confidence and extraordinary creativity, but also of disease, poverty, ignorance and extraordinary cruelty. Men were hanged for scores of petty crimes. The populace turned out in joy to see men burned, spitted alive, or drawn and quartered. You may say that we kill more efficiently on a larger scale now, but at least we have grown squeamish and kill from a distance, and we do it only when we call it war.

Perhaps you would wish to live with the Founding Fathers. That was another extraordinary age. A contemporary described Jefferson as "a gentleman of 32 [years], who could calculate an eclipse, survey an estate, tie an artery, plan an edifice, try a cause, break a horse, dance the minuet, and play the violin." Two years later, of course, he wrote the Declaration of Independence and built our faith in the common man. I think I would like to have lived in that age if I could have been Thomas Jefferson or John Adams or Alexander Hamilton.

But suppose that one were not Thomas Jefferson but a slave, or an indentured servant, or an impressed seaman, or a woman dying alone in childbirth in a sod hut in a remote forest clearing. I think I'd rather draw my lot today.

I think next of the Hellenes. They breathed freedom and had a nobler view of man than ours even though they also faced grief, death and sorrow without papering over the facts of their condition. But the facts are that citizens of Athens built their state upon the backs of slaves, and there was also Sparta as well as Athens.

I grant you that it is harder than it used to be to have confidence in the system. Time has destroyed many of our illusions. The quick conquest of a continent and the Horatio Alger story bred a folklore of endless resources and easy success. For all but the unfortunate, technology and industrial organization poured out a seemingly endless flow of material comforts. American might in two wars led us to suppose that our power extended to the farthest reaches of the globe. Now we see our cities become unlivable; the succession of cars, television sets and refrigerators proves a wasteland. Our power in the world is limited. We have lost our innocence and learned our capacity for evil, witness the bombs dropped on Southeast Asia and the discrepancy that still exists between our pretenses and practices in the treatment of blacks, chicanos and native Americans.

All this is true, and we should face up to it. But I do think in order to maintain our sense of proportion we may also recall that the speed of communication, the vivid frightening and sickening pictures on the television screen, and the social consciences of editors and newsmen make us aware of wrongs and suffering that in the past were simply beyond the individual's ken. That our awareness has expanded and our concern has increased put us two steps ahead. Too much of the press seems obsessed with whatever is wrong, with the violent, the perverse and the abnormal, to give us a fair perspective.

Contemporary literature and the arts tell of men the absurd, the pervert, the drop-out, but rarely man the hero, or even the tragic—for the tragic requires a degree of nobility and few current authors see nobility in man. It is also harder to bear the wrongs and cruelties attributable to human shortcomings. In the past, misfortune and suffering were as inexorable as sowing and reaping, or birth and death.

Should the plague come, should the crops fail, still one could say with the Psalmist, "The judgments of the Lord are righteous altogether." The sense of inevitability is gone. Man feels that man is in charge. And he is in charge as never before in history. So we now have to face the perception simply expressed by Pogo: "We have met the enemy, and it is us."

Harder to face—yes. But also a moment in time for a burst of idealism and optimism—and for staying power. Never before has any substantial part of the world been freed from the pressures of unremitting struggle for food, clothing and shelter. In the U.S. and most of Europe three of the four forces of the apocalypse have retreated; ignorance, disease and poverty—all except war; and war is now as always within human control and only the result of human perversity.

So it is mostly in our own hands and the question becomes, what view of man will you take from here? Errant, stumbling, selfish, indifferent to cruelty, and often cruel himself; in all perhaps very little above the brute. Yes, but I say, still above the brute. As we read history, we can see individual men and women rise to just below the angels: Pericles, Michelangelo, St. Francis of Assisi, Abraham Lincoln, Martin Luther King. A true list would have no end. Consider too man's vision of man's potential: Prometheus of Greek mythology, for example, or the gentle spirit of the Sermon on the Mount. Such dreams and such individuals are part of us, I submit to you; they are our potential.

In what I am trying to say there are no "saving truths," no guarantees, no answers to the staggering problems that confront us and all the world. But perhaps one can take from the university not only a sense of perspective but an attachment to a way of life. Woodrow Wilson called it "the spirit of learning":

What we should seek to impart in our colleges, therefore, is not so much learning itself as the spirit of learning.

The physical scientist knows that too bow before the burning bush is no substitute for the patient exploration of observable data and the constant checking and rechecking of induced hypotheses. The historian and humanist know that the record of human experience is replete with proof that some of the greatest wrongs have been done and many of the most civilizing and liberalizing ideas have been suppressed in the names of Truth and Conscience. The "spirit of learning" is the way of freedom and reason, of mutual trust, civility and respect for one another.

As the scholar does not know the truth he seeks, as he lacks assurance that there is a truth and knows only that by putting one foot before the other, despite false starts and blind alleys, he makes a little progress, so upon our joint human adventure we do not know the goal, we have no proof there is a goal but can catch glimpses of a bright potential and perhaps can see that by reason, mutual trust and forbearance, man can learn to walk a little straighter.

These qualities might not matter so much, I suppose, if we were content with authority, uniformity, and security of a sort for the conformist. But if men—and women too—are of equal dignity and worth, if though destined to live and work together our goal is the freedom of each to choose the best he can discern, if we seek to do what we can to move toward the realization of these beliefs, then authority will not suffice and some means must be found to mediate between the self-interested, passionate factions, each convinced of its righteousness and each demanding all for itself and the extinction of all opposition. Yet the only means consonant with freedom—so far as discovered—is to impart to the State and its citizens what Wilson called the "spirit of decency":

The spirit of learning is the way of freedom and of reason, of even-handed inquiry, of civility, and respect for one another. The spirit of learning is willing to reach conclusions, act upon them, until a better hypothesis appears, yet it is spirit that is not so sure that it is right.

