

and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land located in the Fairbanks Recording District, State of Alaska, to the Fairbanks North Star Borough, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. ESCH, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. HUBER, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. THONE):

H.R. 16386. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to strengthen the regulatory authority of the Postal Rate Commission with respect to the operation of the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. REGULA, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. BAUMAN):

H.R. 16387. A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 16388. A bill to provide for disclosure of information by executive departments to committees of Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 16389. A bill to establish a National Commission on Supplies and Shortages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16390. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to redesignate the National Historical Publications Commission as the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, to increase the membership of such Commission, and to increase the authorization of appropriations for such Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 16391. A bill to create a congressional price ombudsman; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 16392. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the

labels on all foods to disclose each of their ingredients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 16393. A bill to amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 in order to strengthen the import restrictions which may be imposed to deter foreign countries from conducting fishing operations which adversely affect international fishery conservation programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 16394. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specially adapted housing for disabled veterans; to the committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 16395. A bill to amend part B of title XI of the Social Security Act to provide a more effective administration of professional standards review of health care services, to expand the Professional Standards Review Organization activity to include review of services performed by or in federally operated health care institutions, and to protect the confidentiality of medical records; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 16396. A bill to amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for dependent care expenses of married taxpayers who are employed part time, or who are students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 1108. Joint resolution designating the first full week in April 1975 as National Shoppers' Newsletter Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr.

KYROS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. POBELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ROE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. NIX, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. KING, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. REES, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania):

H. Con. Res. 597. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding

the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. GUDE, Mr. STARK, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. DERWINSKI):

H. Con. Res. 598. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. FROELICH):

H. Res. 1308. Resolution to affirm the foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H. Res. 1309. Resolution relating to officers and members of the U.S. Capitol Police under the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

518. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to no-fault insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

519. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to making recipients of supplemental security income eligible for food stamps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

470. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the council of the city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to Federal participation in the costs of educating immigrants; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INDIAN TEACHERS FOR SCHOOLS ON RESERVATIONS

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, of all the problems on our Indian reservations, one of the most perplexing is how to provide a good educational system. We want a system which will provide Indians with the education which they need to compete in and share in what is frequently referred to as the mainstream of American life. Yet we also want a system which will enable Indians to maintain their rich traditions, language, and cultural heritage.

One of the major obstacles is the lack of teachers who speak Indian languages and understand the various cultures. An obvious answer to this is to train Indians to become teachers, but this involves unique problems because of the remoteness of some reservations, because of economic barriers, and because in the past Indians simply have not been motivated to get a college education.

The Arizona magazine of the Arizona Republic carried an excellent article on July 28, 1974, about an experimental program which appears to show some success.

Mr. President, I believe my colleagues would be interested in reading about the program and the remarkable determination of both those operating the program and the participants. I request unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

A SPECIAL KIND OF TEACHER FOR THE RESERVATION

(By Robert Barrett)

In 115-degree heat, Mrs. Selma Elizabeth Carlyle was hoeing a small canal in the sandy ground so water could reach a newly planted palm tree. She motioned the visitors to the shade of a thatched ramada in front of her home that stands by itself off a dirt road on the reservation southwest of Lavean.

"I've been here in this little shack, oh boy, about fourteen years. I raised all my boys here. My boy (Deke) is not wild. He stays close to home and that's the only way I get through school," she said.

Mrs. Carlyle is one of 36 American Indians scheduled to graduate with a bachelor's

degree in elementary education from Arizona State University in August. At age 47 she returned to school after 30 years, three marriages, eight children and a bout with cancer. Each week, she drove 90 miles to attend classes on the Gila River Indian Reservation.

Mrs. Carlyle started working for the reservation's Headstart program as a cook. She worked as a volunteer because the program had no funds to pay her. After cooking for the school she worked from 2 p.m. until sundown bunching vegetables. Eventually she was paid for cooking but she didn't give up her second job.

"I was supporting my family alone then. I got fifty dollars a week as a cook and after taxes I got about forty-seven dollars a week. I had to raise five boys and I guess I was too proud to go on welfare," she said. One of her sons, Paul Smith, is president of the Salt River Indian tribe.

"All my children have scattered to the winds except for two," she said. Tony works as a hospital orderly and her thirteen-year-old, Deke, keeps house while she's at ASU. "He brushes dirt under the chairs," Mrs. Carlyle said.

Her children are the product of three marriages. She dropped out of the ninth grade when she married at age 17. Her first husband died, she divorced her second and she's separated from her third husband.

Mrs. Carlyle advanced from cook to teacher aide while working at the Gila Crossing Day School. Then she entered an experimental

project called the Career Opportunities Program (COP). It is federally funded to produce Indian teachers for the schools on the reservations in Arizona. It is directed at ASU by Dr. John Sullivan. Mrs. Carlyle worked as a teacher aide during the school year but one day each week she attended classes on the reservation instead of working. The classes were held at the most central point on the reservation and she drove 45 miles each way to attend.

"Some drive sixty miles each way to attend the classes on the reservation," Sullivan said. The students earn nine hours per semester on the reservation and attend summer sessions on campus to accumulate twelve more each summer. They may commute to ASU or they may live on campus. "As a result they can finish in four calendar years and one summer. That compares favorably with going off to college," he said.

Speaking of the Indian teachers, Sullivan said, "They will serve as a communications bridge in their communities. School is alien to the Indian community and they will serve as a bridge by playing at or being role models for others."

Mrs. Carlyle is half Hopi and half Pima. While working as a teacher aide she found the children trusted her more because she speaks Pima.

"Children in the first grade don't have strong English vocabulary. I explain something in Pima then speak in English. This helps them build a strong English vocabulary faster," she said.

"For example, someone was talking about a gopher but one girl asked me what a gopher was. I explained in Pima so she could understand, then repeated it in English. When I said the Pima word for gopher, she understood and added a new word to her English vocabulary."

As a teacher aide, she prepared lessons and acted as a teacher.

"I started with an advanced group in reading. I worked on one side of the class and the teacher worked on the other. I was told I was a second teacher," she said proudly.

Last spring she began working with the slower learning group, still as a teacher aide. She realized then the value of knowing her native language because she did more translating.

"I don't know how many of them are held back because of the language barrier," she said.

Most of the children speak Pima now but the trend is often to use English in the homes to the extent that some families don't teach their children their language. Mrs. Carlyle feels that while English is a necessity, the lack of Pima is a tragedy. Her granddaughter isn't being taught Pima by her son.

"I tell him, don't ever deprive her of her Indian language. You see, younger people feel if you don't teach the child Pima, they are better off. Sometimes it is, sometimes it isn't. The non-speakers lose understanding of the legends and songs of the Pima. That's not good. Our legends are partly spoken and partly sung. The flavor is gone from the legends when they're translated because they're a little on the risqué side.

"Our legends are dying out because the old folks aren't speaking the language . . ." She paused and frowned. "It's just not good."

Mrs. Carlyle is looking forward to working in classrooms as a teacher instead of a teacher aide. She almost didn't make it. From June 4 to July 30, 1972, she was in the Phoenix Indian Medical Center with breast cancer. During the five weeks of cobalt radiation treatment she still commuted to ASU to attend classes and work with the children as a student teacher.

"I was working with the children and forgot my problems. I think it helped keep me going," she explained. "Teaching won't be new, so I'm not excited. I'll have more responsibility and more money. It makes me

feel good that this time I'll be working with a certificate. I won't let it go to my head. I'm still the same person."

She already has become a role model. She said some of her neighbors come to her and ask her what school is like.

"I encourage them to start. They say they can't because they're twenty or thirty. I say I started older than that. I think they're ashamed to say they're going to high school. I tell the younger ones to go to either college or vocational school. They say yes, they'll think about it. Some do, some don't. It depends on the family situation. My children say, 'How 'bout that? Mom's going to get a degree.' And I'm proud," she said.

The COP at ASU began in 1970 with 60 students. It now has 51, the best retention rate of 131 COP projects around the country. Of the 51 students at ASU, 36 will graduate this year and the remaining 15 are expected to graduate next year.

Sullivan said, "That (the 51 students) is a track record that is unique. The dropout rate of minority students is very high." He paused to light his pipe. "I'd say fifty percent is almost normal and ninety is high."

It will be the largest group of American Indians ever to graduate at one time from an Arizona university, Sullivan said.

"We have a more mature group," Sullivan said. "The ages range from twenty-two or three to fifty-eight. We weren't taking kids just graduated from high school. We drew from adults. At eighteen you have a lot of distractions. I know I did. But these people, they know what they want and they are willing to work for it."

"They all have the initial problem of any adult in going back to the books as well as trying to raise a family, but that is the only real handicap."

Sullivan said the federal regulations state that to qualify for COP the student must work for one of the schools fulltime. Because the school jobs only last nine months and funding for the job is usually uncertain, most of the workers are women. This has caused some trouble.

Sometimes the problem is simple jealousy. The husband resents his wife getting a better education which will result in better pay. Some resent the wife being away from the family.

Sullivan said one student's home had only kerosene lamps but that wasn't the problem. The children wanted to play when he came home from classes. He played with them and had to do his homework late at night.

"One of the major problems is the lack of involvement in the schools. What we need is to bind the schools and the community together. This is particularly true on the Indian reservation," Sullivan said. "The (non-Indian) teachers aren't indigenous to the community. They're not native to the area. All our students have some knowledge of school, they work there. They know what it is like and they all know they want to teach."

The turnover rates for non-Indian teachers on the reservation is 20 to 50 percent with an average stay of two years, according to a Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) study. The programs those teachers might start don't have continuity. There is no follow-through.

Part of the difficulty is the language. The non-Indian teachers don't speak the language. The teachers don't have a choice of housing and must live in a small group of apartments. And most feel there really isn't much to do on a reservation.

The graduating Indians don't have to remain on the reservation but Sullivan feels sure they will. "Every one of the thirty-six has job offerings in their own areas. That's where they have their home, their roots and their children. I'm sure most will stay."

He leaned back and gazed at a photograph of two Indians, one very old and one young.

The caption read: "The past is only a beginning."

"You know," he said, "they have another advantage over the Angla teachers. They're receiving dual certification. They can teach elementary school and they are trained in special education. That means they can tell who is exceptional and then give that child the opportunity to advance without leaving the reservation."

Mrs. Carlyle realized the need for special education when her son, Tony, had problems at South Mountain High.

"My nineteen-year-old had trouble with a black teacher. In one of his classes the teacher used him as an example of someone who gets everything free, books free, tuition free. My son said no, it wasn't so. It wasn't. I worked to give him what he had. He ended up in the counseling department and they sent him back to class. He's heavy, you know. He walks heavy. The teacher said he stepped into class and he said no. They argued and they sent him home," Mrs. Carlyle said.

After a few weeks she took Tony back to school and they met the assistant principal. According to Mrs. Carlyle, Tony lost his temper when the assistant principal wouldn't let him explain his side of the story. Tony quit school but plans to return.

"Maybe I should specialize in special education because they need more understanding people there. When we're not teaching we can see the need that teachers need instruction, too," she said.

Mrs. Carlyle is one of the few who will be allowed to continue in a master's program. Sullivan said the funding for COP ends in August, 1975 and that will allow her and others to work one year on their master's program. He hopes to get a similar project started until Title 4, Part E of the Indian Education Act. If he does, Mrs. Carlyle will be able to complete her master's work and others may enter the program.

"I'm scared (of the master's program)," Mrs. Carlyle said. "Anything I start out I always start out scared. I threaten to drop out every year but I keep going. I guess if cancer didn't kill me education won't either."

**WARDELL V. STANSBURY, FIRST
BLACK CITY COUNCIL PRESIDENT
OF HAVRE DE GRACE, MD.**

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a tendency to forget how much race relations have improved in recent years, but a good example of this improvement occurred recently when the Honorable Wardell V. Stansbury was elected the first black city council president of Havre de Grace, Md., in my congressional district.

Mr. Stansbury comes from a distinguished family of community leaders in Harford County, Md., and also serves as director of family services for the Maryland Department of Social Services in Bel Air.

I include an article from the Record of Havre de Grace which details the admirable career of this young man:

IF YOU DON'T HOPE . . .

(By Mike Norris)

"Wardell V. Stansbury, May 20, 1974: First Black City Council President—Havre de Grace" reads a shining new plaque hanging amidst dozens of family mementoes, athletic

trophies and other memorabilia recalling some of the past successes—and tribulations—of the life-time resident of 400 Stokes St.

"You lose a few, but when you win one you're happy. And if you don't have hope, you have nothing," said the 39-year-old Stansbury, city councilman and new city council president. He recalled the days since June, 1953 when he graduated with the last class to attend the Havre de Grace Colored High School at the corner of Alliance and Stokes streets—a school whose now crumbling masonry and shattered windows are perhaps symbolic of the ideas and institutions which began disintegrating after that commencement 21 years ago.

Primarily due to the influence of his late father, Clayton S. Stansbury, Sr., Stansbury said he abandoned his intention to go straight from high school into the Air Force—"I was impressed with veterans"—and in the fall of 1953 entered Morgan State College, to study biology and physical education and continue an athletic career which began in Havre de Grace.

He also joined the Reserve Officers Training Corps at Morgan, where he found the first year away from home "tough," like most new college students.

Going to Morgan, Stansbury continued a long-standing academic tradition in his family, which began years earlier when his oldest brother Marcus, attended Howard University in Washington, D.C. Marcus Stansbury, now 54, is a lay minister and an electrical engineer at the Aberdeen Proving Ground.

George T. Stansbury, 52, studied at Morgan and Howard, interned at Freedman's Hospital and has since continued his medical practice in Havre de Grace. His younger brother, Russell, 49, graduated from Maryland State College and now teaches industrial arts at the Aberdeen Middle School.

The new City Council President ran track at Morgan—the quarter- and half-mile races—along with his brother Clayton T. Stansbury, 41. The latter earned his doctorate at the University of Maryland and currently heads the Department of Psychology at Morgan State.

Stansbury points with pride to the worn blue and white track spikes that rest along with a host of plaques and other awards, on a nearby shelf. He was an All-American while at Morgan.

"Lt. Stansbury conducted himself and carried out his duties in the best traditions of the Artillery and the U.S. Army. His first consideration, at all times was the welfare of the enlisted men under his supervision," says a letter from Capt. Francis R. Beckman, praising Stansbury's formance in the 2nd Guided Missile Battalion—of which he was the only black member.

However, the military years weren't entirely a bed of roses for the man who managed, while stationed at El Paso, to earn a master's degree in community relations from the University of Texas. The brushes with racism, may have been occasional, Stansbury said, but he can recall them all.

There was the Green Frog, a night club in El Paso, where Stansbury and his classmates—all white—had gone to celebrate the forthcoming graduation. It was a bitter-sweet experience when Stansbury was refused service, and the entire company rose and left their reserved seats.

But the "worst experience," Stansbury said, occurred after he finished his regular military obligation, but only one year before he would be re-called to serve during the Berlin Crisis in 1960.

"No Dogs or Niggers" read the sign hanging on a Texaco service station in Southern Maryland, where Stansbury said he stopped on his way home from El Paso, "Can't you read?" asked the attendant.

"Yes, but I don't consider myself either one," Stansbury replied. He later recounted

this incident to the Texaco Corporation, which he said sent him a letter of apology.

But the passage of 14 years has apparently given him a new perspective. He looks back on the Texaco encounter as a "good experience," suggesting that it was an excellent lesson in maintaining one's self-discipline and composure.

Armed with a masters degree, Stansbury began as a social worker in Philadelphia, where his sister Carrie Stansbury Gordon, 47 lives. Shortly thereafter, he applied for the same work in both Elkton and Bel Air.

"We'd like to have you aboard," said a Social Services representative in Cecil County, "but the town's just not ready for a Negro." That was in 1963. Harford County, however, proved more receptive, and Stansbury became the first black hired by the Department of Social Services.

"There have been no incidents," Stansbury said, during the entire eleven years he has worked in Bel Air, starting with the preparation of medical certificates and moving up to his present position as director of family services.

Although Havre de Grace Mayor Frank J. Hutchins said this week that he is "leaning toward" completing the nearly one year of his current term. Stansbury as Council President would automatically replace him as Mayor should he decide to step down to run for another office.

Stansbury has said that while he is interested in becoming Mayor, the demands of his work with the Harford County Department of Social Services may preclude his taking the job.

"I have nothing but glorious adjectives for Wardell," said Lehman Spry, a Havre de Grace dentist, Democratic office-seeker and long associate of the new City Council President. "His only weakness," Spry continued, "is that he can never say 'no'. People lean on him for too much sometimes."

"Reliable, innovative—and ambitious" are among the words Spry used to describe Stansbury, who will be Spry's campaign manager in the upcoming contest for the Fifth District seat on the Harford County Council member of numerous local organizations, including the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Democratic Party. Stansbury was nurtured in the activist tradition, the most notable example being his sister-in-law Mildred L. Stansbury who served on the Havre de Grace City Council during the mid-1960's.

Stansbury still lives at 400 South Stoeks—where a flaming cross planted by the Ku Klux Klan once burned outside—with his wife, Cassie, a supervisor of nurses at Perry Point Veterans Hospital; his daughter Laurie Lynne, 7; and his niece, Shelia, 8.

And what makes him tick? It is a credo handed down by his father years ago: "I'll never ask you to do anything, son, that I would not do myself."

WOMAN'S LIFE SAVED BY SHORT EMERGENCY TELEPHONE NUMBER

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, many times before I have called attention to the emergency "911" telephone number which is being made available all over the United States through the cooperation of the telephone companies and local officials. I have received a newspaper article vividly describing the advantages of having this simple, three-

digit number and I include it in the RECORD for the Members' information:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 4, 1974]

HOW EMERGENCY NUMBER 911 SAVED WOMAN WITH A KNIFE AT HER THROAT

(By Frank Zahour)

Mrs. Carrie Newman, 83, sat on the edge of her bed, her hands and feet bound, while the young man held a foot-long knife inches from her throat. Suddenly police from outside fired two shots thru a window, wounding the man; then they rushed in to her rescue.

Minutes earlier, the intruder had appeared at the front door of Mrs. Newman's Forest Park home. She was alone and had thought he looked suspicious; so she had slammed the door in his face and rushed to telephone the police.

Just as he broke thru the door, she reached the Forest Park police on the 911 emergency number. But she had had only enough time to give her address before the man had torn the phone from her hands and had ripped its wires from the wall.

"I wouldn't be alive today if it weren't for that emergency number," Mrs. Newman said, recalling the incident last April. She credits the three-digit number with helping bring the swift police action that probably saved her life and led to the intruder's arrest.

"Every town ought to have that number," Mrs. Newman said. As someone who could have been seven digits away from death, she knows that all towns do not have the three-digit emergency line.

The three-digit number in theory is easy to remember and to dial or touch-phone as compared to a seven-digit figure. This would help cut down the time it takes a person to respond to the emergency being reported.

And since the three-digit number is reserved for emergencies, police or fire phone lines are less likely to be clogged with routine calls when the cry for help comes, according to spokesmen for Illinois Bell.

More than 300 telephone systems across the nation, serving about 27 million persons, use the three-digit number. New York, Seattle, Denver, Detroit, and Birmingham, Ala., are among them.

Chicago does not have the system and that situation has become a point of controversy. When two children were killed and 11 others injured in a school van accident last week, the city's response time to the accident was criticized.

Critics such as Ald. William Singer [43d], candidate for mayor, urged the city to adopt the 911 system. Several suburbs have used it successfully, critics pointed out. Chicago officials said the idea is being studied.

In Illinois, a total of 10 communities use the system. Eight of them are Illinois Bell systems and four of the eight are in the Chicago area. In addition to Forest Park, 911 systems are used in Evanston, Oak Park and River Forest.

"We were the first in Cook County to have it," Evanston Police Chief William McHugh said.

If the city does approve a 911 plan, there probably won't be a problem learning the new number, Mrs. Newman said. "It's one number that you'll never forget," she said.

POSTAL SERVICE REFORM ACT OF 1974

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with Mr. BUCHANAN of Alabama and other Members in cosponsoring the Postal Services Reform Act of 1974.

This bill will amend the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 by strengthening the overnight functions of the Postal Rate Commission and the Congress over the Postal Service.

This matter of postal reform is of vital importance to the people of my district. In many instances recently mail service has been curtailed, employees transferred, retired, or cut back, lives and businesses disrupted oftentimes in the name of increased efficiency.

Surveys have been conducted by the Postal Service throughout my district, which have resulted in an areawide reorganization of the system.

The responses of my constituents to the changes thus instituted are vocal and clear: We want adequate not inadequate postal service; increased postal rates should not result in later delivery time, sometimes by hours or days; cutbacks in postal employees should not be made until all the ramifications of such a move have been considered in light of the communities needs.

It is clear that if these changes had been submitted to the Postal Rate Commission before being implemented as would be provided for by these amendments, and interested parties had been afforded an opportunity to express their views on the proposals, the situation we find today in southern Colorado and other areas of the country would in all likelihood not have occurred.

There has been some success in getting the Postal Service to reconsider their actions in connection with my district. However, I feel this does not in any way alleviate the need for the change provided in these amendments.

In conclusion, I want to express on my colleagues the feeling of helplessness, frustration, and anger that many of my constituents have expressed to me. I have received thousands of letters, telegrams, and phone calls requesting action to rectify this situation. My cosponsoring of these amendments is only one of the ways I am responding to this plea. I want to urge each of you to support these amendments and help to return a degree of meaning to the word "service" as used in "Postal Service."

TO PRESIDENT FORD THE NATION
LOOKS FOR LEADERSHIP

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation heaves a collective sigh of relief over the successful resolution of the recent constitutional crisis, the people turn to the new President Gerald R. Ford for sound and stable leadership.

The Nashville Banner in a recent editorial pointed out that President Ford hopefully will emerge as a healer, a binder of wounds, an instrument of revitalization of, and rededication to, the American system.

President Ford has been swept by his ability and the floodtide of events into

the Presidency—and I am sure all of us join the Banner in wishing him every success as he confronts the challenges facing our Nation.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the editorial from the Banner in the RECORD herewith.

The editorial follows:

TO GERALD FORD THE NATION LOOKS FOR
LEADERSHIP

Today Gerald R. Ford becomes the 38th President in this nation's 198-year history and the first not elected by popular vote.

He is taking the scarred reins of government from Richard M. Nixon, the ultimate casualty of the Watergate scandal, in a time of deep national trauma rooted in two years of waning trust in the executive branch and culminating tragically in Mr. Nixon's resignation last night.

It is the fourth time in Mr. Ford's career that he has been given a swift, surprising boost in his career as a public servant.

He rose out of the ranks of House Republicans 11 years ago in a sudden crop that installed him as chairman of the Republican Party caucus.

Two years later he was vaulted into the party leadership post and remained there until picked last Oct. 12 by Mr. Nixon as Spiro Agnew's replacement as vice president at a time Mr. Ford was considering retirement at the end of his House term.

Mr. Ford claimed then he had no further political ambitions, but his confirmation as this nation's 40th vice president stamped him clearly as a presidential prospect in 1976.

Then came Mr. Nixon's devastating admission of omission and suddenly Mr. Ford again was being called upon by his party and his country for leadership.

When he announced the nomination of Mr. Ford for the vice presidency, Mr. Nixon described him as a man "qualified to be President."

At a commencement address at Utah State University in June, Mr. Ford said he would "remain my own man, fly my own course and speak my own convictions" in answer to criticism of his extensive traveling and speaking schedule.

Perhaps a preview of Mr. Ford's future may be glimpsed with his leadership efforts and personal campaigning, credited with being the important ingredients in bringing the Republican Party back from a crisis nearly as great as the Watergate-Agnew scandals to a sweeping mid-term House Republican victory in 1966 and a presidential win for the party in 1968.

Now Mr. Ford's leadership abilities will face their greatest test—the reuniting of a nation's political process ripped by rumor and scarred by scandal held together by the United States Constitution but divisive in application.

The nation of which Mr. Ford assumes leadership today is one thrashing in the throes of inflation, and other domestic doubts; seeking to maintain world leadership in efforts of peace and security; and trying hard to reestablish faith and trust in government and its functions.

Thursday night Mr. Ford told the nation in a statement from his home:

"To work on the problems, serious ones, which we have at home, in the spirit of co-operation which I believe will be exhibited with the Congress and the new president and the new problems overseas and the problems at home will be beneficial not only to 211 million Americans but to the world as a whole."

As has been demonstrated before, the vice presidency, often described as a heartbeat away from the Presidency, was a purely titled

job for years—until Lyndon Baines Johnson was thrust into the Presidency Nov. 22, 1963.

Since then, the Vice President has remained close to the President, sharing views in domestic issues, foreign affairs, national defense and hundreds of issues dealt with daily by the Chief Executive.

Mr. Ford said Thursday night he would continue the foreign policies of the Nixon Administration and that Dr. Henry Kissinger will remain as secretary of state, underlining Mr. Ford's concern for and interest in world peace.

The nation is looking to Mr. Ford as a healer for the country—one who understands the congressional process, the necessity of maintaining the American system of checks and balances, and one who can unite this nation and its political parties for a common goal, the revitalization of a society mired in Watergate aftermath and political apathy.

As Vice President Ford becomes President Ford, we as a nation should pledge to him our cooperation, our friendship and our prayers. His task is difficult at best and he above most others, believes that "united we stand, divided we fall."

CORRECTING THE RECORD ON
HERBERT HOOVER

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, back in the year 1932, when I was just 16 years of age, my father and mother kept my brothers, sister, and me out of school for a few hours so that we could drive to Woodville Junction, to greet our great Republican President seeking reelection that year.

It was a chilly, rainy, late October day when the Presidential special rolled to a stop on the main line of the B. & O. Railroad. Only moments later, President Herbert Hoover and his wife appeared on the platform to speak briefly to the sparse group of loyal Republicans who had ventured out to pay tribute to our President. As the train moved slowly away, my father and mother shed real tears, knowing full well that this great statesman had not one chance of being reelected. The opposition and mischief of the Democrat 72d Congress had frustrated his programs and brought him down.

Now 38 years later I am privileged to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following tribute to Herbert Hoover as published in the August 10 issue of Human Events, in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the birth of this great American.

How many years will pass before the American people realize and acknowledge the tremendous achievements made in their behalf by another great Republican President, Richard M. Nixon?

The article follows:

CORRECTING THE RECORD ON HERBERT HOOVER
(By Eugene Lyons)

The great majority of Americans, because they still cherish the "old-fashioned" virtues and decencies now in sadly short supply, have reason this month to commemorate the 100th birthday of a great American whose life embodied these values. Herbert Clark Hoover was born on Aug. 10, 1874, in the Quaker hamlet of West Branch, Cedar

County, Iowa, in the primitive cottage of Jeeze Hoover, the village blacksmith, and Huldah, an eloquent "witness" greatly in demand at Quaker meetings.

He was doubly orphaned by the age of eight, but did not lack affectionate homes with relatives. Though he spent only his first 10 years in his birthplace, it was always close to his heart. He rose to the summit of his profession, which was the mining of metals; to the pinnacle of his true vocation, which was humanitarian service; to the presidency of our Republic. But always he returned, as if for spiritual refreshment, to West Branch. And there he was laid to rest on Oct. 25, 1964, at a site he had himself selected—a knoll overlooking the cottage, by then a national shrine—in which he first saw the light 90 years before.

CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

A Hoover Centennial Committee has organized a week-long birthday celebration in West Branch, climaxed by formal ceremonies on August 10. A large assemblage of admirers is expected from all parts of the country. Commemorations are also scheduled in other places. No doubt he will be eulogized in the press throughout the country. Yet many survivors of the thinning ranks of his close friends and associates feel that the occasion merits far more attention than it is getting. It is an opportunity missed, as they see it, to acquaint our children, in particular, with Hoover's inspiring life.

The centennial comes in an era when moral standards are crumbling, in a year when ambiguous conduct in high places, dominates the news. Against this background, Hoover's career, for those who know it, has a special luster and significance. To put it crudely, "Watergates" could not have happened in the Hoover Administration or in any of the great enterprises in which he was engaged.

Intellectual and moral integrity were the hallmarks of his character. Hoover never once put expediency above honesty, honor and unabashed patriotism. The austerity of his ethical commitments both baffled and awed the moral relativists and jugglers of expediency who for the most part were running his world.

In Hoover's half-century of practical benevolence, from the Belgian Relief when he was 40 until the last year of his life, concern for the young always held first place. He brought tremendous gifts to hundreds of millions of children on all continents, in bread and milk and new hope. But the greatest gift was the example of his own career and conscience and compassion. That is the gift which should not be denied today to the new generation.