I take your time for just one current example:

We are now shaping for future generations the instruments for dealing with wrongdoing by a President's close associates and the only instrument with which to deal with a President alleged to be fundamentally unfaithful to his trust.

We need to restore above all else our confidence in the honesty and integrity of our government, which in our country, of course, means our confidence in ourselves. The manner in which the further investigations of the impeachment proceedings is conducted, the role of reason, the degree of impartiality, the degree of effort to achieve justice, will affect our self-confidence more than the vote.

In the heyday of Joseph McCarthy 20-odd years ago, the intellectual world, including the press, was properly outspoken about the danger of *ex parte* accusation, about the unfairness of planting stories in the press without adequate opportunity for reply, and about the lack of true adversary proceedings.

Last Wednesday morning the newspapers told of an interview with a member of the House Judiciary Committee, in which he asserted that the Committee had "proof positive" that the Secretary of State ordered wire-taps upon the members of the staff of the National Security Council but when asked to reveal the proof, he replied that to give out the proof would be improper. Several weeks earlier someone on the staff or a member of the Ervin Committee gave the press proposed findings of guilt upon men under indictment and awaiting trial. The similar incidents have been too numerous to excuse them by careless slips of the tongue alone. Still we read no editorials condemning current *ex parte* accusations, "leaks" to the press, and judgment without true adversary proceedings.

Are they now any less unfair than they were 20 years ago? Do not misunderstand me—my brief is with the prosecution. I think that liberty was at stake and the kind of abuse that investigation has proven occurred in high places deserves only contempt and punishment of those found guilty.

Procedural fairness does not depend upon whose ox is gored.

So I hope that you will take from here a sense of the value of method and a long view. Youth measures in only one direction, we are told: from things as they are to an ideal of what things ought to be; while the old measure things as they are against the past they remember. The students of recent years belonged to an extraordinarily idealistic, honest and courageous generation: idealistic enough to see what can be, honest enough to face the gap between what is and what can be, and courageous enough to seek instant correction.

I hope that you will never become patient about the gap between what is and what ought to be.

But of course the "boob-tube" is misleading and the millennium cannot be achieved at once. As in the past, most men and women go blundering along, some inept, but doing the best they can; some selfish, power-hungry, and all of them possessing the capacity for evil. I have heard it said that today's classes, in their discouragement, retreated from idealism and commitment. Their style has changed, I think, but I doubt that there is a loss of underlying commitment.

But honesty and disappointment with failure to achieve the millennium should not lead to obsession with whatever is bad, and so to cynicism and despair, or to escape into the perverse and abnormal.

For those who take the long view of man's experience will find that from time to time there were other societies no less honest and courageous than ours in facing all the ugli-

ness, cruelty and indifference that the mirror reveals, but which also held a brighter, nobler view of man, and had the greater courage to pursue the vision.

And perhaps, if you compare where we are with where we have been, as well as where we ought to be, you will conclude that even if you cannot bring about the millennium, still we can help each other to suffer a little less and learn to walk a little straighter.

I can give you no assurance even of that, but I can and do promise you joy in the endeavor.

MONTHLY CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD each month the monthly calendar of the Smithsonian Institution. The August calendar of events follows:

AUGUST AT THE SMITHSONIAN

THURSDAY, AUGUST 1

DEMONSTRATION.—Jewelry-making demonstrated by Stephen Bondi, of Catholic University. Finished pieces are also displayed, 1 to 4 p.m. The Renwick Gallery. In conjunction with the current exhibition on contemporary goldsmithing. FREE.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 2

REHABILITATION MEDICINE FILM.—*Wonder Engine of the Body; Heart to Heart;* and *Kevin Is Four.* 12:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Films are scheduled each Friday in conjunction with the current exhibition *Triumph Over Disability.*

SUNDAY, AUGUST 4

ORIENTAL RUGS AND BRUNCH.—Discussion of oriental rugs by Anthony Landreau, Director of the Textile Museum. Mr. Landreau will also examine and identify rugs brought in by participants. Brunch and music will be provided in the gardens. 11 a.m. The Textile Museum. $15.50.*

SUMMER SHORTS.—*Song of the Prairie* by Jiri Trnka; *Castro Street* by Bruce Baillie; *Buccaneer Bunny; Mint Tea; Calder's Circus* with Alexander Calder; *Energy* by Tim Huntley. 3:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. $1.25.*

TUESDAY, AUGUST 6

PHILATELIC DEDICATORY LECTURE.—*Chautauqua,* by Dr. Keith Melder, former Smithsonian Curator of Political History and currently consultant in American History to the New York State Historical Association. This lecture marks the issuance of a "Rural America" stamp at Chautauqua, New York, and the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Chautauqua Institution, especially known for its traveling tent that brought the best in entertainment and oratory to the rural areas of America, 8 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Cosponsored by the Smithsonian Institution and The Postal Service. FREE.

MUSEUM TALK: *FDR.—Our Stamp Collecting President.* Speaker: Franklin R. Bruns, Jr., Associate Curator, Postal History, 12:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. FREE.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7

RESEARCH FELLOWS LECTURE.—*The Image of the Black in 19th Century American Painting,* by Karen Adams, doctoral candidate, Emory University. Final lecture in the series presented by NCFA Research Fellows as a result of their dissertation research. 12:30 p.m. National Collection of Fine Arts. FREE.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 8

CREATIVE SCREEN.—*Aurum*—an exploration of the age-old attraction for gold and its transformation into treasures. *Of Jewels and Gold*—intricate pieces of jewelry created in the studios of international designers and goldsmiths. Complete program begins 11 a.m., 12:15, and 1:30 p.m. The Renwick Gallery. FREE.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 9

NEW INSTALLATION.—*20th Century Painting and Sculpture.* Artists include Joe Shannon, Fritz Scholder and Billy Morrow Jackson. Works are primarily from the NCFA collections, with some on loan for the special showing. National Collection of Fine Arts, through September 29.

REHABILITATION MEDICINE FILMS.—*Modern Medicine Looks at the Heart;* and *The School that Love Built.* 12:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. FREE.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 11

ORIENTAL RUGS AND BRUNCH.—Anthony Landreau, Director of the Textile Museum, discusses oriental rugs and examines those rugs brought in by participants. Brunch will be served, with music also provided. 11 a.m. The Textile Museum. $15.50.*

SUMMER SHORTS.—*Snow White* with Betty Boop; *Peege* with Barbara Rush; *Time Piece* by Jim Hinton; *The Mad Baker; Fall Creek* by Jon Jost; *Melies.* 3:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, Museum of History and Technology. $1.25.*

EXHIBITION.—*The Message Makers.* An examination of the decision making process used in the selection of messages in the four media—TV, radio, films and newspapers. Examples from each of the media are in the exhibit including photos, slides, video tape, teletype. Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, through October 27.

MONDAY, AUGUST 12

BALLET SERIES.—George Gelles conducts a series on contemporary dance focusing on the Joffrey Ballet, the José Limon Dance Company and the Paul Taylor Dance Company. Films, open discussions and performances by local dancers are included. Among the performers will be Elly Canterbury, Diane Frank and Marcia Sakamoto. 7:30 p.m. Reception Suite, History and Technology Building. Remaining programs in the series will be held on August 19 and 26. $16.*

TUESDAY, AUGUST 13

MUSEUM TALK.—*Sizes, Shapes and Uses of Stamps.* Speaker: Reidar Norby, Associate Curator, Postal History. 12:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. FREE.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 15

CREATIVE SCREEN.—*Aurum;* and *Of Jewels and Gold.* Repeat program. Showings at 11 a.m., 12:15 and 1:30 p.m. See August 8 for details. FREE.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 16

EXHIBITION.—*Horatio W. Shaw.* Twenty-five paintings and ten drawings by Shaw (1847–1918), a little-known farmer-painter of the late 19th century. Shaw's strong sense of design and obsessive attention to detail give great force and vitality to the environment of the Michigan farm area. National Collection of Fine Arts, through February 2, 1975.

DRAWING DINOSAURS.—A drawing class for children, conducted by Barbara Price, instructor at the Corcoran School of Art. Students use the models and actual skeletons of dinosaurs to create their own series of drawings. Designed for ages 8–12. 8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m. $4.*

REHABILITATION MEDICINE FILMS.—*Candidate for a Stroke;* and *Toward Tomorrow.* 12:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. FREE.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 18

SUMMER SHORTS.—*1970* by Scott Bartlett; *Trouble Indemnity* with Mr. Magoo; *Two* by Robert Bean; *The Mysterians; The House* by Louis van Gasteren. Complete program begins 3:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. $1.25.*

MONDAY, AUGUST 19

BALLET SERIES.—Second in a three-part series conducted by George Gelles, with films, open discussion and performances by local dancers. See August 4 for details.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 20

MUSEUM TALK.—*How New Is the New Math?* Speaker: Elaine Koppelman, Post-Doctoral Research Fellow, Section of Mathematics. 12:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. FREE.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 23

CHILDREN'S WORKSHOP.—Students create a mural based on the favorite tales of *Through the Looking Glass* and *Alice in Wonderland.* Movement and expression in their visual interpretation is enhanced by the students acting out the characters. All materials are provided. Conducted by Bonnie Webb, of the Resident Associates Program. 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. Designed for ages 5–7. $4.*

REHABILITATION MEDICINE FILMS.—*Back on the Job; Help for Young Hearts; The Way Back.* 12:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 25

SUMMER SHORTS.—*Jump Rope* by the Computer Image Corp.; *The Making of Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid; Scram* with Laurel and Hardy, 3:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Tecnology, $1,25.*

RECITAL.—*The National Capital Chapter of the Tubists Universal Brotherhood Association* (TUBA) in a debut recital of music for tuba ensembles and tuba with piano. 3 p.m. Hall of Musical Instruments, History and Technology Building. FREE.

MONDAY, AUGUST 26

BALLET SERIES.—Final program in a three-part series conducted by George Gelles, with films, open discussion and performances by local dancers. See August 4 for details.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 27

MUSEUM TALK.—*19th Century Household Textiles in America.* Speaker: Rita J. Adrosko, Curator, Textiles. 12:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 28

SUPPER CONCERT.—*The Potomac Brass Quintet,* in a program of Baroque music by Pezel, Reiche, and Scheidt, with additional works by Bach, Mozart, Gabrieli, Franckenpohl. A selection written for the quintet by Washington composer Russell Woolen will also be performed. 8 p.m. Courtyard, Fine Arts and Portrait Gallery Building. Cold box lunch and wine will be served. $11.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 30

REHABILITATION MEDICINE FILMS.—*Better Odds for a Longer Life; Because She Lived;* and *Children and Language Disorders.* 12:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium History and Technology Building. FREE.

DISCOVERY ROOM

Museum of Natural History: An area where visitors of all ages can touch, handle and smell a wide variety of natural history specimens of all shapes and sizes ranging from whale fossils to petrified wood. Now open seven days a week—Monday through Thursday: 12 noon to 2:30. Friday through Sunday: 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. On weekends, free tickets are required and may be picked up at the rotunda Info desk.

DOCENT APPLICANTS

Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden

Applications are being accepted for docent tour guides at the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. Those persons selected will be required to take one course in modern

Footnote at end of article.

art history as well as attend at least five tours of the museum during the fall. Training will then be given at the Hirshhorn in January. For further details call the Education Office, 381-6713.

INFORMATION VOLUNTEERS NEEDED

The fall recruitment is currently under way for Smithsonian Information Volunteers to staff desks in all of the museums on the Mall, including the new Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. The program operates seven days a week and requires a minimum of three hours of service weekly. For information, call 381-6264, by September 1.