Youth craves heroes to admire and emulate. Those of us who care must find ways to make young Americans aware of the true story of the 31st President. Among the towering figures of our century there are few whose qualities are so directly pertinent to their needs. In him American youth could see as in a mirror, the best in its own character and in the national heritage.

Hoover's life was a "success story" in the traditional American pattern that used to be so attractive to young people—and should be again. The generation that grew up to the 11 Depression years, three under Hoover and eight under Roosevelt, was hardly allowed to know that Hoover came up from poverty and knew the ache of hard labor.

His basic elementary schooling at a Quaker school in Newberg, Ore., ending at 15, when he moved to Salem. There, except for a short break when he drove that town's first horse-car, he worked as an office boy in a business started by a maternal uncle. Largely self-taught, he qualified at 17 for enrollment in the newly founded Leland Stanford University. He earned his way by organizing a campus newspaper route, a laundry service, a cooperative student residence.

MEETS FUTURE WIFE

Despite these and other economic activities, and despite his self-effacing shyness, he emerged as organizer and coordinator of all athletic and many other student enterprises—unpaid, on his own insistence. (He was supremely fortunate, Stanford being co-educational, in meeting the attractive and brilliant Lou Henry—majoring in geology like himself—whose love was to be his greatest possession forever after.)

Graduating in May 1895, with only \$40 in his pocket, he took the first job he could find—as an underground "mucker" at a gold mine in the Sierras, at \$2 for a 10-hour night shift. Before long he risked a trip to San Francisco to seek work with Louis Janin, the reigning mining expert of that period. Janin had no need for a fledgling geologist, but hired him as typist and copyist. It was the last time Hoover ever applied for a job; thereafter the jobs applied for Hoover.

Little of these humble beginnings were remembered after he became President and the scapegoat for a great depression. In part this public amnesia was due to the fact that, having succeeded early and spectacularly in his profession, he was a wealthy man (though not remotely as rich as people supposed) by the time the country at large became aware of him. But chiefly it was a result of pounding propaganda linking him, falsely and with intent to defame, to such symbols of presumptive inequity as "Wall Street" and "economic royalists."

WESTERN BACKGROUND

Space here is too limited to deal even with the highlights of Hoover's achievements and personality.

Physically his life was rooted in the pioneer West. He was destined to become the first President born and raised west of the Mississippi. He did not set foot east of that river until he was 23 and on his way to Australia, via London, to explore and manage large gold-mining properties. Spiritually it was rooted in the soil of his God-fearing Quaker forebears. He could remember few of his mother's words, but their purport, love and charity, remained indelibly on his mind and spirit.

Long after he had left his profession, political slander put an accent of irony on the phrase, but Herbert Hoover was in literal fact a Great Engineer. Australia, China, South Africa, Russia, Burma, wherever the old bones of his planet were picked for metals. Hoover had for some 17 years directed some of the work. He was basically a "doctor of sick mines," transforming abandoned or low-grade mines into profit makers.

Far from being the "promoter" later invented by detractors, he constantly warned the industry against the speculative booms associated with mine financing.

Hoover had often confided his hope of giving up business for public service. When the First World War erupted in 1914, destiny caught up with him. While he was in London preparing to take his wife and two sons to America, a delegation of Americans and Belgians arrived to urge him to assume the relief of civilians in German-occupied Belgium and northern France, already threatened by famine.

DECISION MADE

Because of his inside track in the race for metals like zinc and lead, desperately needed by all belligerents, he was in an ideal position to make himself one of the world's richest men. He asked the delegation for a few days to decide, but the decision was already made in his heart. "Well," he said calmly to Will Irwin, a war correspondent then his house guest, "let fortunes go to hell." His family sailed to America without him. Soon enough the world was witnessing a miracle of organization and efficiency, notwithstanding suspicions and obstruction by both the Germans and the Allies.

One of the conditions he made in accepting the task was that he be allowed to serve without remuneration. From that day in 1914 forward, Hoover never accepted a dollar for his private use from his manifold public services, not even from his salaries as secretary of commerce and then President. Associates of his new course, if they had the means, followed his example, living by his Quaker dictum that public service is a privilege, not a business.

Hugh Gibson, secretary of the American legation in Brussels while the United States was still neutral, called the Belgian Relief "without doubt the greatest humanitarian effort in history." Greater ones were to come, but always led by Hoover. The Great Engineer was replaced by the Great Humanitarian.

When America entered the war, Hoover headed up a Food Administration, so brilliantly conducted that neither soldiers nor civilians on the Allied side had to go on short rations for a single day. His agency offered the largest and most successful test of voluntary cooperation in modern times. At the war's end it had some 8,000 full-time and 750,000 part-time volunteers, with only a minuscu contingent of paid employees. Hoover believed then, as he did a dozen years later in setting up successful relief during the Depression, that a paid bureaucracy is a self-perpetuating blight on any such undertaking.

With the Armistice, the food agency was converted into the American Relief Administration. During the war he had shocked official and even popular opinion, as he would again in World War II, by trying in vain to relax the Allied blockade enough to allow the feeding of children in enemy and enemy-occupied countries. Now Europe was in chaos, ravaged by hunger, epidemics and civil disorders. Hoover fought for and won from the Supreme War Council in Paris the right to organize the salvage of life and economic rehabilitation of an entire continent—a colossal operation dwarfing even the Belgian Relief.

He returned home in 1919 with some idea of resuming private business. His instincts for public service would not permit it. He could and did reject offers of fabulous wealth in business, but not appeals to his conscience. Although he had been a registered Republican since 1895, many Democrats too, ignoring his refusal to run, pressed for his nomination for President. Franklin D. Roosevelt wrote to Josephus Daniels, "Herbert Hoover is certainly a wonder, and I wish we could make him President. There could not be a better one."

As Secretary of Commerce in the Harding and Coolidge Cabinets, Hoover fought an offensive against waste in economy and government, in which he scored some historic successes. His parallel agitation for reform in banking and financing, however, was stymied by Congress, the business community, and the passivity of Coolidge.

From 1921 forward, Hoover repeatedly urged curbs on the orgy of "cheap money" and speculation. They could lead, he warned, to "inevitable collapse that will bring the greatest calamities upon our farmers, our workers and legitimate business." The country, on it get-rich-quick binge, dismissed such fears as "spoilsport" and "crepe hanging." As the 1928 Republican convention approached, the forces broadly referred to as "Wall Street," appalled by his refusal to go along with their illusions of perpetual prosperity, tried to prevent his nomination. He was chosen on the first ballot, however, and elected by a landslide.

His first chore as President was to arrest the runaway stock gambling. He failed, of course. The public was being assured daily that the zooming common stocks would keep on zooming, and legal authority to curb the

stock market rested in New York, where Gov. Roosevelt saw everything "in a healthy and prosperous state."

The disaster Hoover had cautioned against struck the nation eight months after his inauguration. He began that long regimen of unstinting exertions for which he was rewarded with the infamous myth that he "caused" the Depression, then "did nothing" to mitigate its miseries. For already, months before the market crash, a unique smear factory was operating in the Democratic party, fueled with millions provided by anti-Hoover financiers, geared to one job, the defamation of a President.

Far from subsiding after the victim had been ousted from the White House, the defamation was expanded. New lies and libels were constantly added to the piled-up insults. "We'll hang Herbert Hoover on a sour apple tree," the radicals were singing gaily, "when the revolutions comes!"

The New Deal soon had thousands, then tens of thousands, of "information" personnel in its teeming agencies, all zealously vilifying the ex-President. John Spargo, liberal and Socialist, called it "the most shamefully scurrilous machine for discrediting a public man that this or any other nation has known in my time."

The unprecedented tragedy of Hoover's martyrdom, his long years in the valley of shadows, mocked and mauled, is too immense and complex to be treated here. Fortunately—for the country more than for the man—it had a happy ending: He lived to see almost complete vindication, with his amazing abilities and energies undiminished, to carry out more enterprises of services to the nation and the world.

When Hoover announced from the White House that in any major economic breakdown the federal government must assume responsibility, he was establishing a new and audacious principle. All previous depressions had been allowed to run their course. Spokesmen for political and economic orthodoxy assailed him bitterly not for the Depression but for initiating what would later be called the New Deal.

The "nothing" he did as President included memorable political and economic innovations: the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Mortgage Discount and Loan Banks, a score more that could be listed. Many others would be adopted and hailed as proof of New Deal wisdom by the very men who had prevented their passage when Hoover first proposed them. For his job-making construction projects he was denounced as a spendthrift. "Throw the spenders out!" was a Democratic slogan in 1932, and Roosevelt solemnly promised to reduce the budget by "not less than 25 per cent."

Failure to provide federal handouts, the so-called "dole," would in time rank near the top among Hoover's alleged sins of hard-heartedness. Actually a hostile Congress, Gov. Roosevelt and most other Democratic leaders—virtually everyone, indeed, but a few wild men on the left—had also opposed the dole, and so did the Democratic 1932 platform.

It was continually charged that in the Hoover years millions of families were starving. Had that been true, Hoover would write, surely Roosevelt "would not have failed to say so during the presidential campaign. It would have been the best vote-getter." But in the Democratic campaign literature one finds few traces of the fairy tale of mass starvation.

Five times Hoover had turned back panic. It finally came—in his last months, when the President-elect had the real power and jovially refused to cooperate with the lame-duck incumbent. "We definitely had the Depression licked in the summer and early autumn of 1932," Hoover would say years

later, "but the election of the New Deal reversed the trend and perpetuated the Depression." The climactic hurricane of fear was let loose by Roosevelt's refusal to disown the reckless talk of panacea-peddlers around him. On July 16, 1934, the New York Times would attest that "the change for the better in the last half of 1932 is beyond dispute."

The idea that the New Deal "ended" the Depression is, of course, as spurious as the idea that Hoover "caused" it. One still finds some innocents shocked to learn that the Great Depression dragged on for eight years under Roosevelt and ended only with the advent of war in Europe. The 1930s wound up with some 11 million unemployed (aside from millions "employed" on make-believe work life leaf-raking) and 20 million on relief.

There was something pathologically vengeful and petty in Roosevelt's relentless persecution of his predecessor. Hoover had opposed intervention in World War II, but when the die was cast he immediately pledged his loyalty. Most of Roosevelt's own official family were among the prominent Americans who pledged that Hoover's talents be used in the war effort. FDR adamantly barred him from even a token participation.

Only after Roosevelt's death in April 1945 did the government's 12-year ostracism of Hoover end. President Truman, who deeply admired him, at once invited Hoover to the White House. In 1946, as head of the President's Famine Emergency Commission, Hoover, already in his 70s, made an epic 35,000-mile fact-finding journey through Europe and Asia, then another to Latin America, as prelude to another post-war relief and rehabilitation program.

It marked the beginning of the end of his long martyrdom. The tides of slander rapidly receded. In August 1957, HUMAN EVENTS published my article, "Herbert Hoover: Triumph of Integrity." Actually the steep spiral of his revived popularity began many years earlier. His 75th birthday, in 1949, saw a remarkable nationwide outpouring of praise and affection, mixed with guilt and repentance for the cruelties he had suffered. It was repeated every August thereafter. On his 85th birthday, an editorial in the *Saturday Evening Post* was captioned: "Herbert Hoover's Service to the Nation Shames Those Who 'Smeared' Him."

It was said, inevitably, that the ex-President had made a "comeback." Not so. It was the country that came back and found Hoover where he had always been, too securely planted in his moral soil to be uprooted by the cyclones of abuse.

True, he had mellowed with age so that the American people now could see more of the warm, whimsical Hoover always known to his loyal friends, the very human and profoundly humane Quaker behind his austere facade.

More and more of his countrymen, including outstanding New Dealers, came to think of him primarily not as a President, however rated, but a man whose compassion reached out to embrace all mankind. He had not lived with an eye on opinion polls and intellectual fashions. He had not patience with those who consider it broad-minded to steer a middle course between truth and falsehood.

On fundamental issues of good and evil—such as the challenge of communism, for instance—his innermost commitments shielded him from the confusions that undermined the self-confidence of many free men, including statesmen. Hoover, thank God, hadn't the "flexibility" of a Nehru or a Nixon.

Dr. Alvin Johnson, a ranking liberal, in an open letter to the ex-President in June 1947, declared: "Among Americans of my time you have been the greatest, by virtue of your extending the concern of Americans for the

whole world." Others have expressed the same insight. For nearly half a century Hoover's historical role was as the most effective instrument of America's idealistic conscience and humane instincts.

Such is the man to whom so many throughout the free world pay homage on his centennial. He belongs to all generations.

H.R. 13377

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 5, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a great joy to me to see that an inequity of many years has finally been corrected by this House through the passage of H.R. 13377, a bill which would provide certain hospital and domiciliary care and medical services to persons who served as members of the Polish and Czech Armed Forces during World War I and II and have been citizens of the United States for at least 10 years.

I have been a sponsor of this legislation ever since I came to Congress in 1965 and this legislation was before the Congress long before I came as a member of this honorable body.

I am sure that the Members of the House understood the problem quite well and joined in passing this legislation as a just and fair action to create equity for those people who fought in the same cause in the Allied Army along our U.S. Forces. It is my feeling that we should take nothing away from these brave soldiers that is available to our own U.S. veterans.

The people who this legislation will greatly assist are those who volunteered to fight for the cause of freedom although not required to serve. These volunteers trained on their own time, formed their own fighting units and went into battle. The passage of this legislation gives us an opportunity to express our thanks for their willingness to fight for the ideals of liberty so deeply cherished by all men and women.

Mr. Speaker, the people who will be, affected have fought bravely on our side in two different wars. They have been strong allies. Today they are citizens of our great country, but have unfortunately, not received the same kind of veteran benefits as others who fought alongside have received. By means of this legislation we are paying proper honor to their service and extending our appreciation for their contribution to the common cause through providing these normal benefits that are rightfully due to these veterans.

Now, that this legislation is before the Veterans Committee of the Senate, I hope that the committee, and the Senate itself, will expedite its passage so that these men will finally become eligible for the benefits provided for in this legislation. These men are examples of spirited individuals who were, and are yet, determined that freedom is the most prized possession of any people.

TERRORISM AND COUNTERTERRORISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the continuing cycle of terrorism and counterterrorism in the Middle East threatens the structure of peace to which some States in the area have made a commitment and to which the United States has committed so much prestige.

One focal point of trouble in this cycle of violence is the Lebanese-Israel border across which Palestinian guerrillas travel to attack sites and people in Israel and across which the Israel Army retaliates and tries to destroy the bases of the guerrillas.

I recently wrote the Department of State expressing my concern over the deteriorating situation on the Lebanese-Israel border and asked about the possibility of trying to station a United Nations force along that frontier in the hope of trying to deter raids.

Since the time my letter was written, things have improved along that border and the situation is calmer, but basic problems remain.

The Department of State's reply to my letter describes well the intricate problems involved and I would like to bring the letter to the attention of my colleagues.

My letter to State and State's reply follow:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1974.

HON. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The continuing cycle of terrorism and counterterrorism in the Middle East has the potential of destroying the foundations of a structure of peace in the region that you have worked so hard to build and Members of Congress are anxious to see this cycle curbed as soon as possible and as best we can.

I would like the Department of State's assessment of the idea of creating a United Nations force to seal off the Lebanon-Israel border.

I would appreciate an early response to this matter.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Near
East and South Asia.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., August 6, 1974.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Near East
and South Asia, Committee on Foreign
Affairs, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to thank you for your letter of June 25 in which you expressed concern over the cycle of terrorism and counterterrorism in the Middle East and requested our assessment of the possibility of establishing a United Nations force to seal off the Lebanese-Israel border.

You are quite right in pinpointing the Lebanese-Israel border as a source of serious

potential danger to the stability of the Middle East. In June we witnessed further acts of violence across this border. If continued, the cycle of violence could undermine the progress we have already made in our Middle East peace initiative and make further advances much more difficult.

We have tried to contain this violence by diplomatic means, and the relative quiet that has prevailed along the border more recently shows that we have had some success. Nonetheless, we realize that this calm is precarious, and we have been examining other means for stabilizing the situation. We recognize the presence of UN peacekeeping machinery has proven helpful in many conflict situations around the world. The idea of a United Nations force along the border has come up a number of times in recent years when there has been serious trouble along the Lebanese/Israeli border. Unfortunately, there are serious questions about the practical feasibility of this idea. One problem is that the area involved, in addition to being extensive, is mountainous and in many places heavily wooded, so that a large force would be required even to attempt to seal the border. Another is that such a force, if effective, would be vulnerable to attack by terrorist elements not under the control of the Lebanese Government. In saying the foregoing, we are not ruling out the possibility of a UN force along the Lebanese-Israel border at some stage, although it is not something that either side is presently proposing.

There are now thirty-five United Nations observers along the Lebanese side of the border. They have no police authority; their mandate is to report any violations of the Israeli-Lebanese Armistice Agreement of 1949, including illegal crossings by regular or irregular forces. Israel has not accepted UN observers along its side of the Lebanese border.

Our hope is that continued progress in the Middle East negotiations toward an equitable, permanent settlement will in the end resolve the problem of violence across the Lebanese-Israel border. It is possible that these negotiations might bring about agreement on an augmentation of the current United Nations presence along the border, but of course such a step would have to be weighed very carefully and would require the agreement of the parties.

The Secretary very much appreciates your concern, as well as that of other members of Congress, over this crucial issue. Please do not hesitate to let me know if I may be of further assistance.

Cordially,

LINWOOD HOLTON,
Assistant Secretary
for Congressional Relations.

MR. BILL COCKERILL

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, for many years, Mr. Bill Cockerill has been one of northeastern Pennsylvania's leading citizens. He has been a leader in the struggle for more job opportunities, better health care, improved working conditions, and numerous other civic opportunities. Such activity has won him the admiration of all who know him in the Scranton area. However, the greatest and

most meaningful recognition that can come to any man or woman is to have your talents and leadership ability recognized by your peers. Such an honor has come to Bill Cockerill in his selection as the new president of the Pennsylvania State Council of Machinists.

His selection as president at the State convention recently held in Lancaster, Pa., came from all local district lodge delegates representing more than 65,000 I.A.M. members in Pennsylvania. As new president of the State council, Bill Cockerill succeeds another distinguished Pennsylvania labor leader, Arthur B. White of Warren, Pa., who has held the post of president since 1947. In addition to his full time duties as business manager for I.A.M. Local 128, Bill Cockerill also serves as a member of the Machinists National Planning Committee.

Next year, the members of District 128 and affiliated members will host the 1975 State convention in Scranton.

Mr. Speaker, I know all of the Members of the House will want to join me in congratulating Bill Cockerill upon receipt of his newest accolade. He is a good friend of mine, a fine gentleman, a community leader, and a champion of the cause of working men all across this country.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

MAN IS NOT PERFECT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, after one of the most traumatic weeks in the history of our country and with the national media filled with all sorts of comment and speculation as to whether or not there should be additional action against former President Nixon, I was struck by the message conveyed in an editorial appearing in the July 27, 1974, edition of the Peoria Journal Star entitled, "Man Isn't Perfect."

I insert the text of the editorial in the RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it carefully and thoughtfully:

MAN IS NOT PERFECT

The greatest trouble with the visionary movements of this age is that they seem more and more to be based on something that is simply, utterly false.

If there is anything demonstrated by common experience, history, and religious thought over the millennia, it is the simple reality that man is imperfect and of very dubious perfectibility.

No logical process ever conceived will anticipate perfect institutions constructed by imperfect men in the first place and executed by other imperfect men.

It is beyond reason, and it can't happen. Yet when any imperfection occurs, we greet it with a kind of rage which presumes that it ought to be perfect. That not only makes no sense, but it makes for dumber steps and actions in response than are necessary.

The task of man, obviously, is not perfection and to make such our measuring stick is false doctrine and bad direction.

The real task of man is to find ways to accomplish as much as possible with institu-

tions and instruments and manpower that is imperfect. Our schemes, our forms of organization, our laws and our rules have to be designed to expect this imperfection and to cope with it as effectively as possible.

We need things that work as well as possible even with imperfect people running them and executing the details as well.

You don't build the same kind of a machine to be run by a perfect person as you build for a fellow you know is going to make mistakes.

Indeed, you can't build the same kind of structure for the skilled engineer to operate in the factory as you build for the shift worker—or the housewife—to operate "in the field."

It is vitally important that allowances be made for our errors and ways provided to work around them—and when we deny our imperfection we simply do not do that.

It is self-defeating every time something falls short of perfection to look around in frantic search for some dirty dog who viciously and deliberately made the mess—whether it is an oil shortage or a flood condition.

The first place to look is for the natural mistakes made in good conscience—usually while trying to solve some other problem that seemed big at the time.

The second thing to look at is whether the remedy goes overboard based on temporary circumstances and thus invites new and bigger errors to explode upon us later.

We have to build into every plan we make and everything we do a reasonable margin of error and that offsets our aesthetic sensibilities. We like things to be very neat and tidy and complete—perfect.

We can achieve this in concept, in argument, in theoretical exposition, in writing up a "law"—but the achievement is an illusion when translated into action.

It just isn't in us to be perfect.

Hence, we have a good chance of producing a "solution, for example, to the extraordinary high water in Lake Arlann at Pekin, now, that will have the residents going wild 10 years hence because the lake is drying up.

Or we have a good chance of "reforming" our political campaign practices in ways that will bring bigger scandals 10 years hence than those merely suspected now.

From one extreme to the other eternal human capacity for honest error exists—and it is the first place to look when things go wrong. Instead, emotionally, we look for a "criminal" act. Meanwhile, the best and most helpful institutions we are capable of creating can be condemned and lost to us with nothing half as good to follow if we pursue the course of some of our philosophic and some of our religious leaders of the day—who insist that everything should be perfect and if it isn't it ought to be destroyed! They aren't perfect, themselves. Whence will this perfection come, then?

The workable and beneficial approach to our problems has to be, "How can we do better recognizing our limitations?"

And that has to be an art and not a science.

It has to take into consideration variables.

A TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. CHARLES C. NOBLE

HON. GILLIS W. LONG OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention here today to the dedicated work of Maj. Gen. Charles C. Noble, who will soon retire

from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and his position as president of the Mississippi River Commission.

It has been my distinct pleasure to work with General Noble, both in my capacity as a Member of Congress and as president of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association.

We are all aware of the devastating flood of 1973. I think it fitting that we give credit here today to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and to General Noble who led last year's flood fight. General Noble's unerring decisions in this battle against the ravages of floodwaters saved our Nation millions of dollars. Through General Noble's leadership my State of Louisiana was spared from suffering far worse than it incurred.

Yet, as magnificent as were General Noble's actions and deeds during the perilous flooding of 1973, I believe the future will record that his greatest service has been the paths and new directions he carved for the betterment of water resources throughout the Lower Mississippi Valley.

From the time of his graduation from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1940 to this day, General Noble's record has been one of distinction with one major accomplishment following another. His military awards include the Distinguished Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit with two Oak Leaf Clusters, the Bronze Star and the Army Commendation Medal.

General Noble, through his superb leadership and counsel, will leave a part of himself and for that, we in the flood-prone Mississippi Valley will always remember him. Thank you.

ST. FRANCIS' LETTER

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the English Branch of the Third Order of St. Francis located at St. Leonard's Church, Boston, has presented me with a copy "St. Francis' Letter to the Rulers." Miss Agnes Sharples, the order's prefect has informed me that the director, Fr. Ubaldo DiPrizio OFM, offered a motion at a recent meeting that St. Francis' moving letter be forwarded to me for inclusion in the RECORD.

St. Francis of Assisi laid aside both the riches and indeed the necessities of this life to more perfectly follow the example of the Gospel. From his life comes a simple and yet profound wisdom we would all do well to heed in these troubled times. I am therefore honored to be able to join these dedicated lay people in the Third Order of St. Francis by sharing this letter with my colleagues:

ST. FRANCIS' LETTER TO THE RULERS

To all Magistrates and Consuls, to all Judges and Governors all over the world and to everyone else who receive this letter, Brother Francis, your poor worthless servant in the Lord God, sends greetings and peace.

Consider and realize that the day of death is approaching. I therefore beg of you with

all the respect I am capable of that you do not forget God or swerve from His commandments because of the cares and anxieties of this world which you have to shoulder. For all who forget Him and turn away from His commandments (Ps. 118:21) shall be forgotten by Him (Ez. 33:13). When the day of death comes, all what they thought their own will be taken away from them. The more wisdom and power they enjoyed in this life, the greater the torments they will have to endure in hell.

And so, my lords, this is my advice. Put away all worry and anxiety and receive the holy Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ fervently in memory of him. See to it that God is held in great reverence among your subjects; every evening, at a signal given by a herald or in some other way, praise and thanks should be given to the Lord God Almighty by all the people. If you refuse to see this, you can be sure that you will be held account for it on the day of judgment before Jesus Christ, your Lord and God.

These who keep a copy of this letter and put its prescriptions into practice can rest assured that they have God's blessing.

Peace and blessings to all in God's Holy love.

VIETNAM MISSING

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been instances reported in the public press in which individuals running for election have used the emotional value of the men who still are missing in Southeast Asia in their political campaign.

The truth about the MIA problem is that our Government, to include both the administration and the Congress, is seriously concerned about our missing servicemen. This is not a political issue. It does not divide people along partisan lines, and it must never be allowed to become a political issue.

There are 1,140 Americans who are classified as missing in action and 1,266 who were killed in action whose bodies were never recovered.

Right now the efforts of the U.S. military teams in Southeast Asia to recover bodies or investigate crash sites and suspected burial locations have been suspended. This is because on December 15 of last year the Communists murdered in cold blood, Captain Reece, a member of an unarmed U.S. identification team, at a crash site in South Vietnam.

We have three levers on the North Vietnamese, the Pathet Lao, and the Vietcong which are useful in gaining the release of data on these missing men.

The first is military pressure, and we have abandoned this course of action as a matter of national policy.

The second is public opinion. This is being used. Although not widely publicized, I wrote a letter to Premier Phan Van Dong of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam—North Vietnam—on February 20, 1974, urging his country and the guerrilla forces who respond to it to comply with the agreements reached on missing in action in the peace accords. Other Members of Congress and administration officials have taken similar actions.

In June, the House passed a resolution urging renewed efforts to clear up the MIA issues. This legislation passed by a vote of 374 to 0. There were no "sides" and no political or partisan differences.

The third alternative is negotiation between China, the U.S.S.R., and the United States to bring pressure on North Vietnam to stop the conflict in Southeast Asia which is hampering resolution of these very serious problems. Such negotiations are a responsibility of the administration and involve sensitive diplomatic considerations.

My purpose in making this statement is to set right some misconceptions that have been fostered on this matter and to attempt to take any further discussion of the missing-in-action problem out of the political arena.

It is unconscionable for any candidate for political office to play on the fears and hopes, particularly the hopes, of the families of our military personnel who are missing in action in Southeast Asia. Nothing could be more cruel than to exploit an issue of this kind for political gain.

The forces of the Congress, the administration, and all Americans, as well as those of other countries, must be joined in this humanitarian effort.

**BROWN'S PERSPECTIVE ARTICLE
HARMFUL TO UNDERSTANDING
OF SOUTH AFRICA**

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon be considering S. 1868, a bill to restore the United States to full compliance with United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia.

I am glad that Congress will have this opportunity to realign U.S. policy with the rest of the nations of this world in the quest for a satisfactory government in Southern Rhodesia. Our national interest will be best served by the recognition that Rhodesia is not important to our economy—last year only 11.2 percent of our chrome imports came from Rhodesia—and that support of human rights and liberties is important for democracy.

In this regard, I would like to share with my colleagues the following thoughtful letter published in the Denver Post on August 4:

**BROWN'S PERSPECTIVE ARTICLE HARMFUL TO
UNDERSTANDING OF SOUTH AFRICA**

To the Denver Post:

There is a great need for more background articles on Southern Africa in the U.S. press, but the article by Robert K. Brown in the Perspective section of The Sunday Post of July 21 is less than helpful in this regard. Coming as it does, when the House of Representatives will shortly face a crucial vote on U.S. compliance with U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia, it is positively harmful.

Nowhere in the article is it even mentioned that the present minority government in Rhodesia is a rebel government, unrecog-

nized by a single country—even its reluctant de facto ally, South Africa—as a legitimate sovereign state. Legally it is a colony of Great Britain, whose often halting efforts to effect an orderly transition to majority rule were thwarted by an illegal unilateral declaration of independence in 1965. Nowhere is it mentioned that the African nationalist parties for a decade prior to their banning and for many years thereafter, tried through generally peaceful protest and petition to effect change before coming to the reluctant conclusion that violence is the only language the white man seems to understand. Nowhere in the article are their armed forces recognized under their own term, liberation fighters, or even under the relatively neutral term, guerrilla soldiers. Brown is not even content with the pejorative term terrorists, but reveals in the white Rhodesian slang phrase "terrs."

Nowhere is it acknowledged that control of the land was taken from its African occupants only in the 1890s by the same kind of violent warfare with which the Africans are now trying to regain it. Nowhere is mention made of the continuing peaceful opposition among Africans inside the country, led by the African National Council headed by Bishop Abel Muzorewa. While generally sympathetic with the aims of the guerrillas, this group still seeks to negotiate rapid peaceful change. The last effort at settlement with Britain in 1971 produced convincing evidence of the widespread popular support of the NAC's efforts. In short, the article reflects one perspective, that of the white European settler within Rhodesia, representing less than 5 per cent of the population, and anyone familiar with the country must wonder if the author spoke to anyone at all from the black 95 per cent.

If Henry Kissinger, as Brown claims, does not regard Rhodesia as a "threat to world peace," that can only reflect the lack of attention the secretary of state has given to this part of the world in his preoccupation with personal attention to the smallest details of relations with the macropowers and the Arab-Israeli conflict.

In fact our government, with good reason, has joined, at the recommendation of Great Britain, in just such a recognition of the gravity of Smith's Rhodesian rebellion, and voted in 1967 to apply mandatory U.N. sanctions in an effort to bring about relatively peaceful change. In 1971, against the advice of our State Department, the U.S. Congress made us the only nation in the world openly to defy this "mandatory" U.N. action when it passed the so called "Byrd Amendment" to the military procurement bill. This amendment permits open importation into the United States of chrome and other products from Rhodesia, even though ample supplies are available from other sources.

A new bill (S. 1868) has now passed the Senate and has been reported out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee with a substantial favorable vote that will again put us in compliance with our U.N. commitments. It will be a tragedy if, when this vote comes to the full House in the next few weeks, biased viewpoints like that of Robert K. Brown are allowed to prevail, and our credibility with most of black Africa and the Third World again damaged by a failure to pass this important legislation.

ROBERT C. GOOD,

Dean, Graduate School of International Studies, University of Denver.

EDWARD A. HAWLEY,

Editor, Africa Today.

GEORGE W. SHEPHERD, Jr.,

Professor, University of Denver.

J. LEO CEFKIN,

Professor, Colorado State University.

BARRY M. SCHUTZ,

Professor, Fort Lewis College.

JAMES SCARRITT,

Professor, University of Colorado.

**RHODESIAN CHROME AIDS GLOBE
DURING TURMOIL ON CYPRUS**

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, soon we will again be called upon to make a decision in the area of U.N. sanctions against products of Rhodesian origin. There are many charges and countercharges being made in conjunction with the anticipated debate regarding specifically, the reimposition of an embargo on Rhodesian chrome.

I respect the moral arguments of my worthy opponents, the supporters of S. 1868. The arguments are well made, but they are also decidedly one-sided. I choose to believe that the important points to be made in the chrome situation are instead economic considerations.

The recent war on Cyprus between Greek and Turkish forces served to underscore in a small scale the dangers inherent in excluding Rhodesia from the world chrome marketplace. Substitute Russia for Turkey in the current crisis of several U.S. ferrochrome producers and the crisis indeed becomes much more full blown.

The article follows:

[From the American Metal Market
July 30, 1974]

**RHODESIAN CHROME AIDS GLOBE DURING
TURMOIL ON CYPRUS**

(By Jeff Wood)

WASHINGTON.—The Rhodesian Government, currently under the threat of a renewed full United States economic embargo, has come to the aid of the U.S. ferrochromium producer whose normal source of chrome ore supply was interrupted by the war in Cyprus.

Late last week Univex, the Rhodesian state corporate which manages the country's chrome properties, made an exception to its policy of not exporting chrome ore and agreed to ship Globe Metallurgical division of Interlake, Inc., 8,000 tons of ore.

As a result of the Rhodesian action, coupled with help from a U.S. competitor and an indicated restoration of the interrupted ore shipment from Turkey, Globe won't have to halt production of high carbon ferrochromium beginning Aug. 1 after all.

"It looks like we'll be able to continue high carbon ferrochrome production at a curtailed rate until the ore arrives and then we'll go back into full production," Alfred D. Gate, assistant manager, Globe Metallurgical, said yesterday.

"We're thankful to all those who have helped, particularly the Rhodesians," Gate added. "I think this makes a good point about the value of having Rhodesia as an alternate source of ore."

Up until late last week it appeared that Globe Metallurgical, which depends on Turkey for its chrome ore supply, would have to halt high carbon ferrochromium production. The firm was advised early last week that a ship which was to have delivered 8,000 tons of ore to the U.S. was commandeered by the Turkish government because of the state of emergency caused by the conflict in Cyprus.

Globe contacted its competitors and asked for help and also asked for aid from the General Services Administration, but to no avail. The firm advised its customers it wouldn't be able to meet its commitments.

Meanwhile, Univex, which had heard about the halted shipment, contacted Globe and said it would watch the shipment held up in Turkey.

Subsequently, a Globe competitor, Chrome Mining Co., got back to the firm and agreed to furnish it with some ore until normal shipments were restored. Then at the weekend, the Turkish government contacted Globe and indicated that the ship would be released.

Gate said that Globe would still take shipment on the Rhodesian ore.

Normally, the Globe executive said, an interruption of one shipment of ore wouldn't cause such disruptions in the firm's production schedules. "Up until a year ago we always maintained inventories of 6-12 months, but in the last year because of strong worldwide demand we've been living pretty much hand to mouth," he said.

Rhodesia, which has the world's largest resources of high grade chrome ore, recently has exported very little ore. Instead it has been refining its ore into higher value ferrochrome for exportation.

The threatened interruption to Globe's ferrochrome production, though coincidental, couldn't have come at a more opportune time for opponents of the Congressional move to repeal the current exemption for chrome from the U.S.-backed United Nations economic sanctions of Rhodesia.

The House Rules Committee today is scheduled to calendar for floor debate S. 1868, a measure which would restore the U.S. blockade of all Rhodesian imports, including chrome.

U.S. specialty metals and ferroalloys interests are expected to offer the Globe situation as proof of their main argument against cutting off Rhodesian chrome—that it would leave the U.S. with no alternate sources of chrome in emergency situations.

In addition to Rhodesia and Turkey the other major U.S. source for chrome is the Soviet Union, which has an exclusive supply agreement with the Airco Alloys division of Airco, Inc.

There is a substantial tonnage of high carbon metallurgical chrome in the national stockpile, but the GSA still needs the authority from Congress to release it.

Passage of this and other stockpile release bills is being blocked by a House Armed Services subcommittee which has demanded further White House justification for the administration's proposed massive stockpile disposal plan.

Meanwhile, in today's tight raw materials market, any disruption to normal supply channels invites almost immediate scarcities.

Opponents of the reimposition of the Rhodesian chrome embargo would like to see a House vote on S. 1868 delayed. They claim to have the votes to defeat the measure, but fear that because of absenteeism it could be passed.

S. 1868, previously approved by the Senate, was recently approved by the House Foreign Relations committee. If the bill isn't debated in the House before the beginning of impeachment debate, action could be delayed until September, according to Capitol Hill sources.

A NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER FOR THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, President Ford has asked the people of the United States to "confirm him with their pray-

ers." Such a request is basic to the tenets of this God-fearing leader who has been elevated to the Presidency.

Because there will be a dependence upon divine guidance as President Ford carries out his multifarious duties, I have today recommended to the President that he immediately proclaim a National Day of Prayer so that all of our citizens can participate in this act of supplication.

With the thought that many of my colleagues would want to join me in recommending a National Day of Prayer for the benefit of the new administration, I am inserting a copy of my letter to the President in the RECORD. I will be grateful to all who support this proposal. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
August 12, 1974.

HON. GERALD R. FORD,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT FORD: Your thoughtful, sincere remarks at the time you were sworn in as the 38th President of the United States struck a responsive chord around the nation.

My constituents were particularly impressed by your request to the people to "... confirm you with their prayers." I feel confident, Mr. President, you are in the prayers of a majority of the citizens as you take over the awesome responsibilities of the highest office in the land.

Those who pray and seek divine guidance undergird the strength of America. They want you to succeed. They want you to heal the wounds and move us out of the malaise which has dominated the mood of the country too long. They want to help you in every possible way.

As you proceed toward the immediate decisions you must make to put the Ford administration on course—the selection of a Vice President, the solution of economic problems, the implementation of your foreign policy—divine guidance will be a dominating force. It would appear, therefore, that a National Day of Prayer, immediately proclaimed, to offer thanks to God for seeing us through this crisis and for granting understanding in the future, should be one of your first proclamations.

I respectfully and humbly offer this suggestion. A National Day of Prayer at this time would be more than balm to heal the wounds; it would be the armor to protect against now wounds as well.

Sincerely,

LAMAR BAKER,
Member of Congress.

THE HONORABLE JAMES ALOYSIUS FARLEY—GIANT OF AMERICAN POLITICS

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the July 27, 1974 issue of the Irish Echo in New York City had a very fine article about a very good and long-time friend, a man I have admired for many, many years, the Honorable James A. Farley. Through a long, successful, and distinguished career "Big Jim" Farley has always epitomized the best in American politics. These are the days in which those of us in active politics fully

appreciate the record for integrity and ability of men like Jim Farley.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues in the Congress. I include this article in the RECORD which reads as follows:

JAMES A. FARLEY: ELDER STATESMAN
(By Joe Murphy)

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

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

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

CAREER BEGINNINGS

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

"The rest of it" is one of America's great success stories: Jim became head of the New York State Democratic Committee in 1930, and two years later successfully pushed the presidential nomination of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Becoming chairman of the National Committee, Farley managed F.D.R.'s presidential campaign with equal success and landed up in the cabinet as Postmaster General. He dropped out to mastermind Roosevelt's 1936 campaign after which he stepped back into his old cabinet job. By 1940, Jim had accumulated some presidential aspirations of his own, and when Roosevelt decided he wanted the job again, Farley dropped out of the cabinet and shed his party chairmanship. It took 20 years for someone else to bring to reality the dream Jim had nurtured: to become the first Irish Catholic President.

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

feature of the banquet circuit, a claque of about three stands up and the rest of the room is ashamed not to follow suit.

SINCERE TRIBUTE

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

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

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

CANONS OF DECENCY

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

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

IT IS NOT THE BRAINS THAT
MATTER MOST

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this year marked the 120th commencement of Rockford College in Rockford, Ill. The commencement ad-

dress was delivered by Juanita Kidd Stout, judge on the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas. Judge Stout, the first elected Negro woman judge in the United States served Rockford College as a trustee from 1967 to 1972. In 1966, she was the recipient of the college's Jane Addams Medal, awarded periodically to a woman who has made a distinguished contribution to society through her life and work. I found her address, "It Is Not the Brains That Matter Most," well worth reading.

I would like at this time to insert her remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to my colleagues:

IT IS NOT THE BRAINS THAT MATTER MOST

(By Juanita Kidd Stout)

This commencement speech is the last lecture you are required to endure before receiving your hard earned degree. It will be of short duration. Moreover, like all graduation speeches, these few words ride on air of futility for I am confident you will not long remember the details—and maybe not even the subject—of what is said here. Five times I have graduated, and the content of four speeches and even the identity of four speakers I have long since forgotten. Oddly enough, the one I do remember is the speech given at my very first graduation which was from the eighth grade. The theme of that speech, which has been most helpful to me throughout my life, was repeated frequently and with emphasis as the speaker admonished us: "Don't get discouraged." That is not my subject but it is advice worthy of recall even in the last third of the Twentieth Century.

Before giving you the theme of my message today, I want to congratulate you on your physical, psychological and educational survival to the status of a college graduate. This is an achievement in and of itself when you consider that the entirety of your short lifespan of some two decades has been lived through a period of rapid change, both positive and negative in character; and through a period of great instability encompassing some of the most violent and cataclysmic years known to mankind.

You were born just prior to the beginning of the Space Age which began in 1957 with the launching of Sputnik I, and you saw within a period of 12 short years the beginning of the Age of Moon Exploration when Neil A. Armstrong took "one great leap for mankind." You have seen a new concern for the environment born with the publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in 1962, and you witnessed the advent of consumerism in 1965, when Ralph Nader directed our attention to the fact that some of our sleekest vehicles were *Unsafe at any Speed*. Since you entered college, America has taken a long, hard and constructive look at the rights of women; and you have become the first generation to vote as eighteen-year-olds. Even since you began your senior year, America has become a land of shortages, real or contrived.

During your short lifetime, explosions have occurred of knowledge, population and subcultures, some of the latter practicing communal living and the use of narcotic and other destructive drugs. New and radical political forces advocating violent confrontations, bombings, skyjackings and political kidnappings have crossed the American scene. You have been awe-stricken as violence has erupted in the most unexpected places—on college campuses and at political conventions. You have shuddered at the violence which attended the Sit-Ins, Freedom Rides and church bombings of the early and mid-60's. You have wept bitterly as the assassin's bullet deprived the Nation of three progressive leaders.

Your entire lives have been lived in an era of wars and rumors of wars ranging from the Korean conflict of 1950 to the senseless and protracted Vietnam War and the sporadic fighting of the Middle East. The ultimate in man's capacity to destroy himself, the hydrogen bomb, had its beginning in 1953, when some of you were infants and others were yet unborn.

Your youth has protected most of you from active participation in the physical violence which has characterized the era in which you have lived; however, because of your youth, you have been even more susceptible and vulnerable than older persons to the psychological assaults which have resulted from the violence in which you have been immersed. That you have come through this formative period of your life psychologically unscathed and unalienated by this rapid change and discordant strife is a major achievement on which you are to be congratulated and of which, unfortunately, many of your contemporaries cannot boast.

You have been told that your generation is the smartest one to inhabit the earth—and that is true. You are the products of better educated parents, better nutrition, better medical care, better education and a higher standard of living than has been enjoyed by any previous generation. As a result you rightly may lay claim to being the smartest generation which has ever lived—to having the greatest brainpower.

For brainpower, there is no substitute. Knowledge is essential and excellence is a goal much to be desired. Nevertheless, I want to leave you with just one thought which, hopefully, will be of value throughout your life. That thought is derived from the words of the Russian philosopher, Dostoyevski, who said in his novel, *The Insulted and the Injured*: "It is not the brains that matter most, but that which guides them—the character, the heart, generous qualities, progressive ideas." This thought I should like to illustrate with a very few examples and vignettes all of which happened within your lifetime.

Education has progressed from pre-1954 status, segregated in law and in fact, to post-1954 status, integrated in law and substantially and increasingly integrated in fact.

In 1956, the Governor of Alabama stood in the doorway of the University of Alabama to bar the entrance of a Negro coed who later was stoned and wrongfully expelled simply because she was a Negro. In 1973, that same Governor, at that same University, crowned another Negro coed as Miss Homecoming as black football players scored for the mighty Crimson Tide. Throughout the 11 Southern States few Negro citizens were registered to vote before 1965, and black elected officials, few of whom could be found anywhere before 1965, now number over 2,000, many of whom are in the South.

There was not a dearth of brains on the United States Supreme Court before *Brown v. The Board of Education*. As a matter of fact, all the Justices who decided *Plessy v. Ferguson* were learned men. Neither was there a dearth of brains on the part of the Governor of the State of Alabama, nor the administration and student body of the University when Autherine Lucy was denied entrance and stoned. They all knew that barring her entrance was a denial of equal protection of the law and that assault and battery was a crime. Even before the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the voting registrars understood the Fifteenth Amendment guaranteed to every adult the right to vote. But it was not their brains which had mattered most, but that which had guided them—their character and heart, which were uncharitable at best and hateful at worst; their qualities which were selfish and ungenerous, and their ideas which were provincial, unprogressive and reactionary.

You have seen the pervasion of business and industry by immoral leadership. Only

recently the Securities and Exchange Commission has charged the corporate leadership of the nation's largest railroad not with incompetence but with authorizing "false and misleading" financial statements which "improperly inflated" the railroad's stated earnings and with siphoning of millions of dollars in Penn Central funds to a bank account in Liechtenstein. Similarly, insurance has been shocked by the Equity Funding scandal which has resulted in the recent indictment of a number of well-trained, professionally competent executives for fraudulently writing some \$2 billion worth of fictitious life insurance policies, filing false death claims and selling counterfeit securities.

You have seen peccadilloes in government. All too often, the lives of public officials have been sullied by influence peddling and pay-offs, wheeling and dealing, kick-backs and bribes, conflicts of interest and cronyism, hypocrisy and credibility gaps.

Despite his outstanding legislative record, one of the most brilliant members ever to sit in the halls of Congress, the late Adam Clayton Powell, was expelled, censured by his colleagues and rejected at the polls by his constituents for junketeering and other exploitation of his official position. In the five years that he was Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives, he expedited the passage of 60 major laws from his Committee including some of the most important legislation in the history of America. Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education, Assistance for Colleges and Universities, Manpower Development and Training legislation, and legislation which increased minimum wages, established the War on Poverty, and legislation which aided the School Lunch Program and Library services were part of his legislative output.

In 1968, you saw the resignation of a brilliant member of the Supreme Court of the United States when disclosures were made that he had entered into a contractual relationship with a foundation controlled by a disreputable person charged with crime and that he had participated in drafting legislation and had acted as advisor to the President while on the Supreme Court Bench, both clearly in violation of the doctrine of separation of powers.

Even before ascending the Supreme Court Bench, Abe Fortas was recognized as having one of the most precise and keen minds in the legal profession. As a lawyer, one of his many contributions was to establish, through the landmark case of *Gideon v. Wainwright*, the right of indigent criminal defendants to have state appointed lawyers in all serious criminal cases. Later, the incisive reasoning he displayed on the Supreme Court won for him the admiration of the Nation as perhaps the Court's most brilliant mind.

You are witnessing currently the most distressing parade from government service of brilliant, well-educated young men, and a few older ones, who have been caught up in a whirlwind of greed, dirty tricks, perjury, conspiracies, political espionage, income tax evasion and other crimes. There have been abuses of power in the improper use of prosecutorial discretion where Internal Revenue, anti-trust and other laws have been used wrongfully and oppressively against those thought to be political enemies.

Most of these men are members of the legal profession—a profession which professes to play a major role in implementing moral values in society. To these men, however, the sacred words of the oath of admission to the profession must have been empty indeed, for they ignored that oath which binds them not to "maintain any suit or proceeding which shall appear . . . to be unjust" and which implores them to "employ . . . such means only as are consistent with truth and honor." The oath further

binds them never to "seek to mislead . . . by any artifice or false statement of fact or law." In addition to the ethical standards embodied in the lawyer's oath, these men also were bound by the Code of Ethics for United States Government Service which dictates that: "Any person in Government service shall . . . put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party or Government Department." It also admonishes: "Expose corruption wherever discovered." Only belatedly has one of the recently resigned government employees begun to articulate a proper sense of values. Egil Krogh, now confined in Allenwood Prison, wrote earlier this month:

"I'm coming to the feeling that no matter where one works, and regardless of the sensitivity of his job, the enormity of the stakes involved in his decisions, or the number of people affected, he must always first consider the moral question of what he is about to do . . . a person working in an organization has to feel free enough to be unpopular, to dissent, and, perhaps to walk away and leave if he can't square the organization's views with his own . . ."

Powell was, and Fortas, and that innumerable through which currently is making its exit from the executive branch of government, are brilliant, well-educated men, who admittedly made many positive changes in American life and who, intellectually, still had much to offer their Nation and the world. But, it was not their fertile and productive brains that mattered most but the greed of their hearts and the callousness and insensitivity with which they viewed their public trust that brought them to shame, which deprived America of the continued benefit of their expertise gained through long years of training and experience, and which has lessened public confidence in all three branches of government.

Consider conversely, however, the equally brilliant Dr. Frances Oldham Kelsey and the situation in which she found herself a few years ago.

As she performed her duties with the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Kelsey, who is both a pharmacologist and a physician, received the application for licensing of a new sleeping pill.

Under the Food and Drug Act which was then in effect, the application for a license to market a new drug was approved automatically in 60 days unless the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration acted to prevent its sale. When the 60-day deadline for action on the application presented to Dr. Kelsey arrived, she wrote to the drug manufacturer that proof of safety of the product was unsatisfactory. The manufacturer telephoned, wrote and came to see her. He telephoned, wrote and went to see her superiors. He called Dr. Kelsey unreasonable and irresponsible and, in her own words, "most of the time they called me names you could not print." An editorial in one of the trade papers said that such dilatory tactics would cause a loss to the industry of millions of dollars. As the Yuletide Season approached, Dr. Kelsey was reminded by the manufacturer that if she did not hurry they would miss the Christmas market.

Dr. Kelsey refused to hurry and as each 60-day period arrived, when inaction on her part would have resulted in approval of the drug, Dr. Kelsey wrote yet another letter indicating there still had been insufficient proof of safety. For 19 long months, Dr. Kelsey tenaciously refused approval of this drug. Finally, in November 1961, a German physician announced that the drug which Dr. Kelsey had withheld from the American market was the same drug which had been responsible for the European epidemic of deformed babies. It was thalidomide.

Consider also the circumstances in which

Dr. Jacqueline Verrett more recently found herself. She too is a scientist in the Food and Drug Administration and holds a doctorate degree in biochemistry. Dr. Verrett investigated the toxic effects of materials involved in the food-processing industry by using the chick embryo technique. A large number of the chick embryos injected with the artificial sweetener cyclamate developed serious and grotesque deformities. For 18 months, beginning in March 1968, Dr. Verrett reported these disturbing findings to her superiors, including the Commissioner himself. They did nothing.

In September 1969, Dr. Verrett was invited to appear on NBC-TV. When she advised her superiors of the invitation some 10 or 12 of them tried to dissuade her and admonished that she should say nothing of her scientific findings lest they lead to "undue public concern."

Dr. Verrett appeared on NBC-TV on October 1, 1969 and answered truthfully questions concerning the results of her findings. Thereafter, the Agency figuratively put her under "house arrest." For two weeks she was allowed neither to communicate with the press nor to answer her office telephone. Seventeen days after her television appearance, however, cyclamates were banned as being unsafe for human consumption. Instead of being commended as she should have been, Dr. Verrett was criticized by her superiors for being unethical and overzealous. Of her experience, Dr. Verrett said, "Given the same circumstances, having adequate data in hand, if the occasion arose I would not hesitate to discuss them openly."

Lest you think I emphasize disproportionately the candor and courage of women, consider the contribution of Frank Serpico, who was educated in police science at Brooklyn College and the Police Academy of New York, and who surely was one of that City's finest policemen. His unique contribution to law enforcement did not arise from his education, however, but from the steadfastness with which he refused to participate in the corruption with which the Department was rife and in his five-year fight within the Department, and ultimately through the press and the court, to expose the widespread system of shakedowns, payoffs and graft within it. He too suffered abuse and even violence to his person but his efforts were rewarded directly by the Knapp Commission Report of Police Corruption and a reorganization of the Police Department of New York. His efforts were rewarded more remotely by the same kind of investigation and exposure of police corruption in Philadelphia and several smaller cities and towns in America. Serpico was, in the words of Ralph Nader, a "whistle blower," one whose allegiance to society superseded his allegiance to the organization's policies and one who had the courage to inform outsiders.

Kelsey, Verrett, Serpico—their contributions came partly because of their professional competence to be sure, but it was not their brains which mattered most but the tenacity of their character and loyalty to moral principles, the courage of their convictions, the imperviousness with which they withstood abuse because of those convictions and the priority which they placed on human values above avariciousness.

The difference between the downfall of the Powell-Fortas-Watergate group of public servants and the Penn Central-Equity people on the one hand and the success of the Kelsey-Serpico group on the other hand was not a difference of brains or education, of ability or perception. It was simply a difference in morality; a difference in their private values which reflected the difference in their public performances.

I possess no gift of prophecy which enables me to predict with any acceptable degree of accuracy and precision the events and trends of future years. Neither have I had the privilege of formal training in futuristics. Those

who are experts in the field, however, tell us that change, which has been the hallmark of your entire existence, will continue in greater dimensions and at an even more accelerated, and often dizzying, pace. Accepting this prediction as true, the future before you looms chaotic unless you chart that inevitable, larger and accelerated change in a positive and constructive direction.

Alvin Toffler, an authority on the Sociology of the Future, after considering the many changes which are avalanching upon our heads, wrote in *Future Shock* that: "Every society faces not merely a succession of probable futures, but an array of possible futures, and a conflict over preferable futures."

You, as members of the educated elite, have the responsibility of continually choosing from the probable and possible futures the preferable ones. You will determine whether the future is one of hope or of hopelessness, of confidence or lack thereof, of public morality or immorality, for you will be the policymakers, who will sit in the seats of power in governmental and non-governmental institutions. You will occupy executive, legislative and judicial positions from the precinct to the national level. You will participate in training the Nation's youth, in selecting its political leaders, in shaping its economic policies and in molding its social patterns. At many levels you will determine preferences, articulate and implement them. In order to fashion for society and for yourself the best among all possible futures, you must capture control of change, manage, direct and undergird it with the appropriate moral qualities, for, in Toffler's words: "... change rampant, change unguided and unrestrained, accelerated change overwhelming not only man's physical defenses but his decisional processes—such change is the enemy of life."

You have brains enough and have acquired training enough to control, direct and manage that change in a positive and constructive manner, but it will not be your brains which matter most in determining the direction or quality of that change but your character which must be impeccably honest; your heart, which must be completely compassionate and strongly courageous; your qualities which must be unselfishly generous and your ideas, which must be socially imaginative and progressive.

I close with a short verse from Josiah Gilbert Holland entitled:

THE DAY'S DEMAND

"God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and
ready hands,

Men who the lust of office does not kill;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor,—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without
winking,

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the
fog

In public duty, and in private thinking:
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn
creeds,

Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice
sleeps."

IMMUNITY FOR RICHARD M. NIXON

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a concurrent resolution to

grant Richard M. Nixon immunity from either State or Federal prosecution. I have put this resolution before Congress not because I think Mr. Nixon may be found guilty of any crimes; on the contrary, I think the country should be satisfied with his statement that maybe some of his judgments were wrong, but that he thought he acted in the best interests of the country.

I am introducing this resolution in the spirit of Mr. Nixon's speech announcing his resignation, and that is what is in the country's best interest. Mr. Nixon's decision was the first step in putting this tragedy behind us, and I think Congress should take the second step by formally ending any further dispute or deadlock. I cannot overemphasize my concern about the divisive effects any further debate would have on American life.

In conclusion, now is not the time for petty jealousies and useless revenge. I have introduced this resolution in the hope that it will signify to the people that Congress wants this case closed.

TENNESSEE FORGING STEEL TAKES LEAD IN CLEAN AIR CONTROL

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 1974, an event occurred in the First Congressional District of Arkansas which may hold great significance as a model for some of the Nation's air quality improvement programs. On that date the Arkansas Division of Tennessee Forging Steel, a company that has shown its concern and compatibility with the environment, dedicated a unique million dollar air pollution control system at the Newport, Ark., plant. I would like to share with my colleagues some data concerning this system:

DATA SHEET

The air pollution control system works on the same principle as a vacuum cleaner. Two 600 H.P. motor driven fans, with a capacity of 264,000 cubic feet per minute, create a suction at the hood surrounding the roof of the electric furnace. These fans pull the dust laden smoke through a 96" diameter duct or pipe to 14 modules or boxes which contain 228 dacron bags (like vacuum cleaner bags) each. These dacron bags have a total cloth area of 75,802 square feet. The dust is collected in the dacron bags. Periodically, a shaking operation removes the dust from the bags. The dust is collected and sold to a customer who can use this dust in his product. This dust amounts to: 8,625 pounds daily; 258,750 pounds monthly; 3,148,125 pounds yearly.

This dust comes from oxides escaping from the scrap during the melting process and from grease and paint, etc., in the scrap. Although this dust is a nuisance and a source of dirt in the environment, it is non-toxic and is often used as an additive for fertilizer.