DOCENT TOUR GUIDES

Docent tour guides are needed at the Museum of History and Technology, Museum of Natural History, and the Air and Space Building. Training will begin on September 10. Applications are currently being accepted. Call Magda Schremp, 381-6471, for further information.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Museum of History and Technology

Spinning and Weaving—Tuesday through Thursday, 10 a.m.–2 p.m., 1st floor.

Printing and Typefounding: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, 2–4 p.m., 3rd floor.

Musical Instruments. A selection of 18th and 19th century instruments, and American folk instruments, Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor, 1:30 p.m., Mondays and Fridays—keyboard; Thursday—folk.

MUSEUM TOURS

Walk-In Tours—Monday through Friday through August 23.

Museum of History and Technology. Every half hour beginning 10:30 a.m. Last tour 4:30 p.m.

National Air and Space Museum. Every 45 minutes beginning 10:15 a.m. Last tour 3:45 p.m. Tours begin in the Air and Space Building and include the Arts and Industries Building.

Pre-Arranged Group Tours—Call 381–6471.

Highlights of the Museum of History and Technology, Museum of Natural History, or National Air and Space Museum.

EXPIRIMENTARIUM

Air and Space Building

TO SEE THE EARTH AS IT TRULY IS. A new show that begins in Washington, D.C., travels past the moon, the solar system, the Milky Way galaxy to a hypothetical distant cluster of galaxies, and looks back at each point to see the earth and its place in the universe. Tuesdays through Sundays, 11 a.m., 12 noon, 1, 2:30, 3:30 and 4:30 p.m. Please note: Shows start promptly, and doors cannot be opened for late arrivals. The show lasts 33 minutes.

RECENTLY OPENED

CONTEMPORARY COUNTERPARTS OF EARLY AMERICAN CRAFTSMEN.—Hal Painter. A handwoven knotted wool tapestry created by Painter, a weaver from Oregon. The tapestry combines modern idiom and traditional technique, demonstrating the relationship of today's sophisticated craftsmenship to that of colonial times. Through Labor Day. Museum of History and Technology.

AMERICAN ETCHING OF THE 1880's.—Special exhibit area, Hall of Printing and Graphic Arts. Museum of History and Technology. Through September 30.

MAN MADE MOBILE.—THE WESTERN SADDLE: Sixteen examples of equestrian mobile seating from the Persian-Moorish type of the 1500's to the modern saddle. Slide and other illustrations show how the saddle enabled pioneers to develop the West and how mobile seating is used today in modern vehicles. Through January 4, 1976. The Renwick Gallery.

JEWELRY FIT FOR A QUEEN.—Fifteen royal and nonroyal gems, crowns and jewelry, including the earrings of Marie Antoinnette, an imperial Russian nuptial crown with 1535 diamonds, an emerald and diamond *Inquisition Necklace* and an evening bag covered with approximately 100 seed pearls per square inch. Many of the pieces are from the collection of the late Marjorie Merriweather Post. Museum of Natural History.

INSECT ZOO

Live insects and arachnids—including ants, bees, termites, tarantulas, and a wide variety of other local species—are exhibited with insect zookeepers on hand to explain the habits and background of each. National Museum of Natural History, through August.

DOMESTIC STUDY TOURS

For information on the following tours, contact Mrs. Howe, Room 106–SI, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20650, or call 381–5910.

North Carolina Crafts: Aug. 18–24, 1974.
Iceland: Aug. 17–31, 1974.
Northwest: Sept. 8–18, 1974.
"All About Antiques": Oct. 12–19, 1974.

HOURS

Open 7 days a week

Freer Gallery of Art, National Collection of Fine Arts, National Portrait Gallery, The Renwick Gallery, Smithsonian Institution Building—10 a.m.–5:30 p.m.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum—10 a.m. 6 p.m. Monday through Friday; 1–6 p.m. weekends.

Extended Hours through Labor Day:

Arts and Industries Building, National Air and Space Museum, National Museum of History and Technology, and the National Museum of Natural History—10 a.m. to 9 p.m.

Deadline for September calendar entries: August 5. The Smithsonian Monthly Calendar of Events is prepared by the Office of Public Affairs, Editor: Lilas Wiltshire.

RADIO SMITHSONIAN

Radio Smithsonian, a program of music and conversation growing out of the Institution's many activities, is broadcast every Sunday on WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9–9:30 p.m. The program schedule for August 4th, 11th, 18th, 25th respectivley:

Are There Evil Forces in Our Society? Part two of a discussion featuring psychiatrists Rollo May, Thayer Green, and Charles Taylor.—Aug. 4.

First Man on the Moon: Five Years Later. The Apollo 11 astronauts at the Smithsonian to celebrate the fifth anniversary of their historical trip to the moon.—Aug. 11.

The 1974 Festival of American Folk-life, Part I. Highlights of the music and people that make the Folk-life Festival one of the Smithsonian's most popular events.—Aug. 18.

The 1974 Festival of American Folk-life, Part II.—Aug. 25.

Use of funds for printing this publication approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, June 3, 1971.

TOURS, CLASSES AND WORKSHOPS

Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program

Fall classes for both children and adults begin in August. For a complete schedule and registration openings, call 381–6722.

Walking tours around the Washington area, as well as day and weekend tours are scheduled. For further information on these and other Associates tours, call 381–5157.

DIAL-A-PHENOMENON.—737–8855 for weekly announcements on stars, planets and worldwide occurrences of short-lived natural phenomena.

DIAL-A-MUSEUM.—737–8811 for daily announcements on new exhibits and special events.

PUPPETRY WORKSHOP

Two-week workshops conducted by Allan Stevens, for both children and adults. Each workshop consists of six sessions. All materials are included. Dates given are beginning dates.