Approximately 100,000 tons of iron and steel scrap are recycled annually. The scrap comes principally from a 300 mile radius

around the plant and consists of auto bodies, farm implements, industrial scrap, stampings and turnings from machine shops, etc. Approximately half of the scrap recycled is junk automobile bodies, which is the equivalent of approximately 50,000 automobile bodies recycled annually.

This clean air system has been installed at a cost to Tennessee Forging Steel of nearly a million dollars.

This type of installation at Tennessee Forging Steel is especially unique, in that it establishes a precedent for the steel industry for a clean air service contract. In effect, the manufacturer of the clean air equipment has been contracted to operate and maintain the equipment over an extended period of time, and has guaranteed to Tennessee Forging Steel clean air for the steel plant in compliance with all local, state and federal laws. The Tennessee Forging Steel installations are the first such contracts in the steel industry and, although more expensive, are, in the opinion of Tennessee Forging management, the most sensible direction to follow in assuring its employees and surrounding citizens of the finest possible environment. It is interesting to note that in the event violation of a law should occur, the manufacturer of the equipment would have to pay any applicable fine levied against Tennessee Forging. This, also, to the best of our knowledge, is a precedent setting arrangement.

Tennessee Forging has three plants in the steel division: Harriman, Tennessee; Newport; and the newly acquired Jones and McKnight Corporation in Kankakee, Illinois.

Tennessee Forging also has two fabricating plants: Tennessee Forging Steel Service, Inc., in Hope, Arkansas, and Cahaba Steel Company, in Uniontown, Alabama.

The Newport plant has 250 employees with an approximate weekly payroll of \$55,000. An average of 345 tons of steel is expected daily in the melt shop. This amounts to approximately 9,000 tons monthly, and in the neighborhood of 112,000 tons annually. The rolling mill is expected to average 8,300 tons of rolled product per month, and expected to produce approximately 100,000 tons of finished product this year.

RUSSIAN AIMS IN SYRIA

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that Members of Congress will be deeply interested in having firsthand information from Israel concerning the massive infusion of Russian arms into Syria.

I append herewith a very informative article from the July 30, 1974, issue of the *Jerusalem Post*. This extraordinary piece of journalism reveals that Premier Rabin has warned that the Soviet Union is pouring new arms into Syria at unprecedented volumes and speed.

I append also an article from the August 8 issue of the *New York Times* which confirms the dire predictions of Premier Rabin as reported in the *Jerusalem Post*. The *New York Times* article indicates that Syria has received more than \$2 billion worth of modern weap-

only from the Soviet Union in the last 10 months.

The Times article includes a very helpful graph of the relative military strengths of Syria and Egypt before and after the War of October 1973.

All officials in Israel recognize the fact that it is difficult to exaggerate the significance for Israel of Syria's new military capability.

These two significant articles follow: [From the New York Times, Aug. 8, 1974] ISRAELIS SAY RUSSIAN ARMS GIVE SYRIA MIGHT TO STRIKE

(By Terence Smith)

JERUSALEM, August 7.—Syria has received more than \$2-billion worth of modern weaponry from the Soviet Union in the last 10 months and is now capable of launching a full-scale war against Israel, independently of Egypt, in the opinion of top Israeli leaders.

This new Syrian capability, in the Israeli view, has caused a significant shift in the military and political balance of power in the Middle East.

Syria is seen here as a catalyst that remains fundamentally hostile to Israel and is capable of setting off a new round of Middle Eastern fighting that ultimately would draw in other Arab nations, such as Iraq, Egypt and possibly Jordan.

The massive rearmament of Syria—especially the modernization of the Syrian Air Force with two squadrons of swift MIG-23's—is seen here as the keystone of a calculated policy decision by the Soviet Union to solidify its position in the Arab world and to develop an alternative base of influence in the region outside of Egypt.

This sober view of new strategic realities surrounding Israel has raised concern among the leadership here about the possibility of a war within six months to a year. It has prompted a series of public warnings to this effect during the last 10 days by Premier Yitzhak Rabin, Defense Minister Shimon Peres and Lieut. Gen. Mordechai Gur, the Chief of Staff.

The most recent of these statements came yesterday, when Mr. Peres asserted during a speech in Parliament that Syria was bent upon a new war with Israel.

"The stepped-up arms supplies, the accelerated training of their troops, the constant threats, the stated deadlines—all these have led us to express publicly what is apparent in fact: that Syria has indeed harnessed her horses of war," he said.

Describing the results of Soviet arms deliveries, Mr. Peres said that Syria's air force was now 25 per cent stronger than it was on the eve of the Arab-Israeli war last October and that the anti-aircraft missile defense system was about 20 per cent larger.

"The Soviet Union has increased Syria's arsenal of heavy guns, including long-range 180-mm pieces, and supplied her with Scud ground-to-ground missiles," the Defense Minister said.

The Scud is capable of reaching Israeli population centers from Syrian territory.

A WARNING TO ARABS

Mr. Peres conceded in his speech that the recent public statements by Israeli leaders about the Syrian build-up had been intended not only to inform the Israeli people but also to make the Arabs think twice about renewing the fighting.

Privately, top officials have also conceded that the statements are meant to underscore the urgency of Israel's requests to the United States for new arms supplies. A team of Israeli military experts is in Washington working out the details of arms deliveries that were agreed upon in principle during President Nixon's visit here in June.

"It's hard to exaggerate the significance for Israel of Syria's new military capability," a

senior official commented. "It changes much of what we have based our policies upon in the past and is forcing us to come up with new ones."

Prior to the Soviet arms deliveries to Syria in recent months, Israel had devised strategy on the assumption that Egypt was the key to war and peace in the region.

No Arab country had ever launched a war against Israel without Egyptian participation, the theory went, and none was thought likely to be capable of doing so in the foreseeable future. Hence, as long as Egypt was involved in negotiations rather than in preparations for war, the prospect of serious new fighting was regarded as remote.

Syria's new Soviet-supplied strength has changed all that. The Syrians now are regarded as capable of starting a full-scale war against Israel on their own. If they did so, they probably could expect to receive reinforcements from Iraq and other militant Arab countries, as they did in the October fighting.

"If we were able to stop such a war in four or five days, Egypt might be able to stay out," a high Israeli official said. But if it went on longer than that, the Egyptians and possible even the Jordanians would be drawn in."

In preparation for this possibility, Mr. Peres said yesterday, Israel has embarked on a priority program to upgrade the training, equipment and readiness of the Israeli armed forces.

He said that a new generation of officers was being promoted into key positions in the regular army to fill vacancies created by the casualties of the October war and that new weapons systems were being introduced and more reservists trained. The cease-fire lines are also being fortified with heavy fences and forward positions linked by a new network of roads.

In addition, several thousand key reservists have been called up in recent weeks to repair the weapons and vehicles damaged in October. To supplement its regular corps of mechanics, the army announced plans earlier this week to call up vocational training school pupils from the 10th through 12th grades to work in military repair shops during the next school year beginning in September.

At a meeting today, General Gur, the chief of staff and representatives of the defense ministry urged about 2,000 enlisted men to demonstrate their "volunteering spirit" by remaining at their technical jobs beyond the usual term of service.

The combination of all these measures has brought a new tension to Israel, just ten weeks after the signing of the troop separation agreement with Syria. Israelis who were generally hopeful about the prospects for peace just two months ago seem now to regard another round of fighting as likely if not inevitable.

"The future seems uncertain at best," an Israeli professor of political science observed earlier this week. If there was ever a time to get negotiations started, this is it."

[From the Jerusalem Post, July 30, 1974]

RABIN: RUSSIAN ARMS POURING INTO SYRIA
(By Mark Segal)

TEL AVIV.—Premier Yitzhak Rabin Thursday warned that the Soviet Union was at this moment pouring new arms into Syrian arsenals at unprecedented volume and speed. Urging maximum alertness in view of likely further Arab aggression, Rabin expressed his conviction that only a strong and alert Israel could deter the Arabs from going to war once again.

Addressing Labour Party leaders in the Moshav Movement at Beit Tabori here, the Prime Minister declared: "A future war will be unlike past battles. Any future war will be neither easy, nor short and will hurt

much more. We cannot afford to regard our enemy lightly and we must have confidence in our own strength, for if we are properly prepared then war can be avoided."

Rabin urged talks with the Arab states but not entertaining any illusions about quick results. He stressed the risks of not going ahead with talks were greater than abstaining from them. Arms supplies must be linked with diplomatic activity.

Syria remained the most radical Arab country in its hostility to Israel, and Lebanon would only follow the leadership of the others. The prospect remained of talks with Egypt and Jordan. He had said in this connection on a number of occasions: "We have to test any prospect of negotiations first and foremost with Egypt and perhaps with Jordan," adding: "After all, we do want a settlement; if not full peace then at least a state of no-war."

Rabin highlighted the nuances in the Sadat-Hussein communique after their recent meeting in Cairo which indicated certain shifts away from the traditional Arab stand which had made for an unbridgeable gap with Israel.

The Prime Minister was anxious about the prospect of the resurrection of the Arab eastern front. He noted Syrian President Assad's switch in Hussein's favour, opting for the Hashemite king rather than the terrorist leaders. As Assad favoured war rather than diplomacy in treating with Israel, Rabin believed the Syrian leader thought he could best rely on Hussein in a future battle.

The Premier said Israel could take credit for Jordan staying out of the Yom Kippur War. However, he revealed, "the Americans told us that Jordan believes the other Arab countries that entered the fray benefited territorially in the disengagement talks while it stayed out and lost out. They say that Jordan is now having second thoughts on this score."

The Premier said Israel must do its utmost to avoid any moves likely to bring the eastern front into being, "and we should not cause its formation by our own faults." In the Cairo communique, Sadat had empowered Hussein to negotiate over Judea and Samaria—a move which Rabin believed was aimed at forming a unified Arab line, with Sadat thereby risking attacks from the terrorist organizations who are his creatures.

Rabin pointed out that Israel faces "unbelievably" bottomless Arab oil coffers. Saudi Arabia now had a financial surplus of \$17,000m. and had already granted much more in aid since the war to Egypt than the U.S. had extended to Israel.

REVOLUTION

This revolution in the post-war Middle East situation meant that money was no object when the Arabs wished to buy arms. He warned of the Arab drive to acquire political pull through economic power in the Western world by cleverly manipulated investment plans for their huge oil income. Rabin told of Arab oil financiers having already bought up complete series of U.S. municipal bond issues, and reported that an aide of U.S. Secretary of Treasury Simons told him they were going to Jeddah to persuade the Saudis to invest \$10,000m. in American interests. Rabin warned that a race was on among Europe, the U.S. and the Soviet Union for Arab oil money.

In the face of this grim prospect, Israel must gird its economic loins and manpower resources. Israel must this year devote 30 per cent of its GNP to defense spending, double that of the pre-Yom Kippur War ratio. Despite the great aid extended by the U.S. Israelis were now shouldering their greatest burden ever. "People cannot carry on as if nothing had changed since Yom Kippur—I'm sorry but things are going to get tough," Mr. Rabin said.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE RECOMPUTATION OF THE RETIRED PAY OF MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES WHO ENTERED SERVICE BEFORE JULY 1, 1958, AND WHOSE RETIRED PAY IS COMPUTED ON THE BASIS OF PAY SCALES IN EFFECT BEFORE THE DATE OF THE ENACTMENT OF THIS ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which would authorize the recomputation of the retired pay of members and former members of the uniformed services who entered service before July 1, 1958, and whose retired pay is computed on the basis of pay scales in effect before the date of the enactment of this bill.

Specifically, this bill provides that notwithstanding any other provision of law, any member or former member of a uniformed service who is 60 years of age or older on the date of enactment of this act, is retired for reasons other than physical disability, and is entitled to retired pay computed under the rates of basic pay in effect on the date of the enactment of this act; or who is entitled to retired pay for physical disability under title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (64 Stat. 816-825), or under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code, whose disability was finally determined to be of permanent nature and at least 30 percent under the standard schedule of rating disabilities in use by the Veterans' Administration at the time of that determination, and whose retired pay is computed under rates of basic pay in effect after October 11, 1949, and before the date of the enactment of this act is entitled to have that retired pay recomputed on the basis of the rates of basic pay in effect on the date of the enactment of this act.

Section 2 of this bill specifies that notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any member or former member of a uniformed service who has not attained age 60 before the date of the enactment of this act, is retired for reasons other than physical disability, and is entitled to receive retired pay, is entitled to have that retired pay recomputed on the basis of the rates of basic pay in effect on the date on which such member attains age 60.

In section 3, the bill sets forth that notwithstanding any other provision of law, any member or former member of a uniformed service who has not attained age 60 before the date of the enactment of this act, is retired for reasons other than physical disability, is entitled to receive retired pay, and who, before attaining such age, is determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to have a service-connected disability of at least 30 percent which is permanent in nature, is entitled to elect

to have that retired pay recomputed on the basis of the rates of basic pay in effect on the date on which the determination of such disability is made. No member or former member who elects to have his retired pay recomputed pursuant to this section is eligible to have his or her retired pay recomputed under any other section of this act.

In section 4, there is a provision that any member or former member of a uniformed service who was retired by reason of physical disability and who is entitled, in accordance with section 411 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 823), to retired pay computed under provisions of law in effect on the day before the date of enactment of such act of 1949 may elect within the 1-year period following the date of enactment of this act, to receive disability retirement pay computed under provisions of law in effect on the date of the enactment of this act, in lieu of the retired pay to which he is otherwise entitled.

Any member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to have his retired pay recomputed under the first section of this act shall be entitled to retired pay based upon such recomputation effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which he or she attains age 60. Any member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to make an election under section 3 or 4 of this act and elects to have his or her retired pay recomputed as authorized in such section shall be entitled to retired pay based upon such recomputation effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which he or she makes such election.

A safeguard in this bill for those who are entitled to retired pay for physical disability provides that enactment of any of the first three sections shall not reduce the monthly retired pay to which a member or former member of a uniformed service was entitled on the day before the effective date of this act.

Any member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to have his or her retired pay recomputed under the first section of this act is entitled to have that pay increased by any applicable adjustments authorized by section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, which occur after the date of the enactment of this act. Any member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to have his or her retired pay computed under section 2 of this act is entitled to have that pay increased by any applicable adjustments authorized by section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, which occur after the date on which he or she attains age 60. Any member or former member of a uniformed service who is eligible to make an election under section 3 or 4 of this act and elects to have his or her retired pay recomputed as authorized in such section is entitled to have that pay increased by any applicable adjustments authorized by section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, which occur after the date on which he or she notifies the Secretary concerned of his or her election to have his or her retired pay recomputed.

Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 1973, I introduced recomputation legislation which authorized recomputation at age 60 of the retired pay of members and former members of the uniformed services whose retired pay is computed on the basis of pay scales in effect prior to January 1, 1972. On April 9, 1974, I cosponsored identical legislation introduced by Representative Bob Wilson. This measure is similar to legislation previously introduced in the Senate which also was attached in the Senate as an amendment to the 1974 Military Procurement Authorization Act, but was deleted by the conferees in the House-Senate Conference. Similar action occurred only recently when this same recomputation amendment was again struck from the annual Military Procurement Authorization by the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, for those who have served their country honorably and faithfully and who looked upon merit and length of service as the primary factors in determining the compensation they would receive as retirees, it must be discouraging and frustrating to witness this annual spectacle of brinkmanship by those opposing this issue in their last-minute efforts to successfully defeat recomputation. I suggest we not wait to witness the same cruel scenario next Congress, but that we face the issue on its own merits now. This situation has existed since the sudden suspension of the recomputation system in 1958 and finally its repeal altogether in 1963. Replaced by a system of raises based upon increases in the cost of living, the retiree now finds that in reviewing pay increases over the entire span from June 1, 1958 to January 1, 1974, an ever widening gap is developing, currently 83.5 percent, between the pay received by retirees and their counterpart of equal grade and service. From this data, it is now quite clear that the actions taken in 1958 and 1963 have provided a system which does not recognize merit and length of service in determining compensation to the retiree but rather when he served and how successfully he manipulated the retirement date. I submit that the moral obligation of the U.S. Government dictates that this very real inequity be corrected and that provisions be reinstated to protect the equities of individuals adversely affected by these changes. In this regard, the legislation I propose today will provide for the eventual total phase-out of recomputation by directly linking current active duty rates to the retired pay of persons who entered the uniformed services prior to July 1, 1958. I am convinced that enactment of this legislation would restore the very important principle that our Government will carry out its moral obligation which exists as the result of promises implied at the time the serviceman entered the service. It must be recognized that members of the uniformed services who started careers prior to June 1, 1958, performed under a legally guaranteed formula but that through congressional action this guarantee was reduced even after benefits had been fully or partly earned.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the heavy legislative calendar confronting the Congress. However, I submit that this Congress must make good to those who served their country so well. I strongly urge favorable consideration of this legislation and enactment into law at the earliest possible date.

FARMERS REAP INFLATION'S
CROP

HON. DAVID R. BOWEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. BOWEN. Mr. Speaker, often overlooked in the tumult of national events here in Washington are the tragic events of inflation which have been steadily ravaging our middle-class families and working people. Of particular concern in my home State of Mississippi is the devastating effect inflation is having on our farmers and, because of the importance of agriculture to the State, the local economics of practically every community.

The following article by United Press International appeared in several newspapers recently, including the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which has broad circulation in the Midsouth area.

I am anxious for my colleagues here in the Congress and other interested citizens around the Nation to be aware of the serious economic situation facing us in Mississippi, which I feel is typical of the crisis facing all of rural America. The article reads as follows:

FARMERS REAP INFLATION'S CROP

JACKSON, MISS., August 1.—A state agricultural expert said Thursday inflation and "black marketeering" were threatening to "swamp" Mississippi farmers.

Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation President Hugh M. Arant of Ruleville expressed concern over a "wide disparity" in prices paid by farmers for necessary production expense items which he said "border on price gouging and black marketeering."

"Soaring farm production costs already are beyond the critical stage," he said, "made worse by a floodtide of overall inflation in the nation which is about to swamp Mississippi's leading industry—agriculture."

Arant said the problem affected all quarters of the state and all agricultural enterprises, and he predicted a "recession looms ahead for Mississippi" and other agricultural states if "economic factors are not put back in place soon."

He noted that state Agriculture Commissioner Jim Buck Ross told a Senate agricultural credit subcommittee recently that many agricultural steel items have increased 100 per cent in price since price controls were discontinued last year.

The farm leader also said "black market offers" were being reported in the farm equipment business, and both tractors and tires for farm tractors were in short supply.

"One delta farmer reported to the federation that recently a farmer in need of a large field tractor that lists for \$19,000 received a telephone call from another dealer offering him immediate delivery for \$8,000 above the list price," Arant said.

He said a dairyman in Northeast Mississippi reported in late July that the cost of dairy feed was increasing while the prices the farmer received for grade A milk dropped.

"Major expense items going into Mississippi crop production are fertilizer, fuel and chemicals for control of grass, weeds and insects," Arant said.

He said Mississippi Chemical Corp. at Yazoo City increased its price of ammonium nitrate from \$70 to \$90 per ton July 1, yet some farmers in the state had to pay as high as \$175 per ton for the fertilizer through independent dealers.

"Agricultural chemicals have been unavailable at any price in some areas of Mississippi this crop season, while prices have risen sharply when the products were available." He noted that there had been reports of chemical "rustling" in some areas of the state.

He said the high costs and lack of herbicides have resulted in crops with more grass and weeds than usual. He said farmers who were forced to resort to more hand labor were hit hard by the increase in the minimum wage for agriculture from \$1.30 to \$1.60 per hour.

"Feed costs have especially been damaging to Mississippi poultry, hog and beef producers," Arant added.

He also pointed out that "the farm fuel factor is another example of questionable pricing practices in Mississippi.

"In one area of the Delta, our farmers are paying anywhere from 24 cents to 38 cents per gallon for diesel fuel for their tractors," Arant said. "This is a price spread that just doesn't add up, except in excessive profits for somebody at the farmers' expense."

SUPPORT FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT GROWS AMONG BLACKS

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many arguments over the past few years over whether or not the death penalty should be reinstated. The Supreme Court ruling on the matter did not specifically prohibit capital punishment. Instead it pointed out that the way in which the death penalty was imposed by the courts was inconsistent and arbitrary and that this constituted cruel and unusual punishment.

So the debate concerning capital punishment continues. What is of interest to me is that some of those individuals who at first favored the abolition of the death penalty have, since the Court decision, changed their minds. A recent article in the July 14, 1974, Sunday Detroit News magazine tells the story of how, and why, there is growing support for capital punishment among the black people of our country. I think the article might be of interest to those who are concerned about the problem of crime and punishment and I am therefore inserting it for their attention, as well as the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues:

SUPPORT FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT GROWS AMONG BLACKS

(By June Brown Garner)

Nearly everyone agrees that progress toward racial harmony will come a lot faster as soon as crime is reduced. As it is now, a white liberal leaving a meeting to increase jobs for blacks may get beat up and robbed

before he gets home. A black liberal leaving that meeting faces an even greater risk of suffering a similar fate.

Though crime has admittedly divided the races, it has divided black unity even more. One example of this division is the increase in the number of blacks who have changed their opposition to capital punishment and now support it.

Many blacks who favor capital punishment believe that when a person takes a life, justice demands that his life be taken. Whether or not capital punishment deters other killings usually does not enter their argument. They believe that if a killer is executed, at least one person has been deterred from killing again.

Some citizens, black and white, base their beliefs on the Bible, saying that God endorsed capital punishment many times and that Jesus, in a parable, said that the man of the house should not allow a thief to enter. Those who don't rely on the Bible say some killers are so depraved that only execution can control them. "Show 'em death!" they say.

On the other side, those opposing capital punishment usually charge that most of the victims executed are black, and that racism rather than justice has determined whether or not a convicted man should live or die. Even though blacks are the principal victims of black criminals, most blacks prefer life imprisonment rather than the death sentence, although this preference sometimes wavers.

Because black-on-black crime seldom receives the publicity that inter-racial crime attracts, many whites believe that black criminals prefer white victims. Actually, by the time a black criminal assaults a white person he has had much practice on blacks. This attitude has caused the black victim to become a forgotten person who is frequently put in the same category as the criminal himself.

Nearly everyone agrees that blacks would never have publicly endorsed capital punishment had not dope become widespread and assaults and murders psychotically vicious. Therefore, the reduction of drug usage and the removal of addicts and habitual criminals from the street would greatly undercut support for capital punishment.

Many citizens of both races feel that the demand for capital punishment is a reaction to the ineffective penal system we now have. The way justice is presently dispensed, everybody knows that a life sentence does not necessarily mean the convict will stay in jail for life. Families of victims are distressed to learn that a sentence of "five to ten years" could mean only six months. The bitter lesson of modern justice has taught us that a person who kills in cold blood not only can be freed, but may kill again—and be freed again.

Capital punishment or not, what we need immediately is better rapport between the parole board and the community. If parole board members were elected officials responsible to the community, men of violence would not be routinely freed to commit more crimes. At present, the community thinks of members of the parole board as faceless individuals who throw unrepentant criminals back on society and assume no blame for their easily predictable crimes.

Those who favor capital punishment defend it against charges of racism, saying that since murders are committed mostly among the black and poor, that is why those executed are mostly black and poor.

Those who oppose capital punishment say that the rich can hire better attorneys, and whether a convict lives or dies depends on how good his attorney is and how much money he has. Wealthy killers, they say, are never executed.

Although most voters may not want capital punishment, the mood of many people

is getting tougher. Instead of immersing themselves in protecting a killer's civil rights, citizens now are more concerned with protecting their own lives and the lives of their families.

Citizens who see capital punishment as the only solution feel that criminals are permitted to flourish because of judicial red tape. They have lost faith in the present penal system, believing that it has not implemented new ideas fast enough for the public to feel the effect of them.

Furthermore, citizens still can't decide what the purpose of the penal system really is. Whether a prison should reform convicts or merely contain them has not yet been clearly decided. Actually, the penal system does not do either very well. Sometimes it merely holds the prisoner for a cooling off period and then releases him.

Other times it gives him the education public schools failed to give him or it provides the job training he never had. In this area, some prisons do an excellent job. But because there has often been no reshaping of a man's moral values, what society gets back is the same old killer, only now he knows a trade.

Before endorsing or rejecting capital punishment, citizens should first make the present penal system work. The community has the right to be free from habitually violent lawbreakers, to be protected in their homes, streets and business places against massive criminal activity. When these rights are neglected or abused, the whole nation and all its resources must work to restore them.

In the end more emphasis should be on establishing and maintaining security in the community rather than implementing changeable methods of dealing with killers.

NATIONAL LAND USE PLANNING? YES

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 11 of this year the House rejected by a narrow vote the rule to allow debate on H.R. 10294, the Land Use Planning Act. I think this was a serious mistake and that this Congress should take the first step toward encouraging sensible land use planning in this country. A number of citizens and organizations of the country share this view and remain hopeful that the House will reconsider that bill or some similar proposal this year. One such organization is the National Parking Association. This association has extensive experience in and is deeply involved with land use problems in urban America. I would like to include for the Members' attention a recent editorial from the July 1974 issue of their publication *Parking*:

NATIONAL LAND USE PLANNING? YES

(By David L. Ivey)

"Land use planning has been viewed as the product of the environmental 'revolution'—the need to bring the living habits of man more into conformity with his diminishing natural habitat, the land. It is that. But what we also have come to realize is that, in the long term, land use planning is perhaps the most significant public policy step that can be taken to influence burgeoning growth patterns that since the end of World War II have

been largely responsible for, among other things, a depletion of the nation's energy resources."¹

Last month, by a vote of 211 to 204, the House of Representatives killed a piece of legislation that could have had enormous implications for the future of the parking industry and that of virtually every real estate-related interest.

The bill, H.R. 10294 by Rep. Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.), was called the "Land Use Planning Act of 1974." It would have allowed states to apply for \$100 million in annual grants for eight years to develop comprehensive land use planning programs if they met certain criteria. It was supported by the NPA staff, the National Association of REALTORS, the International Council of Shopping Centers, National Realty Committee, the Mortgage Bankers Association, American Retail Federation, the National Governors Conference, National League of Cities/Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Counties. A similar bill had passed the Senate twice, most recently by a vote of 64 to 21.

Opponents of the legislation charged that H.R. 10294 provided for Federal control over private property. My analysis of the bill and the concept behind it leads me to a much different conclusion.

Instead of "forcing" anything, the entirely voluntary program sets uniform criteria for the process of State land use planning. It does NOT require that a specific policy come out of that process. Indeed, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee report on the legislation states:

"In no case does H.R. 10294 permit the Federal Government to control the use of private or State land."

During debate, Rep. James G. Martin (R-N.C.) described the bill as a "cautiously drafted piece of legislation." He said the proposal "should rank as a model of the New Federalism." The bill would have granted the states and local governments, Martin pointed out, the "wherewithal" to exercise authority they already have.

In reporting the bill, the House Committee found that local zoning had been uneven or nonexistent. Martin said this was caused by a "problem of jurisdiction" and a "lack of processes" for dealing with land use problems which had more than local impact. The bill sought to correct these problems by setting up methods for looking at a "bigger picture," Martin told the House. He said the work would be done by local governments 90% of the time. The remainder would be handled by the states.

In a letter to Udall, Norene Martin and I said we believed the bill to be "the most effective and equitable approach to land use planning now available." We pointed out that most operating members would not be "directly affected . . . immediately," but said we believe "sound resource planning policies will result in a better quality of life for NPA members and the nation as a whole." I'm still convinced of that.

The full impact of H.R. 10294 or similar legislation wouldn't even be felt for a decade. It's unfortunate that some Members of Congress, some members of the administration and certain business groups were too short-sighted to see the need for it.

Parking operators who conduct business in more than one state should be particularly interested in seeing a similar bill get through Congress not later than next year. The Federal criteria set in H.R. 10294 would have provided some degree of uniformity to the already widely varying state land use laws.

The longer national land use planning legislation is delayed, the more confused the situation will become.

¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Land Use Planning Act of 1974: Report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 1974, p. 31.

STATEMENT ON BERTIE INDUSTRIES

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we hear much criticism of some of the governmental agencies which were created to improve the economy of some of our citizens. I am sure you are aware of some recent criticism of the Small Business Administration and its activities. So, I think it, therefore, appropriate to bring to the attention of the House the success story which has meant much to my own congressional district:

STATEMENT ON BERTIE INDUSTRIES,
WINDSOR, N.C.

On August 2, I had the occasion to return to my district for a unique event—it was a special ceremony to burn the bank note which had been paid off for the original loan for \$260,000.00 to a minority manufacturing firm, Bertie Industries, in Windsor, North Carolina.

Administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration, Thomas S. Kleppe, a former colleague of ours in the House, that day described that after three years of successful operations and growth, Bertie Industries is a good example of the potential benefits of SBA's programs for disadvantaged firms.

With 8(a) contracting assistance from SBA, along with cooperation of the local banking community, Bertie Industries has grown from a tiny firm to a viable manufacturing plant with about 150 employees. This minority owned firm has received about \$5 million in government contracts through the 8(a) program.

Under the 8(a) program, SBA serves as prime contractor for Federal requirements for supplies and services and then subcontracts to socially or economically disadvantaged firms. A large percentage of these are new or established firms that would have had little chance to grow to the point where they could compete successfully without the help of 8(a) subcontracting assistance. Companies operating under the program are supported by management and technical assistance from SBA.

The company has progressed to the "graduation" stage, which means they are now in the economic mainstream and able to compete for regular government and commercial contracts without special help from SBA.

Recently, Bertie Industries completed 60,000 bathrobes for the Veterans Administration at \$1 million, and is presently completing a contract for 400,000 shirts for the military at \$1 million.

Presently, they have a regular bid government contract for an additional 200,000 military shirts, and 25,000 more VA bathrobes. They are negotiating for a commercial contract with a food manufacturer for a large quantity of uniforms.

The company began this third year by paying \$150,000 in federal income taxes. In fact, the company has progressed to the point where expansion of the facilities is needed, and this would provide for employment for 150 more people in a persistent labor surplus area.

During the fiscal year of 1974, disadvantaged contractors received 47 contracts amounting to \$9.5 million in North Carolina, out of a total of 226 8(a) contracts for \$45.6 million in the Southeast.

It is to the credit for the able management of Thomas Kleppe and through his leadership that SBA has gone forward with this

program and made it work. In conclusion, the Southeast's Region IV anticipates the graduation of 70 such 8(a) companies in fiscal year 1975.

PRESIDENT FORD—A MAN OF
THE HOUSE

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's Baltimore Sun editorially points up a matter in which all Members of the House of Representatives can take pride regarding our new President. The Sun notes the long association President Gerald Ford has had with the House of Representatives as well as the prospect of his good relationship with both Houses of Congress.

As one who has known President Ford for more than 20 years, it has been my pleasure to work with him in various capacities. I suspect, however, that the coming years of Mr. Ford's Presidency hold the greatest possibility for our relationship, at a time when almost all Members of Congress are willing to work with him in bringing the country together again.

I include at this point in the RECORD the editorial from the Sun:

MR. FORD, A MAN OF THE HOUSE

The House of Representatives will be pardoned a certain feeling of pride this evening when one of its own takes its rostrum to address a joint session as President of the United States. For oh so long the presidency has been the preserve of governors, generals and senators, with the House generally regarded as only a kindergarten at best for future Chief Executives. Not since James A. Garfield's election in 1880 has a man of the House moved as directly to the White House as has Gerald R. Ford.

The new President's 25-year tour in the House is already shaping the character of his administration. Each member of his transition team—Donald M. Rumsfeld, Rogers C. B. Morton, William W. Scranton and John O. Marsh—was serving in the House when Mr. Ford was in or on his way to the Republican leadership. Charles Goodell, a liberal GOP senator purged by the Nixonites, was conspicuous by his presence at the Ford swearing-in, thus reminding onlookers that he once was a member of the Ford inner circle in the House. Melvin R. Laird, who is sure to hold an influential place in the administration if not the vice presidency itself, was Mr. Ford's chief lieutenant when Mr. Ford won the GOP leader's post in the mid-1960's.

The new President has asked the cabinet and most White House functionaries to stay on for the sake of "continuity and stability." But this is—and should be—only a holding operation. None of the Nixon cabinet members is particularly controversial for the simple reason that Mr. Nixon himself was lightning rod enough for animosities. But then, again, no cabinet member is particularly outstanding with the outstanding exception of Secretary of State Kissinger, who has promised to stay on. We would hope that in an atmosphere of calm selection, Mr. Ford will reshape his cabinet and give it a prestige and authority the Nixon cabinet never had.

Quicker action is needed, in our view, in replacing the Nixon White House staff. While General Alexander Haig loyally served his commander-in-chief as a good soldier should, he is too closely associated in the

public mind with recent traumas to be long retained as White House chief of staff. Ronald L. Zeigler, who brought California press agency into the news room of the White House, is already gone as press secretary. His replacement is Jerald F. terHorst, the respected and experienced Washington bureau chief of the *Detroit News*. In other words, a real journalist. This is a welcome change, and if it is an example of how the character of the White House guard will change the country should be reassured.

Although it is understandable that in shaping his administration President Ford will rely on one-time House colleagues, inevitably his new responsibility will force him to reach far beyond that circle. This is not only inevitable; it is good. Yet in the process, we hope the President will retain those qualities often associated with membership in the House. Among these we would list a lack of pretension, a receptivity to many views, an openness with the press and a close attention not only to the broad sweep but to the nuts and bolts of the nation's business. If President Ford continues to reflect these characteristics as he has in the past, the House of Representatives will be honored and the nation well served.

HEALTH NEEDS OF CONNECTICUT
VETERANS

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, in May I wrote to the President about the health needs of Connecticut's nearly half million veterans. Using information gathered by a special hearing of the Hospitals Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I concluded that existing veterans' health facilities were inadequate to meet the needs of the State's large veteran population. Therefore, I asked the President to recommend the construction of a new VA hospital at the University of Connecticut medical center site in Farmington, and the renovation of the existing Newington VA hospital for use as an extended care facility.

The health needs of Connecticut's veterans were the subjects of resolutions adopted by the Department of Connecticut, VFW, and the American Legion, Department of Connecticut.

For the benefit of my colleagues the resolutions follow:

Whereas, The American Legion, Department of Connecticut has in convention assembled expressed itself clearly in favor of action calling for the construction of adequate hospital and clinical facilities for the treatment of veterans disabled as result of emotional and psychiatric illness; and

Whereas, we have similarly on more than one occasion sought and pleaded for early construction and staffing of facilities suitable for the care of veterans requiring Nursing Home Care and/or Convalescent care; and

Whereas, The American Legion has sponsored and supported the proposals calling for the establishment of full medical care facilities in the New London County area of Connecticut; and

Whereas, having been pioneers in the calls for and aggressive pursuance of the location and construction of Veterans Administration Hospital at Newington; and

Whereas, we have frequently made known our support of plans and advanced plans on our own initiative which called for renovations, improvements and more importantly

the appropriation of monies for new and modern Veterans Administration Hospital facilities for general medical and hospital care; and

Whereas, none of these objectives have become a reality and require added urging, support and encouragement supported by sound and factual evidence,

Be it resolved, That The American Legion, Department of Connecticut in convention assembled this 13th day of July 1974 does hereby establish a committee of 7 members for the purpose of making a comprehensive study of the entire medical-hospital problem as it affects veterans in Connecticut, and

Be it further resolved, That the Department Commander shall appoint such committee and direct it to make known its findings in a report to the 1975 Department Convention.

RESOLUTION No. 43

Concerning the immediate construction of a new veterans' hospital in the State of Connecticut and the upgrading of present veterans' hospital facilities on behalf of Connecticut's 482,000 veterans

Whereas, there exists a general hospital consisting of two buildings in West Haven, Connecticut with hospital bed capacity of 815 beds, which facility is currently operating at 650 beds with psychiatric, geriatric and blind services currently being administered; and

Whereas, there exists a forty year-old V.A. Hospital in Newington, Connecticut which provides general medical and surgical facilities for approximately 190 bed capacity and which facility is, in fact, providing inadequate, sub-standard, medical and N.P. hospital services; which facility is in great need of modernization and, in fact, should be replaced with a new facility. This conclusion had been reached seven years ago when the proposed merger with the Connecticut Medical Center and Medical School in Farmington, Connecticut was, in fact, contracted; and

Whereas, the remaining hospital facility in our region exists at Northampton, Massachusetts and provides no medical services and is in worse condition than the facility in Newington, and this facility could hardly qualify for accreditation as we have documented; and

Whereas, it has been documented by the Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars before a U.S. Congressional Committee and Sub-Committee on Veterans' Affairs that the V.A. Hospital facilities in Connecticut are inadequate to the point of national scandal in the areas of psychiatric, alcoholic and drug dependence treatment, and that over 90 percent of Veteran psychiatric patients must be treated out-of-state or in state-supported mental institutions, and that V.A. Hospital facilities in Connecticut are up to 50 percent below the national average of the patient-to-bed ratios of other States in the areas of domiciliary, nursing, and extended convalescent care and the rejection rate for those seeking hospital treatment is exceedingly high and unjustified, and

Whereas, public and private hospital facilities, already overloaded, must take on additional burdens brought about by the increase in sick and disabled veterans requiring medical attention after being turned away by V.A. Hospitals because there is no room for them; and this increased load upon both public and private hospitals deprives the tax-paying citizens of every community of their own right to seek hospital treatment, drives the hospital's cost of doing business to inflationary heights, and destroys the public trust in the country's medical profession as a whole, and in the government's ability to spend tax-dollars wisely and for the betterment of all; and

Whereas, we have approximately 482,000 veterans in Connecticut with the number

growing daily in view of the Vietnam conflict casualties being discharged from military hospitals, it becomes clearly apparent that a redistribution is essential within the type of service rendered in the V.A. Hospital system for Connecticut. The psychiatric problem, for example, is not new and has existed for well over two decades; and

Whereas, the State of Connecticut, in conjunction with the University of Connecticut, has completed construction of a new medical and dental school in Farmington, Connecticut, which center could be readily utilized as a major source of trained personnel, let alone the professional service and guidance proven advantageous in other areas; and

Whereas, Congress has repeatedly urged VA and Medical Center affiliation; and

Whereas these inadequate and sub-standard V.A. Hospital facilities will be allowed to continue in that the present Federal Administration, through its Director of the Office of Management and Budget, refuses to approve funds already appropriated by Congress for the purpose of V.A. Hospital construction; and

Whereas, it has become obvious that the present Federal Administration will not release the Congressionally approved funding for new V.A. Hospital facilities in Connecticut until pressure is brought to bear upon it through the efforts of the major political parties and the news media; therefore

Be it resolved, by the Department of Connecticut, Veterans of Foreign Wars in convention assembled this 7th day of July, 1974, that we do hereby insist that the President of the United States, our Congressional representatives, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to take immediate action for the conversion of one of the buildings in West Haven into a 500 bed psychiatric unit and to build a new general service hospital at the Farmington Medical Center site to replace the Newington facility; and

Be it further resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be made available to the aforementioned, all political office-holders and office-seekers within the State, other veterans and civic organizations, and to all directors of the State's news media.

SMOOTH, SWIFT PRESIDENTIAL
TRANSITION PROVES CONSTITUTION
STANDS ON FIRM FOUNDATION

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there had been speculation by some skeptics during the unfolding Watergate scandals that our Constitution lacked the resilience and flexibility to cope with this recent domestic crisis and turmoil.

However, when the chips were down and the critical test came, our Constitution met the challenge with flying colors and the smoothness and ease of the Presidential transition under the Constitution demonstrated once again the wisdom and foresight of our Founding Fathers and the soundness of the document they drafted and adopted.

There were no coups, no tanks, no mobs—the democratic processes of our Republic worked easily and effectively without violence.

It was nevertheless a dramatic moment when Chief Justice Warren Burger

in the historic East Room of the White House said:

Mr. President, are you ready to take the oath?

After a brief recitation of the oath administered to President George Washington and all other succeeding Presidents, the Chief Justice said:

Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

This exemplified the swift and sure transition of power—and America from that moment accepted the new President and looked to him for leadership.

As the Washington Star-News in a Sunday editorial declared:

(The) orderly and historic progression of justice to the highest summit, under the Constitution, is testimony that the old foundation is strong as ever.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter, I place the editorial from the Washington Star in the RECORD here-with:

THE FIRM FOUNDATION

It is time to reflect, with some sense of national pride, upon the testing through which we've just passed as a people. For this ordeal of deposing an errant president could very well prove the means of regeneration—a revival of faith in the heritage and promise of our country.

The tumultuous decade behind us, and especially the past year, has been a time of growing skepticism about the strength of American institutions and, indeed, the ability of Americans themselves to rise above cynicism and materialism in times of crisis. After all, so much has changed. And did the founders, with their quill pens and simple generalities, really write a constitutional tune that could play through the age of technological supremacy, with all its complexities of social change, its new concentrations of power?

We have seen the polls showing a loss of optimism about the American future, and declining election turnouts that bespoke a growing public disillusionment with government. And we have heard all this, and more, cited as proof of a system in decline toward obsolescence. The nation simply cannot go forward, some have said, without structural changes—perhaps a whole new modernized Constitution. But we should have remembered that it's all been said before, and much worse, for that matter. "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor," sneered Lord Macaulay more than a century ago, in a letter to America. And many Americans believed him.

Well, now we've seen the anchor. We have seen it hold in a hurricane. The highest law, finally, needed no shining up, no dusting off; it moved in majesty from 1787 to the present to solve the greatest crisis of power—and confidence—in our times. Only the words that attended its formulation, such as those of Madison, needed reading again: "We want no king here. So, therefore, gentlemen, some mode of displacing an unfit magistrate is indispensable." Reasons for displacement could include the negligence or perfidy of the chief executive.

Vague terms, some said, but they came to fit very well the situation of Richard M. Nixon as the evidence unfolded. And Congress, of which so many dispirited Americans expected so little in the way of courage or competence, suddenly began to act as if it were performing in the presence of the founders—on trial itself before Madison and Franklin and the rest. A black congresswoman from Houston sitting on the House Judiciary Committee, would go to the Archives more than once to read the charter in its handwritten original, and proclaim, "My faith in the Constitution is whole, it

is complete." She and all of us again became students of our beginnings. Others of both parties on Judiciary saw their duty and expounded it in a solemn and moving exercise of deliberation as the whole nation watched. The framers had laid this responsibility squarely upon the House, and it was ready, in the end, for an overwhelming vote of impeachment, on the basis of overpowering evidence. Beyond doubt, the first removal of a president in history was assured, and prevented only by his removal of himself.

Of course this is no reason for joy in itself—only in its vindication of our systems of justice and government. The experience has invigorated those systems and, we think, immeasurably elevated them in the public esteem. Two mighty questions have been answered at last: No president is above the law, and, yes, a president can be removed without disruption of the country. Many citizens had feared that latter possibility, but when the time came, the American people showed a marvelous resiliency and maturity—and ability to stand, quite possibly, against whatever shocks may come.

At the White House fence Thursday evening, and in Lafayette Park, the partisans of both sides gathered to witness the downfall, but without visible rancor, much less disorder. In how many national capitals on earth, we wonder, would this be possible—this quiet but concerned public demeanor as the elected national leader in effect is put out of office. Yes, there is reason for pride.

Nor can the tonic effect of applying the rule of law to presidents and their subordinates be underestimated. The dangerous inflation of presidential power has been well dramatized by all this, and dealt with in ways that should make all of us feel more secure in our freedoms. Not soon again, we expect, will illegal assignments be performed on behalf of the president, on the assumption that the presidency is a law unto itself.

Resolving the Watergate mess has, true enough, been a slow and difficult process, because the crucial evidence was denied so long. But the determination and courage of many people made the workings inexorable in their many parts: the Senate Watergate Committee (which first met when few dared whisper the dread word impeachment), the special prosecutor, the courts (including the highest one, finally), the Judiciary Committee, and ultimately Congress itself in a virtual consensus for removal of the president. This orderly and historic progression of justice to the highest summit, under the Constitution, is testimony that the old foundation is strong as ever, the old ideals are bright, as we approach the nation's bicentennial.

When Benjamin Franklin left the Constitutional Convention, a woman asked him what kind of a government had been wrought. "A republic, madam, if you can keep it," he replied. There should be some thrill for all of us in knowing that this generation is indeed keeping it, with all freedoms intact.

REPEAL OF DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning I submitted the following testimony to the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

REPEAL OF DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate the opportunity to ap-

pear before you today to express my support for legislation to repeal daylight saving time.

During hearings before this Committee last year, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association testified that there was little documented evidence to suggest that much energy conservation will be achieved in rural America through the use of daylight saving time in the winter months. In my own district, little energy conservation has resulted. For this reason and the inconvenience that winter daylight saving time has caused, it certainly is not justified.

The Southwestern Public Service Company, which covers the Oklahoma and Texas Panhandles, the South Plains of Texas and Eastern New Mexico, recently notified me that they support repeal of year round daylight saving time legislation. I would like to quote from a letter which I received from the Vice President of the company on this matter: "There is no significant change in total daily electric consumption. I checked one Monday on standard time against another Monday on daylight saving time and found a difference of fifteen hundredths of one percent. I checked a Thursday against a Thursday and came up with fifty-five hundredths of one percent.

"The morning peak was up by seven-tenths of one percent on one occasion and four-tenths on another. There is a compensating drop in the evening peak, but you get right back to the fact that nothing really changes over the 24-hour day.

"So, daylight saving time flunks the course as an energy conservation method and is a miserable flop, particularly in the Texas and Oklahoma segments of our service area."

Daylight saving time was put forth as an energy saving measure. If it is not a conservation measure, then it should be repealed. Something that has been of concern to many Congressmen is the effect that this legislation is having on school children. During the winter months last year, many children were forced to stand out on the highways in complete darkness. Many parents have written to me to say that instead of sending their children to school on the school bus as they have always done, they are now driving them to school in their own cars because they fear for their safety. Certainly this is not saving energy! During the hearings last year, it was suggested that schools could get around this problem by starting an hour later. This suggestion, however, has failed miserably. Too many schools found that their teachers, bus drivers and even students could not easily rearrange their afternoon schedules because of prior commitments to a second job, part-time job, or their families.

Perhaps in areas of the country where people ride to work underground, arrive in their offices without ever going outside, or are engaged in a business where the time of the sunrise makes little difference, whether or not we have daylight saving time is inconsequential. But in areas such as my own where a majority of the jobs are directly or indirectly related to agriculture, the time the sun comes up is very important. To further compound the problem, the District which I represent—the 13th District of Texas is in the westernmost portion of the Central Time Zone. As the Department of Transportation's report points out, sunrise and sunset times at different places in a time zone may differ by as much as an hour. Under daylight saving time, the sun does not rise until almost 9:00 in the morning on some days in my District. The sentiments of those in agriculture were expressed aptly by one of my constituents who commented:

"You can legislate daylight saving time until you are blue in the face, but the dew is still going to dry off the field on standard time."

As housewives complain of rising food prices, it should be one of our primary con-

cerns to help the farmer produce food more efficiently; daylight saving time does just the opposite.

In short, Mr. Chairman, although I favor complete repeal of daylight saving time, if winter daylight saving time doesn't result in energy conservation and the people don't want it, then let us at least follow the recommendations of the Department of Transportation to observe standard time for four months of the year.

TRIBUTE TO JOCKO CONLAN

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to Jocko Conlan, father of our distinguished colleague from Arizona, who was today formally inducted into baseball's national Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, N.Y.

Jocko Conlan was one of baseball's greatest umpires, who always called them exactly as he saw them. I can honestly say that, during my own days as a pitcher for the St. Louis Cardinals, no one in baseball was more deserving of this honor than the jaunty Irishman from Chicago. In fact, it was thanks in part to Jocko's unbending honesty that his son today represents Arizona's Fourth Congressional District. When he was not calling National League games, Jocko invariably spent his time during JOHN'S youth watching his son's Little League play. Jocko told me that JOHN could not hit worth a darn, and after one particularly bad afternoon at bat Jocko gently took him aside and urged him to stick to the books instead.

When my friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN B. CONLAN entered Congress in 1973 I had an opportunity to visit with his father. During that visit I told Jocko that after I left baseball he became a much better umpire.

Mr. Speaker, several newspaper articles have recently recounted Jocko Conlan's outstanding baseball career, and I would like to include them in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Arizona Republic, Jan. 29, 1974]

JOCKO MAKES HALL OF FAME

NEW YORK.—Three long-time National Leaguers—first baseman Sunny Jim Bottomley, outfielder Samuel "Big Sam" Thompson and umpire Jocko Conlan—were voted into baseball's Hall of Fame Monday by the Committee on Veterans.

They join two American Leaguers—former New York Yankee stars Mickey Mantle and Whitey Ford—who were elected earlier this month by the Baseball Writers Association of America.

All five—Bottomley and Thompson—posthumously—will be inducted into the Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y., in August.

Conlan, 71, played only two seasons in the majors with the Chicago White Sox in 1935-36. But he was a controversial National League umpire from 1941-65 who twice had kicking incidents at home plate with the volatile Leo Durocher.

"I was a strong umpire," he wrote in his autobiography. "And I was a good umpire. I always respected the ground a ballplayer walked on, and I respected the player him-

self. But, in turn, I demanded respect from each and every player I came across. And I got it."

The brash Conlan, who stood only 5-7 and weighed 160 pounds, was the only National League umpire who wore the standard inflated American League chest protector outside his jacket while his colleagues all used the smaller inside type.

Conlan got into umpiring while playing with the White Sox in 1935. Sidelined with a broken finger, he offered his services when one of the umpires in a Chicago-St. Louis game was overcome by the heat. He did so well that the next year he began umpiring in the minors.

At his retirement home in Paradise Valley, Conlan described the honor "as the best thing that's ever happened to me."

"I got many letters from fans over the years, saying I'd be in the Hall of Fame some day, and that I deserved to be," Conlan recalled. "They certainly made me feel good."

[From the Phoenix Gazette, Aug. 7, 1974]

JOCKO CONLAN HAPPY WITH NO. 3

(By Tim Tyers)

John B. "Jocko" Conlan will celebrate the third biggest moment of his life Monday.

Which should tell you something about his life.

After all, how many men could list induction into baseball's Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y., as No. 3?

"Hell yes, I'm thrilled," said the 74-year-old Paradise Valley resident. "It's a life's dream come true."

"Still, I've had bigger thrills. Like the day I married my wife, Ruth, 53 years ago and the day my son, John B. Jr., was elected to represent Arizona's 4th Congressional District."

Unlike most Cooperstown residents, Jocko didn't make the Hall with his bat or a strong throwing arm. He made it with his thumb.

He joins the National League's Bill Klem and the American League's Tom Connolly and Billy Evans as the fourth umpire to be enshrined.

And he knows exactly how he got there. "Respect," he said. "That was the most important thing an umpire could have. I demanded it. I always respected the players and in turn they had to respect me."

"I never let the fans, a manager or a player take the game away from me. Those players who tried usually got a quick shower that day."

Jocko broke into baseball in 1920 as an outfielder for Wichita in the Western League. And 14 years later, he finally reached the bigs with the Chicago White Sox.

"I busted my knee while I was in the minors," he said. "In those days, they put hot towels around it and told you to get ready. Nowadays, they call an ambulance and then specialists."

"Anyway, not too many teams wanted to take a chance on an outfielder with a bum knee."

His White Sox career lasted exactly two seasons. And, ironically, it was his thumb that got him into umpiring.

He broke it sparring in the White Sox clubhouse with teammate Ted Lyons and planned to ride the bench until it healed.

In St. Louis one day, umpire Red Ormsby was overcome by the heat and a base ump was needed. Jocko volunteered and, surprisingly, was accepted by Browns' skipper Rogers Hornsby.

Moments later, he called teammate Luke Appling out at third on a close play and White Sox manager Jimmy Dykes went berserk. "Luke told him to quiet down, that he was out. I could've kissed him," grinned Jocko.

The next season (1936) he started an umpiring career in the New York-Pennsylvania League that ended 28 years later after 34 big league seasons.

Jocko, who was 5-7½ off the field and about 10-feet tall on it, says he acquired only one true enemy. That was every umpire's friend, Leo Durocher.

"I don't like Leo, and Leo doesn't like me," he frankly states. "Leo was always out for himself. He tried to intimidate officials and there just isn't room for that in baseball."

The duo had such deep affection for each other that they took part in a celebrated shin-kicking contest in Los Angeles.

"He called be a dumb Irishman and kicked me," grinned Jocko. "So I kicked him back. I don't know who was dumb, but I had shinguards on and he didn't. I left him limping for two weeks with bruises as big as silver dollars."

Jocko, always outspoken, doesn't like what he's seeing lately.

"Guys hitting .250, getting paid \$60- or \$70,000 a year and being called superstars," he groaned. "That's a superstar? Ball players today complain too much. They don't know what they have."

"They gripe about traveling conditions. My goodness, they can fly from New York to California in five hours in an air conditioned plane, eat a meal and have a few drinks."

"If they would've had to take the train from Boston to St. Louis with the windows open in 95-to-100 degree heat how would they act. They'd get their lawyers into action, probably."

"Lawyers and agents are getting them more money than they're worth. Hot trains or not, we never complained."

Probably not. But then Jocko loved the game. And the game is rewarding him Monday.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 27, 1974]
UMP CONLAN TAKES UNIQUE ROUTE INTO HALL OF FAME

A friendly scuffle with one of his closest friends started Jocko Conlan on the road to Baseball's Hall of Fame. The jaunty Irishman will be formally inducted along with five players Aug. 12 at Cooperstown, N.Y.

It's difficult to imagine a more popular member of the Hall among the baseball fraternity. Or a more unusual route for only the fourth umpire to gain this honor.

Conlan was a 32-year-old outfielder in only his second season in the major leagues when he umpired his first game. He umpired because he was sidelined with an injury and because an American League ump was felled by the heat one afternoon in 1935.

Jocko did so well he became an umpire in the minors the next season, joined the National League staff in 1941 and lasted for more than 24 years. And it all started because of some clubhouse horseplay.

"My first game as an umpire came about because I'd broken my thumb fooling around with my good friend Ted Lyons," said Conlan. "We were sparring in the clubhouse one day, fooling around, and I broke my thumb."

"We were with the White Sox and were playing the Browns in St. Louis when Red Ormsby was overcome by the heat. Harry Geisel was the other umpire and they were wondering what to do for a base umpire."

"I said, 'I'll umpire, I can't play anyway.' And Dykes [White Sox manager Jimmy Dykes] said kind of sarcastically, 'That's right.'"

"Rogers Hornsby was managing the Browns and he said, 'I'll take Jocko. He was never afraid.'"

"I went out there and had several close decisions—one on Luke Appling [White Sox shortstop]. I could run pretty good and I'm running right with him when he slides into third and the third baseman tagged him on the shoulder. I called him out and Dykes comes out any says, 'What kind of player are you? Calling one against your own team.' I said, 'I'm a umpire now.'"

"Just then Appling looks up and says, 'Pappy Dukes,'—that's what we used to call Jimmy then—'Jocko was right. I was out.' I could have kissed him."

"The Chicago and St. Louis papers wrote me up, and said they never saw anybody umpire the bases the way I did."

Conlan wanted to go into managing but Harry Grabinger, business manager of the White Sox, convinced him that umpires last longer, and he started out in the New York-Penn League the next year [1936], went to the American Association in 1938 and to the National League in 1941.

Conlan treasures a host of memories from his years on the diamond, most of them pleasant, because he's naturally friendly and outgoing and really loves baseball. He loved it so much he didn't retire until after the 1964 season but the N. L. called him back for the latter part of 1965 because Tom Gorman became ill.

When it was mentioned that he was being inducted with some pretty fair players like Mickey Mantle and Whitey Ford, Jocko said, "I'm going in with great company. But, you know, I always did go first class."

CAMPAIGN REFORM

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House passed landmark legislation to more strictly regulate and supervise Federal elections, and put an end, hopefully, to the kinds of abuses which characterized the 1972 elections.

The bill was reported to the House under a modified closed rule. Ordinarily, I support open rules on legislation in order to let the House work its will. However, I felt that the rule under which the bill came to the floor of the House gave the House the opportunity to vote on possible amendments to the heart of the bill—financing, limitations on spending contributions, and enforcement procedures—while at the same time assuring that frivolous amendments could not have posed a danger to the passage of effective campaign reform legislation during the end of the 93d Congress.

Briefly, the bill which passed the House on August 8 does the following:

First, it limits contributions to candidates by individuals to \$1,000 per election. Political committees which meet certain specified standards contained in the bill are limited to \$5,000 per election. The bill also establishes a \$25,000 limit per year on a single individual's contributions to all Federal candidates and political committees supporting Federal candidates.