Aug. 12—Teens and Adults (ages 13 and over). 7:30–9:30 p.m., Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday. $50.

Aug. 13—Children (ages 6–12), 10 a.m.–12 noon. Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. $30.

For reservations, call 381–5395.

FOOTNOTE

* Indicates programs sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program. Discounts are available for members and students. For attendance or other information call 381-5157. Unless otherwise indicated, tickets should be purchased in advance.

A YOUNG MAN'S UNTIRING EFFORTS TO SAVE THE NEW RIVER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, no individual has worked harder in our effort to save the New River than Mr. Bill Painter, director of the American Rivers Conservation Council. This young man's untiring efforts have been an inspiration to all of us who wish to save the New River.

I would like to share with my colleagues Mr. Painter's thoughtful statement delivered before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation during hearings on legislation to provide for a study of a section of the New River in Virginia and North Carolina for possible inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System:

STATEMENT OF BILL PAINTER, DIRECTOR, AMERICAN RIVERS CONSERVATION COUNCIL

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Parks and Recreation Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you in support of H.R. 11120 which would add a section of the beautiful New River in North Carolina and Virginia to the study category under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Perhaps the most unique feature of this river is its age, estimated at some 100 million years, making it one of the very oldest rivers in the world. It was once part of the mighty Teays River, which was forever altered by the action of glaciers during the last ice age.

Another outstanding aspect of the river is the fantastic botanical diversity found in the forests and fields of the surrounding countryside. This too is partly the result of the glaciers of the ice age, which created a mix of plant life characteristic of the northern and southern regions of our country. Furthermore, the *Manual of Vascular Flora of the Carolinas* by Radford, Ahles and Bell identifies some 8 rare species found in the area of North Carolina through which the river flows.

The New sports a significant fishery, with some 68 species of fish having been identified. Eleven of these species have been identified as rare and endangered. The North Carolina Department of Natural and Economic Resources has stated that the reach of the New in Ashe and Allegeny Counties is the largest and highest quality smallmouth bass fishery in the state.

Boating is popular along the New. It is mostly a gentle river which can be negotiated by persons with little skill, and a small degree of danger. There are, however some stretches of rapids which can provide exhilaration, but few risks. This is truly a river for all members of the family.

The New is a beautiful river, passing through mountain passes and wide valleys. Some areas are heavily forested, while others are dedicated to agriculture. The waters of the New are pure—one of the largest clean free flowing rivers left in the eastern U.S. The scenic qualities of the New were sited in *Virginia's Scenic Rivers*, a report of the Virginia Commission of Outdoor Recreation.

In conclusion, we feel that this stretch of the New River is more than qualified for inclusion in the study category under section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. As the U.S. Environmental Protection has said, this is ". . . a major environmental resource of marked scenic, recreational and biological value. . . ." The American Rivers Conservation Council urges swift approval of H.R. 11120.

MARIHUANA USE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to discuss the serious problem of marihuana use as well as the current status of existing laws governing possession of this drug. This is a problem which has received much attention and publicity in recent years, and one which has a particularly powerful effect on millions of young people in this Nation.

It has been reliably estimated that between 12 and 20 million adolescents and young adults in this country use or have tried marihuana. In other terms, this means that roughly 7 million pounds of marihuana and hashish were consumed in the United States, and all indications point to the fact that this figure is growing daily.

It is in light of these startling and alarming statistics that I vigorously believe that this situation merits the serious attention of this Congress in terms of opposing any relaxation of the current marihuana laws.

There are many in this Nation who strongly advocate a less punitive law for the marihuana user, maintaining that our present drug policy only breeds further disrespect for the law and thus serves to exacerbate the problem even more. However, this same segment of our population has consistently failed to realize the significance of reports being circulated by scientists and doctors throughout the Nation who have testified to the serious and adverse effects of cannabis smoking.

One serious disclosure related to marihuana usage has been the findings that it has the effect of impairing the body's immunity system. According to noted physiologist and pharmacologist of Columbia University, Dr. Gabriel Nahas, cannabis smoking results in a lower production of white blood cells thereby lessening the body's important ability to combat disease. In addition, Prof. W.D.M. Paton, professor of pharmacology at Oxford University, has found that regular users can develop a tolerance for the drug, requiring higher levels to achieve satisfaction. Professor Paton further notes that marihuana and hashish use among children may result in a generation of young "old people," as cannabis interferes with cell division and metabolism and may affect adolescent development.

Perhaps the most startling and frightening discovery which has recently been uncovered by the medical world is the causal relation established between marihuana smoking and cancer, genetic mutation, and birth defects. Although additional investigation is expected in this area, Dr. Akira Morishima, a prominent member of the department of pediatrics staff at Columbia University, has found that such damaging effects may be attributed to an increase in the number of chromosomes in each cell. This shortage leaves the smoker with less than the normal complement of 46 chromosomes. Discoveries such as this one which will affect the future generations of our Nation's children are something we cannot continue to overlook.

Serious effects upon brain functions have also been discovered. Studies in England by a group of British investigators have uncovered a pattern of cerebral atrophy among heavy marihuana users, prompting their urgent appeal for intensive studies on the neurological consequences of drug abuse. These revelations appear to be quite serious, and the frequency of their disclosures by the scientific world is rising at a frightening rate.

Mental health hazards, too, must be considered when examining the adverse effects of marihuana usage. Both the American Medical Association's Council on Mental Health and the National Academy of Sciences have warned that cannabis is dangerous and a public health concern. More specifically, investigators at the Addiction Research Center in Lexington, Ky., have shown that the isolated chemically active ingredient of the cannabis group caused psychotic reactions in humans tested at the center. In addition, Drs. Harold Kolansky and William T. Moore, between the period of 1965 and 1970, noted a sizable increase in the numbers of individuals who showed the onset of psychiatric problems shortly after beginning marihuana usage. Those who used the drug more often showed serious psychological effects, sometimes complicated by neurologic signs and symptoms.