Individuals and groups would be prohibited from making cash contributions in excess of \$100 to any candidates for Federal office. No candidate or member of his or her immediate family would be able to spend in excess of \$25,000 of their own money in a primary or general election for the House, Senate, or Presidency.

As passed by the House, an independent board of supervisory officers is established, composed of four public members, the Clerk of the House, and Secretary

of the Senate. Both the Clerk and Secretary would serve as nonvoting members. The Board will have the authority to investigate possible violations of the act, and refer appropriate apparent violations to the Department of Justice for enforcement action.

The bill also builds on the dollar checkoff system on tax returns by providing for the automatic appropriation of moneys voluntarily checked off to the fund in an amount equal to that designated by taxpayers. These funds are to remain available without fiscal year limitation in order to permit the aggregation of funds over the 4 years between Presidential elections. The Internal Revenue Service estimates that the fund has accumulated about \$29 million in the 2 years the checkoff has been on the tax form. It is predicted that there will be \$80 million in the fund by 1976.

Major party Presidential candidates will be entitled to receive \$20 million from the fund, an amount equal to the spending limits set by the bill.

The bill also provides that during the pre-convention period, candidates for the nomination of their party for President would be eligible to match small private contributions up to \$250 with equal amounts in Federal funds. The money for these matching payments would be paid out of the surplus remaining in the Presidential Election Campaign Fund after the general election and convention obligations have been allocated.

I supported the amendment offered by Representative UDALL to provide for partial public financing through matching payments for congressional candidates in general elections only. Again, funds for this would have been allocated from the checkoff fund, with public funds for Presidential races receiving first priority in allocation.

Federal matching payments in congressional races would have been permitted for contributions of \$50 or less, and House and Senate candidates could not have received more than one-third of their total spending limit in such matching payments. The amendment would have restricted the use of these matching payments to specified purposes directly related to the candidate's efforts to communicate with the voters, such as radio and television time, telephone banks, and newspaper advertising.

I supported the amendment because I believe that the matching concept would have encouraged candidates to seek large numbers of small private contributions, rather than depending on more wealthy contributors. Unfortunately, the amendment failed to pass.

I also supported the amendment offered by the committee, but originally proposed by Representatives FRENZEL and FASCELL, to create an independent Board of Supervisors of Federal Elections. This amendment passed by an overwhelming majority, and was essential to the elimination of possible conflicts of interest and public distrust which would have been created by giving congressional employees the responsibility of policing the activities of their employers.

I voted against an amendment, which

was accepted by a majority of my colleagues, to lower the spending ceiling for congressional candidates from \$75,000 to \$60,000. I believe that a low spending limit will have a proincumbent bias, and limit a challenger's efforts to compete effectively. Lowering the spending ceiling may well impose severe problems for a nonincumbent seeking name recognition, while such a limitation creates fewer problems for incumbents.

I am confident that this legislation, which is Congress response to the disclosures of the past 2 years, will go far to prevent the recurrence of those trying times.

MORE CANCER DEATHS FROM INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS?

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the following article from this morning's Washington Post tells about what is happening in a small community in Maryland which may be a result of our ignorance of the effect of industrial chemicals on human health. The article also gives us an excellent example of the human cost which can result from the kind of indiscriminate budget slashing which the Office of Management and Budget engaged in during the last administration.

Of the 120 permanent residents of the Little Elk Valley in Maryland, 1 out of 6 has died since 1967. The primary factor in this high death rate is cancer. People in the community have been contracting cancer at more than seven times the rate of other communities in the United States. A prime suspect in this excessive number of cancer deaths is a local chemical plant.

Although Congress established an agency in 1971 called the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health to investigate such health problems, the article concludes with a description of how inadequate the NIOSH efforts have been in this particular situation. This is of little surprise to those of us on the Appropriations Committee who have been concerned about the inadequate staffing and underfunding of this agency for some time. Only last year OMB forced a staff cut of 96 positions or almost one-sixth of the entire staff of this agency, which by all accounts was already critically understaffed. The cut was made in blatant disregard to language in both the House and Senate Appropriations Committee reports directing that no cut be made.

The Director of NIOSH summed up what was happening to his agency when he was quoted by The New York Times on March 6 of this year as saying:

NIOSH is not expanding it is shrinking. It is getting the proverbial meat axe. Our present Laboratory space isn't even adequate for any kind of research. It is substandard. We have been frozen on hirings for most of our existence and we are losing key staff right and left because we don't have the grade point to promote them. I don't think NIOSH is a viable organization at this time.

So, it is little wonder that the Federal Government cannot respond to the critical problem of the people of Little Elk Valley.

This year the House Appropriations Committee increased the funding for NIOSH by almost 25 percent over the President's request and directed the administration to increase the number of positions in the agency by 135. This money should have a major impact on the capacity of the agency to investigate such hazards as the one in Maryland, but there are many problems such as adequate Laboratory and office space and sufficient grade point to hire qualified staff which will continue to be roadblocks.

Clearly, we are never going to have the kind of research effort that is needed in this area until the White House, the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare all come to understand that the cost of our ignorance in this area is human lives and that study of the health implications of industrial chemicals like those in the Little Elk Valley deserves a much higher priority than it has received in the past.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 12, 1974]

CANCER, DEATH RATES FOUND HIGH IN MARYLAND VALLEY

(By Bill Richards)

PROVIDENCE, Md.—No one is quite sure why, but for the past few years the people of the Little Elk Valley here have been dying off at an alarming rate.

Since 1967, 20 of the 120 people who have lived here for more than two years have died, according to a study of the Little Elk's population by a local doctor. The ages of those who died range from 5 to 70. That figure puts the death rate for the valley about 2.2 times ahead of the rest of surrounding Cecil County, in the northern corner of the state.

More ominous, Dr. Pietro U. Capurro's tabulation shows that at least eight of those deaths, and possibly more, have been from cancer, making the cancer death rate here seven times the rest of the county's 53,000 residents. The county's cancer rate is above average for rural areas in the U.S., according to statisticians from the National Cancer Institute.

Suspicion concerning the valley's unusually high death and cancer levels has been compounded by several types of cancers identified here by Capurro, a 49-year-old pathologist and director of the laboratory at Union Hospital in nearby Elkton.

The cancers—lymphomas, leukemia and pancreas cancer—have all been linked in the past in various studies and by medical researchers to exposure to certain industrial chemicals.

Exposure to certain industrial chemicals can lead to cancer that possibly may not appear for 10 or more years, according to National Cancer Institute specialists.

All of the cancer victims described in Capurro's report lived within a mile of the Little Elk Valley's only industrial plant—The Galaxy Chemical Company, which has been reprocessing chemicals here since 1961.

Paul J. Mraz, the president of Galaxy, described Capurro's findings as "unsubstantiated" and "nothing new" during a short telephone interview recently.

Mraz declined to comment further on the doctor's report or allow a reporter to tour the plant and conduct a lengthier in-person interview, "I can't make any further comment on the advice of my attorney," he said.

During the last four years a number of residents including Capurro, who lived in

the valley for four years until 1972, complained that chemical fumes from the plant had made them ill.

Samples of the air around the Galaxy plant, taken by investigators for the Maryland bureau of air quality control after complaints in 1970 and 1971, showed the presence of about 25 chemicals in the valley's air and water that were foreign to the area but that matched a list of chemicals handled by the plant, according to Carl York, head of the bureau's compliance section.

One of the chemicals repeatedly identified in the samples, York said, was benzene, a substance that Mraz recently acknowledged his firm had handled in the past and that he said is still being reprocessed at the plant.

Dr. Herman Kraybill, scientific coordinator for environmental carcinogens (cancer-causing substances) at The National Cancer Institute, said benzene is strongly suspected by researchers of being linked to leukemia in some persons exposed to the chemical.

Carbon tetrachloride, which Kraybill said has been found to produce liver tumors in laboratory rats, mice and hamsters, was found in other samples taken in the valley by Capurro. The laboratory results with carbon tetrachloride, Kraybill said, "raises a high index of suspicion as to its human potential."

Mraz recently told a reporter that his firm handled carbon tetrachloride for only one or two weeks in the late 1960s and does not handle the chemical anymore.

York said that some other chemicals discovered in the valley were so exotic that they could not be adequately identified and their toxicity was not known by researchers.

Neither Capurro nor any other researcher has specifically linked the chemicals found in the valley with the cancer deaths there. Capurro, however, said the findings show a strong need for more testing of the plant and the valley's past and present residents.

Capurro says he has performed his own tests on air and water samples as well as on blood samples from persons living near the plant.

"I can't say that the deaths in the valley from cancer were the result of specific exposure to chemical fumes," he said.

"But there have been a lot of chemicals in that valley's air and water and the blood of those people we tested," he said, "and some of those chemicals cause cancer. And we know there are a lot more malignancies there than you would expect."

"If you're in a room where everyone is scratched and there's a lion in there too, then you've got to suspect the lion."

Capurro is not alone in his belief that something is wrong medically in the valley. State and federal investigators who have been there said that the physical condition of a number of residents there is unusual.

"We know there's something up there in the valley that's not right, some sort of a health problem," said York of the state bureau of air quality control. "What we don't know is whether it's coming from Galaxy."

York worked for eight months in 1967 and 1968 as an engineer for Galaxy at the Little Elk Valley plant and is now responsible for inspecting it and conducting air sampling in the valley.

He said that until 1971 the company dumped residues from its reprocessing operation into an open air evaporation pit behind the plant. Among the substances put into the pit, he said, was the residue from the benzene re-processing operation.

"We know that benzene was dumped into that pit," said York, "and there were several other chemicals we suspected were carcinogens. But the whole thing was such a gunky mess that it's questionable whether the company even knew what it was evaporating in there."

Leonard Madison, an ex-foreman at the plant who died recently, and a second former supervisor who asked not to be identified,

said they witnessed occasions when workers flushed out chemical tanks and tank trucks at the plant into the Little Elk River nearby. (Madison was interviewed shortly before his death from throat cancer.)

The state ordered the waste pit shut down and Galaxy was directed by a Cecil County Court judge in early 1971 to clean up its chemical emissions after it was cited for air pollution violations.

The plant was allowed to reopen by the judge in May 1971, after the judge instructed the state to monitor its emissions and report the findings to him.

York, however, said the state has done no air sampling at the plant in more than a year and that the company has been left to monitor its own choice of chemicals it handles at the plant.

Both Mraz and Peter Nerger, head of the Marisol Chemical Company, a Middlesex, N.J., firm that supplies Galaxy with chemicals for reprocessing, refused in telephone conversations to disclose what chemicals the plant has handled recently.

Kraybill, of the National Cancer Institute, who has not studied either the valley or its inhabitants, said exposure to carcinogenic chemicals did not mean that cancer would appear immediately. Cancer cases after such exposure, he said, often do not appear until years after exposure.

The presence of the cancer types noted by Capurro, and the identification of chemicals found in past samplings of air "could pose a potential cancer problem which should be further studied by an epidemiological investigator," Kraybill said.

Galaxy's last problem with complaint concerning its chemical emissions occurred in 1972 when a Caroline County judge awarded 10 residents of the valley, including Capurro, a total of \$34,932 after they filed suit complaining they were made ill by the plant's fumes.

Since then, residents near the plant who were interviewed recently by The Washington Post said they had not experienced any problem with fumes until this year. Several persons said they had been bothered by fumes this year in January, March and July.

Olive Feehly, who runs a general store with her husband George about 150 yards west of the plant, said the fumes had become particularly powerful in recent weeks.

"Three weeks ago," she said, "I noticed a bluish haze coming from the direction of the plant one morning. When I went out to hang my wash it was so strong that I collapsed and had to crawl back inside on my hands and knees."

Nancy Chadwick, who lives on the east side of the plant, said she too had smelled fumes recently. "They blow into the house and my whole family just starts coughing," she said. "Since they've started, we've been tired and dopey all the time."

Rebecca Madison, who also lives in the valley, said several weeks ago she walked by the plant with her 1-year-old son, John Paul. "We must have picked the wrong time because we got a good whiff of whatever it was they were doing in there," she said. "John Paul began throwing up right on the spot."

"I want to get out of here," she said. "I don't know what they're doing in that plant but I don't want my son to grow up breathing that stuff."

Her father, Leonard Madison, 50, worked for Galaxy for 11 years until he developed what was diagnosed 14 months ago as throat cancer. He died in early August.

Interviewed just before his death, Madison said he was down from 175 pounds to 105. He was barely able to speak in a croaking rasp of a whisper and said he believed that a combination of cigarette smoking and inhalation of the fumes at the plant was responsible for his condition.

"No one wore masks," he said. "The chemicals we'd breathe would burn our throats

and make us sick but they kept telling us 'it won't hurt you.' I believed them then and now I know better. But it's too late for me now."

Charles Dunlap, 22, a second worker known to have developed cancer, died in 1971 after working for Galaxy at the plant for 13 months. Capurro, who diagnosed the cancer with a nuclear scanning process, said he died of cancer of the pancreas. Mraz said the man had "stomach trouble" before he was hired, but did not know if the man had cancer before he was hired.

No outside agency has conducted a medical investigation of the dozen or so workers now at the plant or on any of the plant's past employees, state air quality official York said. Mraz refused to tell a reporter whether his company has undertaken medical checks on present or past employees.

Madison, York and others who worked for Galaxy said turnover at the plant has been high. A number of the workers there have been sent to Galaxy from the Maryland state employment office in Elkton. State officials said there is no requirement that the employment office notify workers that they may be handling dangerous chemicals.

Turnover in the valley also has been high in recent years. Capurro said that 60 per cent of the population living around the plant had either moved away or died since 1967.

Capurro identified eight of the dead as cancer victims, using hospital records, state and county information, his own records and interviews with the relatives of the dead persons. Two other deaths, he said, may have involved persons who had cancer but died of other causes.

All of the cancer victims, who ranged in age from 5 years old to 70, lived less than a mile from the plant and had been exposed to the valley's air for at least two years. Only one, a part-time painter, had any other exposure to chemicals, the doctor said.

Last year, Capurro sent the results of his findings and the previous reports on chemicals in the valley to Dr. N. E. Day, a highly regarded biostatistician for the World Health Organization's International Agency for Research on Cancer in Lyon, France.

Day wrote back in February of this year that he noted an unusually high incidence of lymphomas and pancreatic tumors in Capurro's findings and that these two types of tumors are increasingly being found among chemists.

"In a population of 120, over seven years, you would expect .068 lymphomas and .067 pancreas tumors," Day wrote.

"The probability of observing two pancreas tumors by chance is about .006," Day continued, "and of observing the four lymphomas is less than .000001, i.e. very small."

Dr. Sidney Cutler, a biostatistician and chief of the biometry branch of the National Cancer Institute, said during an interview that he had no knowledge of the accuracy of Capurro's raw data.

"But," he said, "if we're talking about a population as small as he (Capurro) reports, and in such a limited number of years, the results certainly look unusual."

Both York and Capurro said they have requested a study of the conditions in the valley and of its past and present residents by an outside federal agency.

Such investigations of plants where workers have been believed exposed to carcinogenic chemicals have usually been handled by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), a federal investigative agency under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

NIOSH sent Dr. Carey Young, one of its investigators, to the Little Elk Valley in March. Young interviewed Capurro and left after the interview without checking the plant or the valley's residents and has not returned since.

"It was a preliminary interview," he said in a telephone interview from NIOSH headquarters in Cincinnati. "We have other priorities taking our manpower and time. We feel some aspects of the valley's situation are interesting, though, and we may consider some kind of contractual study for a full evaluation some time in the future."

Such vague promises of attention have done little to ease the fears of people like Olive Feehly, who counts off on her fingers the names of her neighbors who have died recently and repeats the details of each death for visitors to her store.

"This used to be a place where people died of old age and you'd go years without a funeral sometimes," she said, "Good Lord, nowadays I spend more time in the funeral parlor than I do in my own home."

DOCTORS, MERCHANTS, AND GUNS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I include two articles which recently appeared in the New York Times in the Record at this point. The first article is by Dr. James A. Brussel, a psychiatrist in New York City, who carries a .32-caliber revolver, however shocking that may be to some liberals. The second article is about the businessmen of this country, who daily face a host of thugs and criminals too impatient to wait for the Government to take the businessmen's money and give it to them.

Now, however, the businessmen are taking measures to protect themselves and their property. It is sad that this must be so, for it indicates a breakdown in the Government's ability to govern; but the blame lies not with the businessmen, but with the liberal policies our Government have been pursuing. The articles follow:

GUN-CARRYING DOCTORS

(By James A. Brussel)

As I waited to renew my handgun permit at the New York City license bureau recently, I noticed that the police officer who paged applicants to step forward seemed to address about one in every six as "Doctor."

Though I've carried a revolver for some time, I hadn't realized till then that many of my metropolitan colleagues do, too. Before my name was called, I corralled several and asked why. Through tales of office hold-ups and broad-daylight street muggings ran one theme: the need for protection against drug addicts.

I've never fired my .32 Iver Johnson at anyone. But it's never far from my reach while I attend patients in my mid-Manhattan office, or on outside calls. And, believe me, if I ever need to shoot—I will. I remember all too well that three of my psychiatrist-colleagues have been savagely beaten (one fatally) by frenzied addicts for whom they'd refused to write narcotic prescriptions.

I could easily have met the same fate not long ago when the doorman for my building announced over the intercom that a Mr. Miller wanted to see me. I asked the stranger to explain over the intercom why he'd come, and he said a young man whom I'd once had in therapy had recommended me. I told Mr. Miller to come to my office.

He was about 21, tall, well-built, and claimed to be an outpatient at a local methadone clinic that was closed for the day. "All

I need is one lousy pill, Doc," he insisted. But when I proposed calling the clinic to verify his story, he angrily offered me the choice of writing the prescription or taking a beating.

"I've got a choice for you, too," I said as I drew my revolver and pointed it at his head. "Either walk out of here quietly, or . . ." He stared at the weapon for a moment, then turned and left.

The gun has helped me out of tight spots on occasional emergency night calls. Usually, I'm summoned to an apartment by a former patient whose friend is unconscious from a drug overdose. Getting a cab to some high-crime neighborhoods isn't hard, but getting back can be. Often I have to walk several blocks to a subway. When I do, I carry the gun in my hand—not in my pocket. Once, about midnight, an almost-stoned bruiser snarled, "I wanna talk to you, Mister." I leveled the gun, and he backed off hurriedly, hands raised.

Nor is the need for self-protection always connected with my practice. Last week my wife and I returned home from the opera by subway because cabs were unavailable. As we climbed the steps of the exit adjacent to our apartment building, I saw three youths slouched against the wall. "Get behind me," I told my wife.

One youngster moved in front of us. "Hold it, Whitey," he sneered, "we got something to say to you."

"So do I," I answered, and aimed the revolver at his middle. All three fled down the street.

Before that night, my wife had constantly begged me not to carry the gun. She hasn't since.

[From the New York Times, July 20, 1974]
URBAN MERCHANTS FIND GUNS VITAL, AND MOST POLICE UNITS NOW AGREE

"I'll be damned if anyone is going to come in here and put his hands on the money I work hard for. I know how to use this thing and I would use it and have no feeling of guilt about it."

Henry Joseph, who operates a gasoline station in San Diego and keeps a .38 revolver "handy at all times," seemed surprised that anyone would even ask him if he needed a gun.

"Oh, I've got no beef about the police, but if I stand by like a tame pussy cat and let these punks take my money and then call the police, what good is that going to do?" he said. "No sir, the Constitution says I can protect my property with a gun and that's what I'm doing."

The armed merchant, interviews around the country show, has become a fact of life in urban America. Some, like Mr. Joseph, keep their guns defiantly; some keep them reluctantly or even fearfully.

But many small-businessmen—not just tavern owners or druggists, favorite targets of holdup men, but boutique managers, fast-food specialists and variety store owners—are convinced that a gun and good aim are as important to staying in business as sales know-how and good advertising.

They want to protect their hard-earned money, but just as often, they say, they are armed to protect their lives because they think holdup men are just as likely to shoot them whether or not they give up their cash without a fight.

And for the most part, police departments and community groups and trade associations no longer disagree. As Hugh Muncy, head of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, put it: "A person has to do what he has to do to protect his property."

The merchants' guns—some kept legally, some illegally—range from small one-shot Derringers to fast-firing M-1 carbines to sawed-off 12-gauge shotguns.

Cyril Zara, Jr., 24 years old, the owner of

Zara's Food Store in New Orleans, carries two guns, a .38 revolver and a .25 automatic, and keeps a 12-gauge shotgun in the store. He has had the guns for two years, ever since he was robbed and shot in the head.

"It was two years ago, in May. The guy walked in, put his arm around my neck—the robbery was secondary—he was out to get me first—and shot me in the head and the cheek," Mr. Zara said.

Two days later Mr. Zara was back in his store. The shot in the cheek had knocked out two teeth; but doctors told him the teeth had saved his life.

"I don't care if they take my money. I'm worried about me, my people, the ones who work for me and my customers. There were eight customers in here the day I was shot," Mr. Zara said.

Wayne Poag, owner of the Dallas Drive-In Grocery in Dallas, wears a 9mm, 14-shot automatic pistol in a holster under his shirt.

Two years ago, Mr. Poag's grocery was robbed by four men who were later convicted of the crime.

"They came in the back door," Mr. Poag said. "One of my employees was out back and one of them said 'let's kill him.' Another one said, 'No man, let's get the money first, then we'll kill him.'"

Not too long ago the police used to warn merchants against arming themselves. They told the businessmen that shooting be left to police officers. But times have changed.

Police officials are more likely to be non-committal, neither approving nor disapproving, and the cop on the beat may pat the back of the merchant who has won a shoot-out.

Elwood Carter, a Queens grocer who shot and killed a holdup man in his store last month, reported, "The police said I did their job for them."

In San Diego, a spokesman for the sheriff's office said that "we neither encourage nor discourage merchants from taking out a permit for concealed weapons."

In New York, Deputy Inspector Peter J. Maloney, who heads the department's license division, said that each merchant's gun application "is individual and should be assessed on its own merits rather than by a general policy, but I can see the viewpoint of the storekeepers."

Many merchants, in any case, are apparently not willing to depend on the police alone for their safety.

Edward S. McConnell, 73, owns a coin and stamp collectors' store near the University of California's Berkeley campus, says: "I'm my only protection. By the time the police respond, even if they come in a reasonable time, the robber would be gone."

Mr. McConnell has been at the same location for 20 years and has been the victim of "four armed robberies, two burglaries and innumerable till taps."

He has "five handguns plus a shotgun and an M-1 carbine" in his little store.

Over the years he has shot two would-be holdup men. Neither died.

There are many other small-businessmen who have armed themselves to use their guns and who hope, somewhat nervously, they never do.

Joseph O'Neill, 47, owns a drive-in in Detroit's west side. He purchased a Japanese made .38 pistol two years ago after he had been held up.

"Since then I haven't had to use it and I don't know if I ever will, but I keep it here under the counter," he said. "One of the younger guys owns a car wash down the street. He shot and killed a man who held him up last fall. I couldn't have that on my conscience."

There are some, too, who still refuse to keep a gun in their store. Peter Lazar, owner of the Louis Shoe Service in Boston, says: "You'd be apt to do a crazy thing. In an outrage you might kill someone."

But there are many others who, regardless of their initial reluctance, have come to feel comfortable with their guns.

One Brooklyn merchant from Brownsville, too frightened to give his name, has been held up three times in the last 22 years. After the last robbery, he got a permit for a Colt .38.

"Now," he says, "it's a piece of clothing. I automatically put it on in the morning and take it off in the store."

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS: A THREAT TO PRIVACY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, every social security card issued in the United States boldly declares that the card is "not for identification." When the social security system was originally adopted there was a very real fear that the issuance of a card to every American might result in each citizen having an official number. As a result, it was clearly stated at that time that the number was not to be used for that purpose.

We have come a long way from that time. Today the social security number is required information to hold a job, to file Federal income tax, collect Federal retirement and survivor benefits, to buy or transfer securities for U.S. savings bonds, to attend high school or college in many areas and for a variety of other necessary activities.

A report issued in July 1973 by the Advisory Committee on Automated Personal Data Systems to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare declares that—

In spite of practical advantages, the idea of a Standard Universal Identifier is objectionable to many Americans . . . Many people both feel a sense of alienation from their social institutions and resent the dehumanizing effects of a highly mechanized civilization. Every characteristic of the SUI heightens such emotions.

Yet, the HEW Secretary's Advisory Committee continues to report that—

There is an increasing tendency for the Social Security number to be used as if it were an SUI. The federal government has itself been in the forefront of expanding the use of the Social Security number . . . The national population register that an SUI implies could serve as the skeleton for a national dossier system to maintain information on every citizen from cradle to grave.

One man who has expressed concern over this invasion of privacy is Representative BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR. of California. In an article in Signature magazine for June 1974, Mr. GOLDWATER notes that:

Many abuses are not dramatic, but are very dangerous. For instance, the denial of an application for a job, loan or insurance because of mysterious "reports" locked in a computer file. Many such cases involve the widespread use of the Social Security number, which is fast becoming a standard universal identifier—the key that unlocks the computer. Using the Social Security number, a person can be tracked from the cradle to grave—without his knowledge or consent.

Mr. GOLDWATER declares that—

We have placed material security above our right to privacy. In so doing, we have allowed big government to take over our personal responsibilities. We let the government educate us, house us and direct our cultural experience. Then we wonder about the collapse of our right to be left alone, after we have permitted, even asked, the government to intervene for us. Government has ordained that our Social Security numbers be used for the sake of economy and efficiency, but this orderliness is achieved at the expense of personal freedom.

It is time that we in the Congress restored the original intent of the social security card and saw to it that this card was not used for identification purposes. One place to start would be in the Congress itself, where employee numbers and social security numbers are identical.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article concerning the invasion of privacy inherent in the use of social security numbers for identification by Representative BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR., as it appeared in the June 1974 issue of Signature magazine, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

NUMBER PLEASE?

(By Barry Goldwater Jr.)

The concept of personal privacy and individual rights is as old and basic to the United States as our Constitution. Most Americans accept it as the bedrock of their freedom, and give it little thought. Until, that is, an individual notices how insidiously his privacy is being invaded and his rights ignored.

I am talking about tyranny. This is no alarmist's flight of fancy. We are fast becoming slaves to technocracy. It is possible today to build a computerized on-line file containing the compact equivalent of 20 pages of typed information about the history and activities of every man, woman or child in the U.S.

Some of the privacy abuses this occasions are chilling. For example, an incident involving a California couple stopped by county sheriff's deputies while on their way home one night: Relying on information from criminal justice data banks, the police handcuffed, held at gunpoint, and locked the couple up overnight on charges of auto theft. What the data banks did not show was that the stolen car had been recovered by its rightful owners long before. The woman, who was pregnant, and her husband were finally released, 18 hours after their arrest.

Other abuses are not so dramatic, but just as dangerous. For instance, the denial of an application for a job, loan or insurance because of mysterious "reports" locked in a computer file. Many such cases involve the widespread use of the Social Security number, which is fast becoming a standard universal identifier—the key that unlocks the computer. Using the SS number, a person can be tracked from the cradle to grave—without his knowledge or consent. Americans are slowly beginning to catch on to this form of privacy invasion. A man in Virginia told me: "I went to register to vote, and found I couldn't until I coughed up my SS number, a direct violation of the 16th Amendment that says I have the right to vote without any preconditions." On a more ominous note, a woman in Florida wrote: "I am worried about having to use the SS number on all documents. Germany and Russia started that way to gain control of everyone and everything they did."

Far-fetched? Hardly. Consider where the SS number is required information: to hold a job; file federal income tax; collect federal retirement and survivor benefits; benefit from an estate, trust, interest or dividend;

buy or transfer securities for U.S. savings bonds; attend high school or college in many areas; open a checking or savings account; serve in the armed forces; receive Civil Service annuities; obtain insurance in many cases; collect state or federal medical assistance; open a charge account in many stores; receive a driver's license or obtain fishing and hunting licenses in some states, and register in a Veterans Administration hospital.

We have lost our sense of the true meaning of personal privacy, beyond keeping strangers out of our homes. What about the strangers who poke around in the stored information about our lives? As a woman in California told me, "Computers are machines that are writing books about people. We ought to know what the robot authors are saying about us!" She's right, of course: We do not know what is recorded about us or where.

We have placed material security above our right to privacy. In so doing, we have allowed big government to take over our personal responsibilities. We let the government educate us, house us and direct our cultural experiences. Then we wonder about the collapse in our right to be left alone, after we have permitted, even asked, the government to intervene for us. Government has ordained that our Social Security numbers be used for the sake of economy and efficiency, but this orderliness is achieved at the expense of personal freedom.