Such serious findings as these regarding the physical and mental well-being of millions of our young population certainly warrants all of our immediate and serious consideration. We are dealing with a grave health problem, one which requires action aimed at reducing the number of cannabis users, not at encouraging increased accessibility to marihuana. We must also recognize that we are not dealing solely with the marihuana problem, but with the whole macrocosm of drug abuse which afflicts our society today. Involvement with pot is only the first link in a chain leading to more serious drug abuse. To relax the laws prohibiting the use of marihuana would only serve to encourage increased pot smoking and a freer drug environment while failing to alleviate the numerous deleterious effects of the drug.

It is time for the Congress to finally adopt a firm stand in decisively resolving the current drug dilemma. Any sensible drug policy must begin with a logical evaluation and thoughtful recognition of the hazardous consequences of continued marihuana usage. Any legislation which attempts to ease the user's accessibility to marihuana only sidesteps this responsibility and constitutes an inexcusable disservice to the welfare of our youth. A serious and thorough examination of the overwhelming statistics of the current users as well as the accumulating reports by our Nation's experts of the damaging side effects of marihuana appear to me to be the most sobering evidence of the dire need for maintaining strict adherence to the present marihuana laws.

HAWAII CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION SAYS MAHALO TO AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the American School Food Service Association, an organization dedicated to improved child nutrition and a better school lunch program, is holding its 28th annual convention here in Washington, D.C. this week. ASFSA has extended an invitation to all Members of Congress to attend its convention and learn more about the association's vital work.

In this connection, ASFSA recently initiated Project Mahalo to say "thank you" to Members of the Congress for their past support of ASFSA's legislative program. Nancy Miura of Hawaii, the able chairman of Project Mahalo, is urging all of her committee members to invite their legislators to the association's banquet tonight. I might add that all four Members of the Hawaii congressional delegation have accepted her invitation. In fact, Hawaii was the first State to achieve a 100-percent response.

Mr. Speaker, it is we Members of Congress who ought to thank the American School Food Service Association for its leadership in the field of child nutrition. Surely, nothing could be more important to us as legislators than making sure that every child in America receives at least one balanced, nutritious meal every day. I hope that all of my colleagues will be able to attend tonight's banquet or a session of the ASFSA convention to learn more about the important work of the association and to say "Mahalo" (thank you in Hawaiian) to the members of ASFSA.

I am submitting for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief description of Project Mahalo published in the July/August edition of the School Foodservice Journal, the official publication of the American School Food Service Association:

DON'T FORGET TO SAY "MAHALO"

Mahalo is Hawaiian for "thank you" and Project Mahalo was designed as a program for ASFSA members attending convention to thank their representatives and senators in

the United States Congress for their support of or interest in school foodservice legislation.

Project Mahalo is a Public Information Committee project thought up by Chairman Nancy Miura from Hawaii (hence its name). Committee members hope that each state association and each chapter will contact its congressional delegation and invite them to participate in ASFA's 28th national convention.

Committee members have been urging states to personally invite legislators. "Explain who attends Convention and what normally takes place on the program. Tell them that by attending they will really go home with a better understanding of school lunch, child nutrition programs and the involvement and dedication behind school lunch."

State and chapter representatives have been urged to preregister congressional "mahalo" guests. Remember that this preregistration means only that your congressional members' names are listed as a prospective convention attendee. Send names of those congressmen preregistering to ASFA and ASFA will prepare a name tag for each. Congressional representatives will not be required to pay the convention fee.

Extra tickets for such events as the annual banquet will be available for those wishing to bring their congressmen to this event. Tickets will be $15 each. Hawaii was the first state to announce that its entire delegation will be at the banquet Wednesday night. But advance registration shows that delegations from all over the country will be in attendance.

If you haven't already, don't forget to say "Mahalo" to your state's congressmen!

THE BATTLE OVER FRANCONIA NOTCH RAGES ON

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. Speaker, the hard-fought battle over whether or not to extend Interstate Route 93 through Franconia Notch rages on. Franconia Notch, which is located in my congressional district, is nationally known for its spectacular scenery and as the home of the great natural face of stone known as the Old Man of the Mountain.

A crusade which has been launched by some "environmentalists" to prevent the extension of a scenic parkway as a section of I–93 through Franconia Notch has received a good deal of attention from some of the national media, including a recent article in the Sunday edition of the New York Times. I have been disheartened by the distorted coverage which the issues involved in the dispute seem to have generated.

A column in the Boston Globe of August 6, 1974, entitled "'Save the Notch' Battle Reaching Court Stage" by columnist David Farrell was called to my attention recently. It is refreshing to read an objective account of the issues involved in the Franconia Notch controversy. I compliment Mr. Farrell on his objectivity. I commend his column to those of my colleagues who are interested in fair reporting of controversial issues involving the quality of the environment in balance with other requirements of our civilization.

The article follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 6, 1974]

"SAVE THE NOTCH" BATTLE REACHING COURT STAGE

(By David Farrell)

FRANCONIA NOTCH.—The tremendous job the New Hampshire Highway Dept. has done on the construction of Interstate Rte. 93 to the Lincoln area should dispel the apprehension of environmentalists who have panicked over the proposed extension of the beautiful superhighway north through the Notch to the Franconia region.

A month ago a new 7½-mile segment of the double-barreled expressway to a point near the Kancamagus Wilderness Highway was opened to motorists in time for the Fourth of July holiday traffic.

Now only the final, 12-mile link between the rising country just to the south of the spectacular Flume and the completed northern portion of the new roadway just beyond Mittersill remains to be constructed.

Environmentalists, spurred on by a new protest group known as Save The Old Man, Inc., plan a last-ditch court drive aimed at blocking the last leg of the new highway dominated by Cannon Mountain on the west side of Franconia Notch and Mts. Liberty, Lincoln and Lafayette to the east.