We should not halt necessary technical advancement, but we must insure the superiority of men over machines. This is not a partisan issue anymore—it never should have been one. The privacy bill now before Congress would outlaw any personal data system whose existence is secret. It would allow any person to find out what is recorded about him and where. It requires data collectors to notify the person about whom information is collected, tell him how it will be used and allow him to check it for accuracy, timeliness and pertinence, and to challenge it if erroneous. Permission must be given by the person if his data is to be transferred anywhere. It forbids the use of the Social Security number for any reason not specifically permitted by federal law.

This action is far-reaching, complex and necessary. However, what is not complex is what we should be fighting for: our right to personal privacy.

WORLD WAR I VETERANS PENSION

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to submit testimony to the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension of the Committee on Veterans Affairs in support of legislation which I have cosponsored to set up a pension for our World War I veterans. I am pleased that the financial difficulties of our World War I Veterans are receiving a hearing by the committee and I would like to share my views on this matter with my colleagues. The following is the text of my statement to the subcommittee:

STATEMENT OF HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

Mr. Chairman, and members of this distinguished subcommittee, thank you for inviting me to testify in support of H.R. 15720 of which I am a cosponsor and which incorporates many of the features of my

earlier bill, H.R. 6769, which I introduced on April 10, 1973. This bill amends title 38 of the United States Code to provide a service pension to certain veterans of World War I and to the widows of such veterans.

Each of us knows how hard inflation has hit our senior citizens, many of whom are living on small fixed incomes. The prices of food, transportation, shelter and clothing has reached all-time highs and the meager income that many elderly citizens receive from Social Security, Railroad Retirement, or from other pension programs is no longer enough to provide the basic necessities of life. As a result, many of these people have been forced to seek welfare money in order to survive.

One specific group that has suffered greatly by the growing inflation is our World War I veterans, and their survivors. The average age of the greater majority of World War I veterans is now almost 80 years and since they cannot work, they must live by what they receive from Social Security or by some retirement pension plan that they may have. Some never had the opportunity to build up the maximum in Social Security benefits because when the Social Security law became effective, they were too old to do work for the full entitlement period. The same condition applies also to their wives or their widows.

For this reason I strongly support H.R. 15720 and the establishment of a service pension plan for World War I veterans and their widows.

Since we have been negligent in our responsibility to our World War I veterans, we owe the responsibility now to show them the respect they deserve, not by charity, but by legislating what they deserve. I know that they are not greedy and only want fair treatment. I also know that with over a million WW I veterans still alive, (plus their families or survivors), the cost of any broad scope or unrestricted pension program estimated at a starting cost of \$1.9 Billion a year and possibly going as high as \$3 Billion for some other bills, would probably not pass. I do hope, however, that this subcommittee will vote for as large an amount as is reasonably possible for a pension program that can become a reality.

I hope that this subcommittee would agree to raise the ceiling on the amount of annual income a veteran can receive before he is disqualified for a service pension. Recent increases in the inflation rate have wiped out any gains the veteran derived from our raising of the annual income limitation rates several years ago. We need to establish rates more realistic to the hardships imposed by our rampant inflation and today's cost of living.

One way we can help the World War I veterans would be to not count retirement income, such as Social Security, as income. We would thus give the veteran a chance to get all his allowed pension up to the annual income limitation, plus whatever he would get from any other retirement income. This would greatly help many of our veterans their families and widows, and would, in all probability, take many of them off the public assistance rolls. I proposed this in my H.R. 6769, which I introduced last year.

In my bill is also a proposal that the base pension payment be increased by 10% if the veteran served overseas during WW I. This would be a little extra sign of appreciation to those who made sacrifices during World War I.

Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, the WW I veteran has been neglected in terms of benefits he has received and now is a good time to recognize those who still remain. It is only fitting that the country they served so well in the past should now serve them by showing our appreciation for their service to our nation.

THE "NIXON PEOPLE"

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the Nixon administration, I think it appropriate that the Washington Post which did so much to reveal the Watergate scandal, should carry the following column by David S. Broder. Never in history have loyal and dedicated men and women so deserved to be remembered, for they will indeed be associated with the misdeeds of their colleagues. For the RECORD, I would like to insert this excellent article so that the men and women in the Nixon administration who have worked so diligently for our country, will be given the praise they are due:

THE "NIXON PEOPLE"

(By David S. Broder)

This has been a grim week for many people in Washington, but particularly for those men and women who worked in Richard Nixon's White House during the past five years.

Some were still there on Monday, when the President belatedly admitted that he had kept from them, and from his lawyers and from his congressional defenders and from the American people, the full truth about his involvement in the Watergate cover-up. These men and women looked ruin in the face right along with him, and felt the added pain of betrayal.

Others were working elsewhere—some of them having left the President's service by their own choice and some of them having been driven out by others who, in their arrogance, had convinced Mr. Nixon that the exiles were not "team players" by the peculiar standards of fitness those formerly mighty presidential aides chose to define.

Wherever they were and however they had come there, last week these men and women shared a common burden—the knowledge that the rest of their lives, they would always be identified as "Nixon people."

For them, there is a special irony in the title of Carl Bernstein's and Bob Woodward's fine best-seller about the Watergate case, "All the President's Men." They know—if no one else does—that it was only a handful of the President's men and none of the President's women who were responsible for the scheme that brought their administration to ruin.

And they know, with a special poignance that no outsider can fully share, that it need not have been.

"What I still can't understand," said a presidential aide seated in a West Wing office at mid-week, "was how such stupidity and such superb accomplishment could exist side by side for so long."

Those who were still working for Mr. Nixon this week, when the roof caved in on their last hopes that the evidence might somehow exonerate him, face problems in the future as difficult as the task of rationalizing the past. "Face it," one of them said, "this address is not exactly the best reference to give your prospective employer."

But those who covered the White House during the years of Richard Nixon know that there was as much devotion and dedication to public service in that building as there has been in past administrations. And the historical record would be more than incomplete—it would be grossly distorted—if those guilty of the grossest arrogance and abuse of power in the Nixon White House were allowed to stain the reputations of

those who set a far different standard for themselves.

Any reporter who worked there could do what I have done just these past few minutes: jot down on a piece of paper the names of those he admires for their work for Mr. Nixon and the country.

The problem is that any list is partial and prejudiced—and there is a danger that those omitted may be damaged unwittingly by the implication that somehow they are less deserving of praise. But let me take that risk and enter the blanket disclaimer that those mentioned here are exemplars of many more who served their country well in the Nixon White House.

One thinks of those like Bob Ellsworth and John Sears, who joined the Nixon cause in the mid-1960s, when there were more risks than rewards in doing so, and were rewarded for their loyalty by being exiled early from the White House by men who were not their moral or intellectual peers.

One thinks of Bryce Harlow and Mel Laird and Herb Klein and Bob Finch and John Davies and Jim Keogh and John Whitaker, friends and associates of Mr. Nixon long before his White House days, who somehow were elbowed away from influence in the Oval Office.

One thinks of the congressional liaison staff, of Bill Timmons and Ken Belieu, and Dick Cook and Gene Cowen, of Bill Gifford and Max Friedersdorf and Tom Korologos, men who earned the respect of the lawmakers with whom they worked, despite their constant uphill battle for recognition within their organization.

One thinks of the domestic policy staffs from Pat Moynihan and Steve Hess and John Price through Ken Cole and Ed Harper and Lew Engman.

One thinks of the writers, like Lee Huebner and Ray Price, and the lawyers, like Len Garment and Fred Buzhardt, and of politicians, like Harry Dent and Bill Baroody and Jerry Jones and Anne Armstrong—who put in every bit of their effort and ability, but did not park their consciences at the door.

One thinks of Jerry Warren, suffering with few complaints in the no-man's-land of the war between the press corps and the President, but unfailingly courteous and patient in his own dealings.

He and many others not mentioned here deserved far better than they got. They worked their hearts out for the President, and it is sympathy—not a stigma—they are entitled to now.

THE NEED FOR POLITICS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not have to remind my colleagues here in the House that politicians in general and national politicians in particular are held in rather low esteem by the American people. But having said that, I must say that I agree wholeheartedly with the position of Senator BAKER of Tennessee in the final paragraph of his views as set forth in the report of the Senate Watergate Committee.

He makes the point that Watergate might never have occurred had there been more politics in the White House instead of less.

In a column appearing in the August 9, 1974, edition of the Washington Star-

News by Mr. Smith Hempstone, the need for politics is dramatized and voters are cautioned against a very understandable reaction on their part to take Watergate out on our system of politics as a whole.

I insert the text of the article in the RECORD at this point:

THE NEED FOR POLITICS

(By Smith Hempstone)

As the shattering truths of Watergate have become evident, it is perhaps understandable that the American public would become disillusioned with politics. Yet, if democracy is to be preserved in America, this political turn-off must be turned around.

Not many people probably got to the bottom line of the views set out by Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr., R-Tenn., as the Senate Watergate committee recently wrapped up its investigation and made its recommendations. But his final paragraph relating to politics is worth reading and thinking about.

"I believe," said Baker, "Watergate might never have occurred had there been more politics instead of less in the White House. Politics is an honorable profession. It is probably a free citizen's highest secular calling. The republic could not function without the dedication of millions of citizen politicians; and, consequently, I hope that politics as an honorable undertaking is not a casualty of Watergate."

There always has been a skepticism about politics and politicians; and a lot of jokes. But the skepticism for the most part has been healthy and the jokes frequently good-natured. What is being seen now, however, is disgust, even loathing. We find bumper stickers saying: "The Lesser of Two Evils—Is Evil" and "Impeach Everybody."

The reaction to Watergate ought to be more involvement by people in politics. It ought to make voters more determined than ever to see that the right kinds of candidates get elected. But the opposite seems to be happening.

If elections held so far this year are any indication, the voting public has been overtaken by apathy, or worse. They aren't marching to the polls to throw some rascals out, and they aren't going there for the more positive purpose of supporting somebody. The number of eligible voters grows constantly and so does the number of those who sit on their hands on election day.

Politics, as Sen. Baker said, has indeed been an honorable profession. Without those citizen-politicians of the revolutionary era—Washington, Jefferson, Adams and the rest—this nation never would have been born. Without Lincoln, the two Roosevelts and others like them, it could not have endured.

Of course, there have been some rascals, even some thieves, elected to offices high and low across this land during the past two centuries. But the majority of politicians who march through the chapters of American history have been men of honor and integrity.

Some of the men of the Watergate White House—particularly many of those in high places—were not politicians in the usual sense of the word. They were not even students of politics. They were single-minded individuals dedicated to one man—Richard Nixon—and pursuing one goal: power.

They were men who brooked no resistance to their sometimes-warped concepts of what was good for America, men who would go to almost any length and follow almost any order to preserve and protect the presidency of which they were a part and to maintain the power that they had acquired through that presidency.

The Haldemans, Ehrlichmans, Mitchells, Deans and some of the others of the Watergate era should not be considered typical of politicians in general, or of Republican politicians in particular. There were and still are

many good men in the administration and they have done yeoman work in the service of their country.

One of the most serious mistakes that voters could make, in the opinion of this observer, would be to take Watergate out on the Republican party. It would be even worse to take Watergate out on politics as a whole. To say that Nixon and his administration were found wanting and, therefore, a pox on the house of politics, would be to deny one's heritage.

No one can deny that Watergate has been a staggering blow, but the American political system is cleansing itself. Constitutional processes are working. Those who broke the law are having to answer in the courts, and Nixon himself was called to account in the impeachment process and resigned when it became clear to him that he would be removed from office in that process.

The nation ought to heed the warning of the late Chief Justice Earl Warren and not overreact to Watergate by tampering with the Constitution. The lesson of Watergate ought to be that citizens need to maintain a constant vigil over their freedoms, which means that they need to maintain a sustained interest and involvement in politics.

Politics does not have to be the choice of the lesser of evils; it becomes so only when citizens turn off from the political system.

ROUDEBUSH SPEAKS ON V-J DAY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fine speech that Richard Roudebush, Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and former colleague of ours from Indiana, gave on the occasion of the August 11, 1974, V-J Day Parade in Seymour, Ind.

Mr. Roudebush notes that we should be "hopeful that the Vietnam war will be our last conflict. And let us be dedicated to the proposition—idealistic perhaps—that we have it in our power to handle our affairs so that young Americans are never called on again to fight and die."

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY RICHARD ROUDEBUSH

I am grateful to you for once again allowing me to participate in this most patriotic observance—that does such great honor to Seymour and the surrounding community.

The fact that you do remember . . . and have remembered for such a long time . . . that great day 29 years ago—when we were at last free of the suffering and the dying—free of the threat presented by our enemies . . . free of war—is commendable and encouraging.

I say—"encouraging"—because I think it is in the interest of our future as a free society—that we remember the times when we have been threatened—and how many brave Americans have fought and overcome those who would destroy us. If we do not remind ourselves—of these past times of danger periodically—we will forget that we can be endangered again.

When I spoke to you at this event last year—I said that this is a day that must be dedicated to brave men . . . the men who fought and died . . . or fought and lived . . . and made victory possible.

I cited the fact that—"brave men"—was the title that Ernie Pyle chose for his famous book—about the G.I.s who served in World

War II. I pointed out that the title was not only appropriate—but that the term "brave men"—summarized succinctly why we were able to achieve a successful conclusion to the war.

And I pointed out that the value of the service—and the sacrifice of these men—had not diminished in the years since 1945.

All of these things are still true now—a year later—and they will be true next year . . . and the year after that.

As long as our nation exists—we will remember that millions of our young men were called to service—during the early and middle 1940s . . . that they faced enemies on both sides of the world—enemies who had sworn to eradicate our institutions—our way of life . . . that they engaged those enemies on a scale never before heard of . . . and that they were successful—in preserving our freedom and our founding principles.

It is inevitable that each year you hold this most laudable event—more and more of those attending it—have no personal recollection of World War II—or the glorious day when it all ended.

It is inevitable that as August 1945 recedes into history—memories of that moment of victory will dim. It is inevitable that such time is not thought of—in the same terms as it was several years ago . . . that more recent events tend to change our perspective.

But this is not a day that relies on memories of personal activity—or personal appraisal—of what it all meant then and means now . . . although it is pleasant to reminisce. This is a day that is written in our history books.

And—if Seymour, Indiana—becomes the only community in the United States to remember it . . . or even if you—the people of Seymour forget . . . it will always stand as the day that America achieved its greatest victory.

November 11th is an important day in American history. It was celebrated as armistice day for many years after World War I. It later became Veterans Day . . . and now—after a brief hiatus—it is Veterans Day again.

V-E Day is an important day. It marked the day that Germany surrendered in 1945 . . . when the evil of Hitler finally came to an end—and the oppressed people of Europe were able to start building new lives for themselves . . . when Americans stopped dying in that part of the world.

But there is no day on the American calendar . . . except the day of our founding, July 4 . . . that had the impact of V-J Day. It was the end of a war in which more than 16 million Americans had engaged—and 406,000 had lost their lives.

More than 400,000 of those participants were from Indiana. Ten thousand of them did not return home.

We all pray that there will never again be such war . . . that there will be no need for future joyous occasions like V-J Day.

And I think we must always be optimistic—that we can be intelligent enough—and dedicated enough—to the cause of just peace—that we can prevent future war.

Reviewing the history of America—and of the world for the first three-quarters of this century—it would be easy to be cynical on this matter. Four times young Americans have been called on to die in major conflicts. Countless other wars have occurred involving other nations. Every week—it seems—there is new fighting somewhere.

V-J day—it can be pointed out—did not end our fighting and our dying. Many of the same men who had a joyous homecoming after that day—were soon fighting in Korea. And some of them survived one war—only to die in another.

Then came the tragedy of Vietnam . . . and more young Americans were called into combat—many of them not to return.

But I think that the fact that the peace after World War II—did not last—does not

mean that war is inevitable. While it may be in the nature of man to quarrel with his neighbors—and to occasionally get into open conflict—it is also in the nature of man to improve himself—and to solve his problems—including those that involve relationships—with his fellow human beings.

So let us be hopeful that the Vietnam war will be our last conflict. And let us be dedicated to the proposition . . . idealistic, perhaps . . . that we have it in our power to handle our affairs—so that young Americans are never called on again to fight and die.

Today here in Seymour—we dedicate our observance to young Americans of a different day. They were successful in bringing us peace—and we celebrate their success—with this event.

Regardless of what came later . . . regardless of what is yet to come . . . there was victory and there was peace in August 1945.

I have special and personal feelings on this day . . . as all of us—who can remember 29 years ago do.

I have a feeling of sadness—that the years cannot overcome—as I remember friends of my youth . . . boys I grew up with and others I met in the service . . . who did not return from World War II.

I have a feeling of appreciation for having been privileged to associate with fine and brave men—and to have been their friend.

I am grateful that I was spared by the fortunes of war—to celebrate the anniversary of an event—that so many did not live to see—although they helped make it possible.

And I am proud of what we accomplished . . . the defeat of power mad dictators—the restoration of peace—the restoration of freedom.

I think we can all be proud of what the American people accomplished in the great crisis that ended with V-J day. I know you are proud—because you continue to remember.

I would like to express my personal thanks to you—for making remembering—a tradition in Seymour. I thank you as a veteran of World War II—and as one who works closely with veterans.

I thank you as a citizen of Indiana and of America . . . as one who also remembers. May this annual celebration long continue.

BIDDING FAREWELL TO NIXONOMICS

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Hobart Rowen's column which appeared in Sunday's Washington Post is an excellent summary of the failures of the economic policies of the Federal Government in recent years. Our new President faces enormous difficulties in leading the Nation to restored economic health. Not the least of those differences is the fact that important real difficulties exist between what can be loosely described as the "Republican" prescription and the "Democratic" prescription for restoring our economic health. In a divided government it will take statesmanship as well as highly sophisticated understanding of the economic forces which exist to devise policies which can be both proposed by a Republican President and implemented by a Democratic Congress so close to a congressional election. Neither the doctrinaire nor the solely self-inter-

ested will contribute much to meeting the crisis which confronts us.

After consultation with Mr. Rowen's office I have corrected a "typo" which appeared in the fourth paragraph from the end of the article:

BIDDING FAREWELL TO NIXONOMICS

(By Hobart Rowen)

The Nixon years have been little short of a disaster for the American economy, and the shocking increase in the wholesale price index for July, reported the same day the President announced his resignation, is but a fitting symbol of the failure of Nixonomics. The index jumped at an annual rate of 44.4 per cent actually, more than 50 per cent if compounded).

To be sure, there were many unhappy economic events out of Mr. Nixon's control, including the worldwide commodities boom that supported inflation, and crop failures that helped to drive food prices up.

But the biggest weakness of Mr. Nixon's economic regime was that it never had a genuine policy—or if it did, it was changeable over night.

Thus, in 1969, when Mr. Nixon came into office, the inflation rate was running around 5 per cent and the level of unemployment was 3.3 per cent. Under Economic Council Chairman Paul W. McCracken, a policy of "gradualism" was adopted to slow the economy down.

And, indeed, it slowed the economy down: We had a recession by the end of 1969 and unemployment rose to 6 per cent, but so did the rate of inflation. And while Arthur Burns began to suspect that the "old-time religion" of tight money and fiscal austerity might not be as effective as it once was, the Nixon managers barreled ahead, anyway.

The result, of course, was that Nixon, after repeated assurances that he would never adopt controls, had to turn full cycle on Aug. 15, 1971, slapping a wage and price freeze on the economy to help brake inflation (and to give the dollar some additional credibility abroad, a fact conveniently forgotten by critics of controls).

In addition, Mr. Nixon abandoned fiscal austerity and began to pump up expenditures. The sluggish performance of the economy during the congressional elections of 1970 was not one that Mr. Nixon wanted repeated during the presidential election year that lay ahead for 1972.

So far as this observer is concerned, Mr. Nixon's best economic performance came with that decision of Aug. 15, 1971. Coupled with the breaking of the dollar's link with gold—which led eventually to dollar devaluation—the freeze and the subsequent Phase II of controls was a courageous program which may have saved the U.S. and the world economy from collapse.

Mr. Nixon's performance in the foreign economic field was superior to what he did at home. It was necessary to devalue the dollar, although the strongarm methods he was encouraged to use by John Connally hurt the U.S. in the eyes of the rest of the world. George Shultz deserves to be remembered for recouping some of the damage of the Connally era, and for starting the world on the road for flexible exchange rates in the Fall of 1972.

It was also necessary to embark on wage-price controls, and the program can not be denied a share of the credit for a drop in consumer prices from a 5 per cent annual rate in 1971 to less than 3.5 per cent in 1972, while wage increase slowed from 6.5 per cent to about 5.5 per cent—or to the level of the famous guidepost.

But Mr. Nixon couldn't leave well enough alone. Exuberant after his re-election, he responded to the ideological pressures of advisers like Herb Stein and Shultz, and mistakenly discarded effective controls in January 1973 for a new Phase III. If the Aug. 15

program was the high-mark for good judgment, the January 1973 program was the low point, a bonehead move without parallel. (A close candidate—in which Congress shares the blame—is the total removal of controls in April of this year, followed by reinvocation of "the old-time religion" when inflationary forces again proved stronger than administration forecasters believed possible.)

As the second term started, the administration misread the pressures that were developing on supplies. It waited a year too long to call Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz off his mad adventure in holding down farm output. The Russian grain deal (the Capitalists "shookered" by the Communists) made things worse.

We know now, thanks to the transcripts, that all during this period, Mr. Nixon was preoccupied with managing the Watergate cover-up. Moreover, as the June 23, 1972, tape shows, he was bored with economic affairs—and gave both the problems and his own advisers, (even Shultz) short shrift.

But in the perennial search for a quick fix and a favorable headline, Mr. Nixon tried a second freeze, this time just on prices, in June 1973.

As soon as the 60-day freeze ended, prices resumed a rapid climb. Controls and controllers were discredited, except for Cost of Living Council Director John T. Dunlop, who managed to keep wages from going through the roof.

The four-fold increase in the price of oil, and the oil embargo itself, of course, added to the problem—one of the external factors often cited as beyond the reach of domestic policy. But the administration since its inception had given first priority to protection of domestic oil interests, rather than the expansion of oil supplies, and rejected a Cabinet committee recommendation in February 1970 which foresaw the potential impact of a cutoff of oil, and which urged Nixon to liberalize import quotas.

In handling the oil crisis, Mr. Nixon took the incredible step of boosting the domestic price of oil although that merely enlarged oil company profits, not supply. This bonanza surprised even the oil companies who naturally didn't turn it down.

Another "external" factor often cited for the miserable economic results of the Nixon years is the impetus to inflation from two dollar devaluations. At the time of the first, part of the December 1971 Smithsonian Agreement—which Mr. Nixon called "the greatest monetary agreement in the history of the world"—administration officials flatly denied that there would be an inflationary impact. But, of course, there was: The dollar prices of imported goods rose sharply and, since our goods appeared more attractive, foreign buyers snapped them up with their more valuable currencies, exacerbating shortages here.

Inasmuch as a trade deficit continued in 1972, and the dollar continued to show weakness abroad, a second devaluation was needed in February 1973. But one of the elements that probably forced the second devaluation was abandonment of the effective Phase II of the wage-price program a month earlier: the world calculated correctly that the enviable U.S. record of price stabilization had been jettisoned by Mr. Nixon.

The stock market made a comparable judgment. Having recovered from the first Nixon bear market in 1970, stock prices touched a high point in January 1973, the day that Phase II was junked. They have been depressed ever since.

Where does Mr. Nixon leave us? We are in the second recession of his time of office, with prices accelerating and wages threatening to take off with their own explosion as labor attempts to recover what it lost in real wages during the past year. The economy is stagnant, with fears spreading about the financial system itself. Interest rates are so high that the government was forced to offer 9 percent

on a Treasury note, the highest coupon in more than a century. Fed Chairman Burns admits that the Fed may have contributed to the mess by being too easy in credit extension in 1972, with a result that a lot of bank debt doesn't look as collectible as it did when the loans were made. The savings and loan associations face massive withdrawals, and housing is in its own depression.

So—it's so long to Nixonomics with no regrets. The challenge to President Ford is enormous, more than can be expected of any man to handle quickly or completely. We trust that we won't get the same dose of ineffective and unimaginative policies and weak leadership under another name. But, for the moment, the mere change provides a sense of relief.

A TALK WITH GERALD FORD

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the August issue of DUN's carries an interesting interview with the Honorable Gerald Ford on inflation, interest rates, tax reform, and other economic issues. The interview was made at a time when Mr. Ford was Vice President, but his answers give an insight in to the manner in which he will cope with these problems now that he is our President. I commend this interview to the attention of my colleagues. It provides some guideposts to the direction in which the new administration will move in the days ahead.

The article follows:

A TALK WITH GERALD FORD

(Amid all the uncertainties in Washington and the economy these days, the views of one key figure are particularly pertinent. He is, of course, Vice President Gerald R. Ford. In the following interview, DUN's editors conduct a far-ranging discussion with the Vice President on inflation, the budget, interest rates and other vital issues.)

Mr. Vice President, it's quite obvious that our problem right now is inflation.

Number One, I couldn't agree with you more. Every poll I've seen—and I've seen a good many of them in the last couple of weeks, both regional and national—indicates that inflation is the Number One issue, substantially as well as politically.

What can the government do about it? My thought is that the federal government—in the one area where it can do something affirmatively, which is fiscal policy—has to show some leadership. This leadership is essential if you are going to ask labor to be moderate, if you are going to ask management to be statesmanlike. The federal government has to set an example. If you are going to ask other people to tighten their belts, the federal government has to be in the forefront.

Which means?

The President and the Congress have to really clamp down on anticipated expenditures over and above this budget. That is where the real battle is going to come now. So if you can avoid the added expenditures over \$305 billion and make some honest and realistic adjustments—a couple of billion dollars below that level—I believe that this is what will be construed among Americans as the kind of leadership that is necessary.

You think cuts can be made?

I can't believe that out of \$305 billion there can't be some slowdowns, there can't

be some eliminations. And, incidentally, I think the new budget reform bill gives to the President some authority that maybe Congress didn't anticipate.

What is that?

It specifically provides two procedures: One for deferrals and another for rescission, and the net result is you get an item deferral potential. So the President can take some action here, under the new bill, that he couldn't have done previously without getting into a legal controversy.

Now, in addition to the actions that I think will require vetoes and the sustaining of vetoes and the possibility of using the new budget bill, I think the President has to commit himself right now—as he has, in effect—to submit an honest-to-goodness balanced budget, not a full-employment balanced budget, for fiscal 1976.

That will have a political effect . . .

I just talked to one of the top pollsters, one who does a lot of work for Republicans, some for Democrats. And the pollster says that polls are now showing, for the first time, that the public perceives a connection between the federal government's expenditures and inflation. They have never really been able to pin it down before, but now they realize the federal government's handling of their money is related to problems of inflation.

Secretary Simon has been talking about cutting as much as \$20 billion from the budget. Do you think that is unrealistic?

I respectfully disagree with Bill Simon.

Are you worried about interest rates—that they could tip the economy into a really deep recession?

I am worried about interest rates. I hope that the Federal Reserve, once it sees that there is an honest-to-goodness effort being made in fiscal policy, will not be too tough too long.

There is, of course, the danger that it will be too tough for too long?

Yes, but I am optimistic once Arthur Burns and his associates are convinced that fiscal policy is going to be a firm one, they will then relax their attitude on the supply of money.

Do you have a rate of inflation in your own mind that you think is acceptable to the country?

When it was 4%, I thought it was too high. But when you are dealing with 10% or 11%, if at the end of this calendar year it is down to 7%, I think that is significant progress—not acceptable, but significant, and ought to lay the groundwork in 1975 for additional progress. If we can survive that and get down to 7% by the end of the calendar year, I think with increased production in many fields—such as food and energy—1975 ought to be significantly better.

Are you at all bothered by the fact that so many banks are in dire straits at the present?

Nobody is proud of or happy with what happened to the Franklin Bank. Then the failure of the bank in Germany, Herstatt, probably had as big an impact in America as the Franklin because it scared a lot of American bankers who had gotten involved with Eurodollars, and so on. I think the banking industry has got to take a good hard look at some of the practices that it has been involved in over the last several years.

You mean you think that some banks are a little bit overextended?

No question about it.

What about Wall Street?

I don't think you are going to get any change in that area until you get public confidence that something is being done in the area of inflation and they see some material progress.