They fear that natural treasures like rock-formed profile on one end of Cannon—known as the Old Man of the Mountain—will be jeopardized by the intrusion of bulldozers and the blasting which are an essential part of highway construction.

The battle to "Save the Notch" hasn't surfaced to any degree in the tough contests being waged for the Republican and Democratic nomination contests for governor Sept. 10.

There is general agreement among most of the major politicians and candidates in the state that completing the final leg of I–93 through this spectacular park area is a must for the economy of depressed communities to the north like Lisbon and Littleton.

And most tourists who are forced to leave I–93 at Lincoln and often crawl along the uphill, two-mile Rte. 3 behind trailer trucks struggling to climb the long slope through the notch of the Franconia Range, favor the completion of the interstate highway link.

A motorist has to drive the 60-mile stretch of I–93 from Concord north to Lincoln to appreciate the caliber of work the state of New Hampshire has done on this artery to the resort regions of Lake Winnipesaukee, Waterville Valley, Loon Mountain, the Kancamagus east-west hookup with the Conway area, and Cannon.

On past performance there is every reason to believe that no harm would be done to the Flume, the Basin, the Old Man of the Mountain, Profile, Lonesome and Echo lakes and assorted other attractions by the extension of I–93 from Lincoln to Franconia.

But the men behind the new group attempting to block any invasion of the Notch don't agree. Lindsay Fowler, Williams College senior and Appalachian Mountain Club hutman in the region, founded Save The Old Man, Inc. and is now raising funds for the legal drive to thwart the proposed interstate extension.

He contends that irreparable damage to the scenic attractions in the entire area will be inflicted if the highway men have their way.

"Franconia Notch is nationally known for the most sublime scenery of New Hampshire and as the home of the great, natural face of stone recognized as the Old Man of the Mountain," Fowler said.

"But a parkway through Franconia Notch? Who would ever believe it would or even could, come about?"

Joining Fowler in his "Franconia Notch: Paved or Saved" campaign is Richard Wright, managing editor of the weekly New Hampshire Times.

Wright recently ran a special edition of his tabloid with 17 full pages of articles, pictures, maps and editorials devoted to the drive to rescue the Notch.

The newspaper has been exhorting its readers to aid the legal fund being set up to fight the superhighway by sending contributions to Save the Old Man, Inc., P.O. Box 147, Twin Mountain, N.H. 03595.

No final action on the interstate link will come until a new environmental impact study of the project is finished.

That study, authorized two months ago, will be conducted by the VTN Corp. of Cambridge, Mass., and is expected to take more than a year.

Unless a decidedly adverse impact is forecast by the VTN survey, the extension of I–93 through the Notch will get underway in 1976 and target date for completion is set for 1978.

IRRESPONSIBLE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SPENDING

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as unbalanced Federal budget follows unbalanced Federal budget, the national debt and the rate of inflation continue to grow. The big spenders continue on their path with little regard to future costs for their new programs.

Federal spending commanded 12.4 percent of the gross national product in 1956, in 1966, 17.1 percent and will probably constitute an estimated 25.1 percent for fiscal year 1976. Social and economic programs have increased in expenditure an average rate of 12.6 percent for each of the last 10 years. Spending has been increasing more than twice as fast as the growth of the GNP. In other words such spending is increasing faster than our ability to pay for it.

To restore fiscal sanity to this country, we must start reducing spending. Sometimes it is not politically popular to say no to various programs that have great titles with huge price tags. However, this must be done. Spending cannot be brought under control until unnecessary programs are cut back and limits placed on new programs. At this point I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the August issue of Government Executive entitled "The Rush to a Crisis in Public Spending":

THE RUSH TO A CRISIS IN PUBLIC SPENDING

(By C. W. Borklund)

This Nation's Governments, Federal, State and local, are on trial. But, thanks to such obfuscations as the Watergate—and related—business, it doesn't seem to have been noticed much.

Governments, particularly legislators, for at least the past half-dozen years or so, have been doing things which, added up, can only be labelled, at best, "Ignorant and Irresponsible." Upshot is, they are rushing the country into a monumental crisis in Public spending.

In about four to six calendar years, the results of the trend will make the Watergate inquisition seem like a child's game. The most frightening "cover-up" in Washington, to us, is not in the White House Oval Office over tape recordings.

Rather, it's the smoke screen that has blown up around the facts of how the taxpayer's dwindling supply of resources is being

gobbled up by Government programs. We'll have a full-blown documentation of this next month.

In the meantime, consider:

In 1956, Federal spending commanded 12.4% of the Gross National Product (GNP); 17.1% in 1966; 25.1%, probably, for fiscal 1976; and, on present trends, 35–37% in 1986.

For comparison's sake, Federal spending at the peak of World War II was about 50% of the GNP. What war are we fighting now?

It's not a military one. To the extent that he deserves all the credit, (and he doesn't), President Richard Nixon has outdone former Presidents Kennedy and Johnson when it comes to increased funding for so-called "social programs."

In fiscal 1968, Johnson's last budget year, total obligational authority (TOA) for Defense and military assistance programs was $75.6 billion. Assuming the current Defense budget request is approved, which seems probable, TOA for fiscal 1975 will be $92.6 billion which is, in effect, a decrease in Defense spending since 1968 when inflation's impact on the dollar's buying power is thrown into the equation.

On the other hand, Federal, State and local spending for domestic social and economic programs was $123 billion in 1966. Unless some program already legislated is cancelled or sharply cut back, social and economic program spending will be $402.4 billion in 1976. In sum, for each of the last 10 years, those programs have been increasing in expenditures at an average annual rate of 12.6% and currently show no signs of slowing down.

In other words, it's been increasing more than twice as fast, roughly, as the growth of the GNP—and thus of the tax base that's supposed to pay for it. What is more, we can't find any evidence anywhere of any political pundits worrying about what is being done to the taxpayer's pocketbook.

If they fret publicy at all about the issue, their target for cutbacks is routinely the Defense budget. Headlined a recent *Washington Post* article: "Brookings (Institution) Sees Defense Cost of $142 Billion." (by 1980.) Echoed *Business Week*: "A new spiral for defense spending."

Baloney. Why don't they talk about a real issue? Where, in 1980, are we going to get the 12.6% of additional funds—on top of the 12.6% increase in 1979 and 1978 and 1977 and 1976—to pay for social security and for the welfare recipients and Medicare and pollution control and education programs and mass transit and occupational safety and Government employees? (In contrast to the 3.2 million persons on the Pentagon payroll, 14 million work for State and local government—and while the former number is trending down, the latter one is rising about as fast as the number of dollars they're spending.)

We are routinely amazed at the ability of high-level Public figures to ignore these trends. Politicians being voted out of office they blame on "Watergate." The failure of social and economic programs to deliver what they've promised they blame on "lack of financing because of the money being spent in Defense."

"If we could only get another $10 billion out of Defense," they say, "we could clean up the rivers and the air and give every kid in the country a college education and guarantee the poor and the old an adequate income and cure every disease afflicting man."

Nonsense. What did they do with the $100 billion more a year they've already received? What happened to the $52 billion a year the Feds have been sending back to the grass roots level?

The University of Michigan Institute for Social Research did an opinion survey recently of how well the Public thought 15 public and private institutions were serving the country. At the top of the "Very good" list: "the U.S. military."

At the top of the "very poor" list, in order: "President and Administration;" "Federal Government;" "Labor Unions;" "Local Governments;" "All Courts, Judicial System;" "State Governments;" "U.S. Congress" *Government* has an image problem and flimflamming the Public out of half its money without giving back noticeable benefit is not the way to a better rating.

But "image" is hardly the most important part of it. At one time, this Nation could afford to suffer and suborn the transgressions of its governments.

But not *today!*

And not at these *prices!*

UTILITIES SECRETLY FUND PRO-NUCLEAR GROUP

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, four major Wisconsin utilities were secretly financing a pronuclear power group known as Safe—Secure Adequate Future Energy—operating in Wisconsin Rapids and Stevens Point, Wis.

A Stevens Point public relations firm—Menzel/Williams & Associates—and one of its executives, Bob Williams, has been hired by the four utilities and is providing the pronuclear power group with full services free of charge.

The four companies—Wisconsin Electric Power, Wisconsin Power & Light, Wisconsin Public Service Corp., and the Madison Gas & Electric Co.—want to build a $1 billion nuclear plant in Lake Koshkonong, Jefferson County and possibly additional plants including one in Rudolph; Wood County.

"We conned the utilities into letting us use him—Williams—until we could get on our feet financially," admitted Mr. William Cownie, secretary of SAFE to a member of my staff. The Williams' firm has supplied public relations assistance and organizational aid including setting up a public opinion survey in Rudolph.

According to the SAFE treasurer, Mrs. Rita Bemke, SAFE has only $60 in its treasury. You can be sure that $60 would not buy Mr. Williams' service for even a day. Mr. Williams' firm allegedly hired canvassers, wrote the questionnaire, and is in the process of tabulating the questionnaire for SAFE.

Mr. Speaker, I first learned of SAFE after receiving questions from some labor union members near Koshkonong area about what independent group studying nuclear power existed in Wisconsin.

The labor members were interested in jobs developed by nuclear power, but were also warned about how independent the so-called independent groups really were.

When questioned about SAFE's relationship to the utilities, Williams told a member of my staff that he was employed by the utilities and did a considerable amount of work for the SAFE organization. When asked if the utility was paying for the services provided to SAFE, Williams referred the question to Tom Fogarty, chairman of SAFE. Fogarty, contacted by my office, refused to discuss SAFE's finances with a member of my staff except at a meeting with his full executive committee in Wood County.

Wisconsin utilities are operating like the CIA—setting up a phony front organization and secretly funding it to carry out the utilities' pronuclear propaganda campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I am making a formal complaint about the secret funding in a letter to Wisconsin Public Service Commission chairman, William Eich. These four utilities may be taking some of the consumers' payments for electricity and secretly funneling them into a pronuclear power organization. While this activity may not be strictly illegal, it is clearly unethical and immoral. I am asking the Public Service Commission to formally audit the four utilities' payments to the Williams public relations firm and disallow those costs from the inclusion in any rate increase. The Wisconsin Public Commission is holding a hearing Thursday to discuss the entire problem. I hope that the Public Service Commission will explore the possibility of prohibiting utilities from promoting private groups which take a stand on controversial issues like nuclear power. It is simply wrong for the utilities to secretly fund propaganda organizations that promote their own interests. Secretly funding SAFE deceives the people of Wisconsin and also ultimately increases the cost of electricity to them.

Officials of SAFE have told me that they hope to start their own fundraising activities to become independent of the utilities' support.

HIROSHIMA: LOOKING BACK

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 7, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, 29 years ago yesterday, the United States committed the ultimate act of war. Seeking to end the American-Japanese conflict in World War II, it dropped the atomic bomb on the city of Hiroshima. As a result of this act, experts estimate that between 80,000 and 200,000 people lost their lives.

We would do well to look back and remember Hiroshima, not in a narrow and isolated way, but rather in the larger context of present efforts to halt the nuclear arms race and, hence, avoid future Hiroshimas.

The superpowers are presently engaged in efforts to limit nuclear proliferation. If we have learned any lesson from August 6, 1945, it is that these efforts must be successful. Hiroshima must signal not the beginning, but the end of the possibility and realization of nuclear aggression. We should not expect and cannot accept anything less.