How about wage and price controls? Do you see any chance of returning to them?

I see no prospect either for the Administration to ask for it or Congress to approve it.

It has been said that one reason for inflation is that business is operating at capacity and the way to get it down is to build more plants. Would you be in favor of increasing the investment tax credit or offering more rapid depreciation?

I am more concerned about the tendencies in the Congress to reduce the investment tax credit from 7% to some other figure, and the possibility that the Congress might try to cut back in one way or another the more rapid amortization that we currently have. I don't think Congress will achieve it, but there are strong elements in the Congress that are talking that way. I think it would be disastrous and firmly believe in the investment tax credit and in the rapid amortization programs that we have now authorized by law.

Would you change the capital gains tax?

I must say that after listening to the pros and cons, I come to the conclusion we are on about the right keel instead of taking drastic action one way or another.

So you would be pretty well satisfied to leave the tax system as it is?

Well, I am against the tax increase. I am against the tax decrease. Or changes in corporate income taxes. I think rather than tinkering now in a period of uncertainty and in a period of perhaps hysteria in some areas, it is better to keep a position of stability.

The people know what they are dealing with, even though there may be some inequities. I think stability at this point rather than a tinkering is a better procedure. Supposing the Congress comes up in one bill or another with some changes that would affect people's investment policies or businessmen's actions in the field of expansion or modernization. The mere threat of some changes I think adds to uncertainty, and we have enough of it now.

How about the charges from various groups that the tax system has too many loopholes?

Well, I have listened to those arguments on the floor of the House and read a lot and you get right back to the old saying that what is a loophole for one is a justifiable benefit for another. I think there's been a lot of demagoguery on this.

Are you at all concerned that the policies we are pursuing to slow down inflation might push us into a recession?

All the economists I have listened to—and I have listened to many—discount any possibility of a depression. As I read various things and listen, I think we may have been on the brink of a recession, but if we can restore whatever confidence is needed in this immediate crunch, I think any problems of recession, if there were any, will evaporate.

You feel stability will restore that?

Stability, and a firm feeling on the part of the public that the federal government is going to be strong on fiscal policy.

Would you be concerned about the effect of a massive swing in Congress this fall?

I certainly would. As you know, the more liberal elements are talking about a net gain of fifty to 100 in the House and, in their political efforts, they are talking about a veto-proof Congress. I have tried to counter that in the political arena by saying a veto-proof Congress leads to a legislative dictatorship. We have assembled some material that shows that if we had had a veto-proof Congress over some previous Congresses, there would have been \$27 billion more in federal spending available. So my feeling is that if the public gets a veto-proof Congress, the public had better fasten its seat belts because there will be massive increases in spending and that will just add fuel to the inflationary fire. After looking at various polls that show really serious, broad public concern with inflation, we will fight the veto-proof Congress; we will fight for an inflation-proof Congress. If the liberals want a veto-proof Congress, we will counter with an

inflation-proof Congress and that will be the issue in November.

Many labor leaders argue that they need a 20% increase just to catch up.

I understand the logic and perhaps the justification. But if we don't ask them to tighten their belts, there is going to be a snowballing effect. I think most of us recognize that some of the demands in 1966 and 1967 in the labor-management field really touched off the wage demands that created much of the inflation in the Vietnam war period. If we go through that same cycle again, we are going to have a tough time.

Would you advise corporations to take a strike rather than accede to . . .

I think they have got to be very realistic and recognize they are part of the big picture. If management capitulates in toto to whatever the excessive demand, it has to recognize that although it may save itself momentarily, it is only adding a very unfortunate part to a whole system. So it may be necessary for some segments of management to be very firm.

There have been quite a few price increases since controls went off.

The ones who have raised prices to please their constituencies, stockholders, or to improve their own economic situation, are extremely shortsighted. Certain professions, once they were freed of wage and price controls, have forgotten that they are a part of the whole system, and they are only leading in the long run either to reimposition of controls or they are leading to an economy that is going to disintegrate, one way or the other.

One follow-up question to that: Do you see yourself filling the void that presently exists, due to the President's preoccupation with foreign affairs, in the government's relationship with business and labor?

Now that some of our major international policies are in better shape than they were maybe three or four months ago. I think you will see the President taking command, really actively participating in the domestic problem of major importance, inflation. I saw him six times last week.

What did you talk about?

In each instance, with one exception, it was devoted to working with him at his request on the problems of the economy and inflation and it was a two-way discussion. He asked me questions as to what my views might be on this or that, and I will be doing my utmost to assist in what I think is going to be a strong, firm policy.

Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

THE GREAT "NONDEBATE" ON INFLATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the third and final article in the recent Bureau of National Affairs Daily Labor Report study on price and wage stabilization presents some useful background for the current debate on the Nation's economic policy. The article by Ben Rathbun, called "The Great 'Nondebate' on Stabilization Policy," follows:

THE GREAT "NONDEBATE" ON INFLATION

Among those interviewed in Congress, the Executive Branch, and in labor and business for this report, there was broad agreement that 1973's unforeseen price explosions should have set the stage for a Great Debate on national economic policy before Congress

TAXPAYERS' MONEY SPENT
FOOLISHLY

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, as we here in the Congress struggle to find solutions to end the crippling inflationary spiral our economy is now experiencing I hope the Members of this body will bear in mind one suggestion I have to offer. That is, the need to end the present wanton amount of wasteful and unnecessary Government spending that has been occurring over the last four decades and which is one of the main causes of our financial difficulties today.

I know this is not a new solution. But it is one which has been frequently courted by the Members of this body but seldom have we fully embraced it in a long and lasting relationship of any sort. Usually the patronizing words and phrases of "efficient government" echoed for the folks back home give way to new and even higher budget deficits.

Government spending has grown from about 10 percent of the national income prior to 1929 to about 40 percent today. Over the same period, the relative role of the Federal Government and State and local governments has been reversed. In 1929, State and local governments spent almost twice as much as the Federal Government; in 1970 the Federal Government spent almost twice as much as State and local governments.

This change is mostly a product of the past 40 years, dating from the onset of the New Deal. For the first century and a half of our Nation's existence, total Government spending—so far as we can judge from the meager data available, never exceeded about 10 percent of national income except in time of major war. And State and local spending was throughout that time roughly twice as large as Federal spending. Total spending as a percentage of national income nearly doubled in the decade after 1929, and then nearly doubled again in the next three decades.

Table I is as follows:

TABLE I.—GOVERNMENT SPENDING AS PERCENTAGE OF NATIONAL INCOME

Year	Federal	State and local	Total
1900	3.4	6.1	9.5
1929	3.0	8.9	11.9
1940	12.3	10.4	22.7
1950	16.9	8.3	25.2
1960	22.4	10.4	32.8
1970	25.5	13.6	39.1

Source: Economic Report of the President.

Much of this spending has been with money we do not even have in our Treasury. In the last 5 years this Nation has spent more than it has taken in. Our national debt is approaching a half a trillion dollars—five hundreds of billions—and the interest on that debt is predicted to be \$31 million for next year alone.

Now as any freshman in economics can tell you, when you print money that you

do not have the goods and services to back, you are going to have an overheated economy or, more simply, inflation. As I pointed out earlier, we here in the Congress all hate to see this excessive spending. But why then does it continue to occur? An incident which happened on the floor of the House just the other day may give some insight into why this mysterious spending continues to occur.

In considering a \$145 million appropriation bill, I, along with 126 of my colleagues, voted to lower the spending level of this measure to its year earlier total of \$105,275,000. This represented a "cut" of \$39,725,000 from the amount the sponsors of this bill wanted.

I did not support this reduction simply out of blind opposition to any spending increase. Instead, I felt this particular spending was wasteful and unnecessary. What particularly disturbed me was a recent study by the General Accounting Office of some of the projects funded in this budget in the past. Their report revealed frightening examples of waste and a flagrant disregard of the taxpayers of this Nation. Among some of the ridiculous projects funded were the following:

\$70,000 for the study of the smell of perspiration given off by the Australian aborigines;

\$6,000 for a study of Polish frogs;

\$71,000 to study the history of comic books;

\$121,000 for a study to learn why people say "ain't";

\$46,089 for an encyclopedia on witchcraft;

\$5,000 to the poet who wrote the poem "LIGHGHT" (That is not the title but the content of the whole poem.)

On the very day this bill was passed, Democrats in the Congress emerged from their caucus pledging to "cut out waste and unnecessary expenditures wherever found." They then proceeded to add \$40 million to a budget which in the past had been used to finance such wasteful and unnecessary projects that I have just mentioned.

If this is what they mean by cutting waste they must be operating under some new principle. This new principle could be stated something like this:

When some agency demonstrates that it is not using the taxpayers money wisely, we will punish them by giving them more money to use wastefully.

With actions such as these, I can understand why our inflation rate is running at 12 percent a year. I only dread the thought of what our budget and economy will look like after this November if an even bigger majority of like-minded Congressmen to apply their economics of waste.

LIMITING AID TO CAMBODIA

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this week, as the Foreign Affairs Committee continues mark-up of foreign aid legislation requested by the President, I expect to offer an amendment limiting

total American aid to Cambodia to \$276 million. My amendment would reimpose the now-dormant ceiling on such aid contained in section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act, which covers all conceivable forms of military and economic aid to Cambodia. Aid to Cambodia is an important question of American foreign policy. It seems to me that the administration's present course of seemingly unlimited assistance to the Lon Nol regime is a grave and dangerous mistake, and that Congress should assert its responsibility to rectify this situation.

WEAKNESS OF THE LON NOL GOVERNMENT

The Lon Nol government took power in a 1970 coup, ousting Prince Norodom Sihanouk. Since then, there has been a steady attempt by a collection of "insurgent" forces, most notably those led by the Prince and the Khmer Rouge—the Communist Party of Cambodia—to overturn the Lon Nol regime. As the conflict rages on, the insurgents are gaining strength. Estimates vary as to how much of the country they control, but 60 percent of the territory and 40 percent of the population seem to be minimum figures.

This represents a significant advance since Lon Nol took power. The provincial capitals still held by Lon Nol are surrounded and can be supplied only by air. Highways leading to Phnom Penh are also blocked, and should the insurgents cut off the Mekong River supply route, as they have the potential for doing, Phnom Penh too would be limited to air transports for outside contact.

There is also the possibility that this fall Lon Nol will be ejected from the United Nations and a Communist delegation seated in his place.

As fighting continues, human suffering in Cambodia abounds. No one claims to have reliable statistics on casualties due to the war in Cambodia, but Lon Nol's Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Um Sim, estimates that casualties are running at about 150-200 per week—8,000-10,000 per year. Other estimates run higher—New York Times, July 10, 1974. According to the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, almost one half of Cambodia's entire population has been forced to move since the beginning of hostilities in 1970. At least half of the 2,000,000 people of Phnom Penh are refugees. And furthermore, the war has inspired severe inflation: prices increased 472 percent between January 1, 1972 and January 1, 1974. June 1974 staff study of House Foreign Affairs Committee, "United States Aid to Indochina," page 21.

The extreme weakness of the Lon Nol government is well recognized. Whatever constituency Lon Nol ever had—the urban elite and the students—has abandoned him by now; students in fact staged protests against Lon Nol this spring—Philip A. McCombs, Washington Post, June 6, 1974. Internally, the Lon Nol government is marked by repeated shuffling and by an inability to deal with the problems the country is facing. Lon Nol recently fired members of his cabinet, whose original presence the United States had cited as evidence that he was strengthening his government. And, in their July 1974 staff study, House For-

ign Affairs Committee staff members John Brady and John Sullivan state that:

Despite its perilous military and economic situation, there is strikingly little sense of urgency evident in Phnom Penh. Reports of high living among top military and civilian officials are prevalent. Until quite recently, Mercedes automobiles, television sets, and delicacies such as canned asparagus and Hennessy cognac continued to be imported.

WIDESPREAD CORRUPTION REPORTED

The widespread corruption of this regime is well reported. High-ranking officers of the Cambodian Army are known to profit heavily from the thriving black market—Sydney H. Schanberg, *New York Times*, August 8, 1974. One of the most alarming forms of corruption, from the U.S. point of view, is the wholesale diversion of U.S.-supplied military supplies for sale in Phnom Penh—or through middlemen to the Khmer Rouge—Donald Kirk, *Chicago Tribune*, June 26, 1974. These sorts of practices led Messrs. Brady and Sullivan to recognize that “there is no guarantee that U.S. aid will be used efficiently, effectively, and without corruption.”

DEPENDENCY ON THE UNITED STATES

With these sorts of characteristics, it is no wonder that, as Messrs. Brady and Sullivan say,

The Lon Nol government in Phnom Penh is fully dependent for its existence on the military and economic assistance of the United States.

The U.S. role in maintaining this government far transcends the transfers of goods and money. John Gunther Dean, the American Ambassador to Cambodia, has made it clear that he believes he is, in effect, running the country—Philip A. McCombs, *Washington Post*, June 6, 1974. He gives orders to certain politicians and, according to Messrs. Brady and Sullivan,

By his own admission he does not hesitate to give strategic military advice to Lon Nol or tactical advice to subordinate military commanders.

There is also evidence, despite statutory provisions prohibiting U.S. military advisers in Cambodia, that U.S. officials, upon delivering equipment, have felt it necessary to give the Cambodians considerable advice to make sure that it is used properly. It is clear, then, that the “Nixon Doctrine’s” expectation that American aid can function to enable other governments to defend themselves is not entirely realistic, at least as it applies to Cambodia; by giving aid, the United States has made a commitment to the Khmer Republic which leads to our assisting it in additional ways—which could conceivably lead to direct U.S. military involvement.

In looking at the Cambodian situation, it is important also to recognize that North Vietnam no longer aids the Khmer Rouge. In fact, relations between these two groups are reported to be strained. Press articles have suggested instances of fighting between the Khmer Rouge and the North Vietnamese. The administration originally claimed that American involvement in the Cambodian conflict was necessary to make North Vietnam honor the Paris Agreements and withdraw its troops from Cambodia, but

as far back as last spring official sources admitted there was no evidence of Vietnamese troops performing combat roles in Cambodia—*Washington Star*, April 12, 1973. The indigenous character of the insurgent movement in Cambodia justifies the description of the conflict as a civil war in the fullest sense of the term.

IS OUR CAMBODIA POLICY REALISTIC?

What, then, is the United States doing in Cambodia? Secretary of State Kissinger, in a memo provided to Senator Kennedy on March 25, 1974, said that:

We are convinced that with United States material and diplomatic support the Khmer Republic’s demonstration of military and economic viability will persuade their now intransigent opponents to move to a political solution of the Cambodian conflict.” (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 1, 1974, page 9035.)

The hope is that a “Laos-type” agreement, in which the Khmer Communists would form a coalition with GKR—Government of the Khmer Republic—officials, in a government of national unity, would result. It seems to me that this hope is based on a false assessment of the Cambodian situation, particularly as it compares with that in Laos. In Laos, Souvanna Phouma, who formed the coalition with the Communist Souphanavong, was a respected leader, and the two sides were relatively even in strength. This bears no similarity to the situation in Cambodia. Lon Nol neither has any real constituency nor commands any respect from his opposition, which refuses to negotiate with him.

And the Lon Nol government’s inferior military organization, institutionalized corruption, and narrow political base make it quite unlikely that it will be capable of reaching even a stalemate. Even Ambassador Dean’s attempts to make it function effectively, while causing some improvements—a reduction in “phantom” soldiers on the payrolls, for example—have resulted in much frustration, as its corrupt practices are deeply ingrained. The United States must ask itself, then, whether its policy has any realistic prospects for success which would warrant the vast investment of resources we are now making. We must act wisely now to avert another drawn-out commitment to a futile cause.

It is hard to predict in an exact sense what would happen if the United States reduced its commitment to Lon Nol. It is difficult to imagine that he would stay in his present position of power, although his ability to hang on has been underestimated in the past: Secretary Kissinger predicted his fall upon the bombing halt of August 16, 1973. There is a possibility that more moderate politicians would take over in Phnom Penh, and that the insurgents would be content to negotiate with these people. An actual insurgent attack and takeover of Phnom Penh is far from a certainty, as an assault on a city requires large expenditures of resources which the Khmer Rouge would not be likely to want to make.

At any rate, the solution of Cambodia’s political problems will be a complex process. The one thing that is clear is that the United States, by keeping Lon Nol in an artificial position of pow-

er, is impeding that solution, doing the opposite of what Secretary Kissinger states as our goal:

To help create stability in that country as a part of our effort to encourage the development of peace in the entire region. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 1, 1974, page 9034.)

Finally, any claim that it is necessary to U.S. interests to maintain this support for Lon Nol must be challenged. Our original involvement in Cambodia stemmed from the connections between Hanoi and the Khmer Rouge, but that is no longer a legitimate claim. There are traditional hostilities and cultural differences between Cambodians and Vietnamese, so that even if Communists controlled Cambodia full cooperation between them and Hanoi would be unlikely. The weakness of the current government in Phnom Penh allows the North Vietnamese to pressure South Vietnam on its western borders just as much as would a Communist government with a viability of its own.

But more fundamentally, the United States must recognize, along with the spirit of détente, that it is not essential to American security in all cases to have foreign countries run by pro-U.S. governments; that the United States can coexist and even cooperate with other governments, regardless of their ideology. The imperative is clear for the United States to choose a rational course of action and curtail this wasteful investment of American dollars and sacrifice of Cambodian lives.

THE HARRINGTON AMENDMENT

Section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act was first enacted in 1971, to apply to fiscal year 1972, at the request of Senator STUART SYMINGTON. It was not, however, extended for either fiscal years 1973 or 1974. The need for this ceiling, originally set at \$341 million, is apparent. American aid to Cambodia has increased remarkably in the past 2 years. In fiscal year 1973, the administration spent \$251 million in total assistance to Cambodia. This assistance level grew to \$710 million in fiscal year 1974, and this year the administration has proposed \$580 million, with a cut-back in Public Law 480—food for peace—funds—from \$194 million in fiscal 1974 to \$77 million in fiscal 1975—basically accounting for the reduction. This \$580 million request, however, does not include the special authorities and “loopholes” the administration can use to supplement the basic authorization. Last year, for example, the administration requested \$167,194,000 for military assistance program—MAP—funds to Cambodia, but, by using section 506 “drawdown authority” ended up spending \$375,012,000 for MAP. Public Law 480 expenditures in Cambodia were also jacked up. This sort of problem can only be solved by a legislative mechanism such as section 655, which sets a ceiling on all forms of aid to Cambodia, including reprogramming.

Measures introduced in the Foreign Affairs Committee by two of my colleagues will have the effect of reducing the authorization for aid to Cambodia. I am referring to Congressman WHALEN’S

amendment dealing with Indochina Postwar Reconstruction, which passed the committee last Thursday, and to Congressman HAMILTON's amendment dealing with the military assistance program—MAP—which is expected to pass the committee this week. The "Whalen amendment" reduced economic aid to Cambodia by \$35 million, and the "Hamilton amendment" lowers military aid by \$160 million. I applaud these measures, but believe that more cuts can and should be made.

The food for peace request should be reduced from \$77 million to \$42 million, in compliance with the amendment to the

Agriculture Appropriations Act, recently passed by the Congress, which states that no more than 10 percent of Public Law 480 title I appropriated funds can go to any one country. And I would like to see the military assistance program cut to \$140 million, a level close to that spent in fiscal year 1973; this would amount to a further \$75 million reduction in military aid from the "Hamilton-Whalen" levels. A table breaking down the fiscal year 1974 expenditures, the administration's fiscal year 1975 request, the effect of the Whalen and Hamilton amendments, and my proposed \$276 million figure follows:

Program	Fiscal year 1974 expenditures (estimate)	Fiscal year 1975 request	Effect of Whalen and Hamilton amendments	Harrington proposal
MAP	\$375,000,000	\$362,500,000		\$140,000,000
Supply operations	37,200,000	27,500,000	\$230,000,000	16,000,000
Other military	10,400,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,000,000
Total military	422,600,000	393,200,000	233,000,000	159,000,000
Indochina postwar reconstruction	95,000,000	110,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
Public Law 480 (Food for Peace)	194,200,000	77,000,000	77,000,000	42,000,000
Total economic	289,200,000	187,000,000	152,000,000	117,000,000
Total	711,800,000	580,200,000	385,000,000	276,000,000

NOTICE ON LOSS OF FLIGHT PAY FOR ENLISTED AIR FORCE PERSONNEL

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, to update the Armed Forces' progress toward observing a congressionally imposed requirement that enlisted men be given 120 days notice before loss of flight pay, I am submitting for the record a letter from Lieutenant General Roberts explaining how the Air Force will handle this matter. You will recall my recent announcement that 106 enlisted crewmembers at McClellan Air Force Base, Calif., had been grounded without the notice required by Congress. In subsequent hearings before the Military Compensation Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, General Roberts admitted to an administrative foul up and promised to correct the wrong done to these men. He also assured the subcommittee that he had taken steps to prevent future mistakes by establishing strict controls.

To insure the subcommittee's understanding of the Air Force's new system was correct, I wrote to General Roberts asking for a verification of his promises. His answer assures me that as far as the Air Force is concerned enlisted aviators will be given every protection possible. Copies of these letters follow.

Of course, a seemingly satisfactory Air Force system does not mean the issue can be forgotten, and so far I have not heard from the Office of the Secretary of Defense nor the Secretaries of the Army and Navy whom I also asked to comment on the Air Force's promised procedures. I

shall report on their answers when received.

JULY 29, 1974.

Lt. General JOHN W. ROBERTS, USAF,
Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, Headquarters, USAF, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL ROBERTS: Thank you for your prompt attention to the plight of the enlisted crew members at McClellan AFB who were grounded with no notice. I am pleased that the Air Force concluded it has sufficient management flexibility to guarantee the 120 days' notice before loss of flight pay as directed by Congress. Your new instructions to the field requiring notification of Headquarters, USAF, whenever local units and major air commands cannot meet the notice requirement should go far toward preventing future mistakes like the one I brought to your attention.

As I understand your new system, you foresee no difficulty in meeting fully the 120 days' notice specified by Congress. This will be done for all enlisted crew members with few exceptions. The exceptions you mentioned I believe are acceptable to the members of the Military Compensation Subcommittee. They are crew members grounded for cause or because of medical disqualification. Further, there is no reason to treat non-crew members, who are assigned flight duties for a period or for a task specified in orders, differently than you always have.

One other exception suggested in your testimony does not seem to be one with common application. It pertains to crew members prevented from performing "frequent and regular aerial flight" because aircraft are not available. The "frequent and regular" criteria are defined in an executive order. While changing an executive order may be complex, would it not be an easier way of eliminating this exception than legislation?

Chairman Stratton has suggested legislation might be the best way to insure enlisted crew member save-pay for 120 days or some other period. If you think the matter should be considered by Congress, I would like you to tell me what features you wish to see in an enlisted flight pay protection bill.

Would you please confirm my understanding of how you plan to meet the 120 day requirement and the exceptions to it you wish to make? Am I correct in interpreting

your testimony as assurance that exceptions beyond the ones you listed will not be made?

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., August 6, 1974.

Honorable LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: Thank you for your letter of 29 July concerning the problem of providing advance notification of flying status change to enlisted aircrew members. This detailed response is intended to clarify the Air Force position with respect to procedures now in effect—and changes to law/executive order which we recommend—to insure compliance with the Congressional mandate. In addition, I would like to take this opportunity to follow up on my commitment to you during the 17 July hearing to advise whether or not there would be any exceptions to the stated policy over and above those discussed during the hearing.

First, let me address what we have done to ensure compliance with the Congressional mandate. The attachment to this letter contains the detailed policy and procedural practices that have been placed into effect. You will note that, while rather complex, they are designed to tighten controls we had established earlier and to preclude a recurrence of the situation we had at McClellan AFB. Unfortunately, I cannot say that we "foresee no difficulty in meeting fully the 120 days' notice specified." There might be occasional administrative foul-ups because of the complexity involved, but we should be able to correct any such instances when and if they occur.

Of greater concern is the fact that short notice, unanticipated unit deactivations, where all of the aircraft are removed from the inventory at a given installation could create a situation where compliance with the executive order would be impossible. While such instances would be very rare, they could occur. Moreover, as indicated in General Benade's letter of 26 July to you, the Comptroller General is being asked to comment on the legal ramifications of authorizing temporary overmanning under conditions where enlisted crew members would otherwise have been removed from flight duties. In this latter case, we feel we are on solid ground in view of the statement of Congressional intent contained in the House Report. However, we must await the outcome of the Comptroller General ruling before we are sure.

Because of these uncertainties, and in order to remove any question as to adequate notification in all instances, we feel that the best course of action is to amend the executive order which, as now written, constitutes the fundamental cause of the problem by virtue of its definition of "frequent and regular" flight. The Air Force General Counsel's initial reaction is that this can be done, and the Comptroller General will be queried toward this end as well. The proposed amendment would simply add a section which would state that an enlisted aircrew member who is involuntarily removed from flight status with less than the 120 days' notice may be deemed to have fulfilled all requirements for receipt of the pay for a period of up to 120 days from date of notification. Should such an amendment not be possible, we will develop and propose through OSD a legislative solution that will provide recourse.

In the closing paragraph of your letter, you asked me to confirm that exceptions to the 120 days' notification rule beyond those identified in my testimony will not be made. Though all the points were covered at one place or another, let me expand upon them here so there is no misunderstanding.

First of all, I was addressing the involuntary removal of crew members. Numerous

instances will occur where an individual will volunteer for a job that does not involve flight duties. This is especially true of those members who are dual hatted, i.e., those whose primary skills are ground oriented and who are on flying status by virtue of the need to apply that skill, on a continuing basis, on board an aircraft when it is in flight (radar repairman, for example). Those, who, for one reason or another voluntarily remove themselves (e.g., request separation in order to reenlist for a base of choice, elect to retire, or self-initiate a request for removal from flight status for personal reasons) would be considered exceptions to the 120 days' notification requirement.

Second, there is the "for cause" category. This would include members who are separated from the Air Force for cause, relieved from flight duties for cause (e.g., drug usage, failure to meet skill performance standards, etc.), those who become AWOL or are confined and those who are removed for medical reasons. Incidentally, in this latter case there is a clause written into the executive order which authorizes continuation of pay for 90 days in instances where a member is unable to meet performance requirements because of an incapacitating aviation accident. It is partially because of this clause that we think we have a good case for the amendment discussed earlier.

Finally, there is the category where the aircraft are simply not available in order for the member to perform "frequent and regular" flight at a given installation. This situation could occur when the aircraft are grounded for safety reasons or the unit is deactivated with a less than 120 days' advance notice and all of the unit equipment is transferred elsewhere. These situations will be rare, but we cannot unequivocally state they will not occur.

In closing, I wish to assure you that we are doing everything possible, within the constraints of law as we understand them, to comply with the Congressional mandate in this matter. As noted in the insert for record contained on page 592, Transcript of Hearings (H.A.S.C. No. 93-20) and in my recent testimony, the Air Force is entirely in accord with the policy. Hopefully, a change to the executive order can be obtained which will obviate the need for any involuntary exceptions to the 120 days' notification policy in the future.

Sincerely

JOHN W. ROBERTS,
Lieutenant General, USAF Deputy
Chief of Staff, Personnel.

A BEGINNING AND AN END

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this evening as Gerald R. Ford returns to the House of Representatives to address a Joint Session of Congress as the 38th President of the United States of America, it marks the beginning of a new era in our Nation's history, an era we all look forward to with optimism.

Last week brought an end to a trying, wrenching period for our Nation, as Richard Nixon resigned from the Presidency. It was a sad moment for me as I announced my intention to support article I of the impeachment resolution, charging the President with obstruction of jus-

tice. It was an even more difficult time for President Nixon who, recognizing the certainty of impeachment in the House and probability of ultimate conviction in the Senate, decided to resign from the highest office in our land, turning the responsibilities of the Chief Executive over to Gerald Ford, a man in whom the American people have great faith and trust.

While historic perspective must be the ultimate judge of President Nixon's decision, his voluntary removal from office was in the best interests of our Nation. Hopefully, it brings to a close the tragic Watergate episode and all it represents.

It is time now for a reunited Nation to turn its attention to the pressing problems at hand, both foreign and domestic, giving Watergate and all its related events the role it warrants—a memorable lesson from which we all can learn.

It is time now to foster in the hearts and minds of all Americans an era of good will which has been so warmly demonstrated in the first few days of the Ford administration. It is time, too, for our Nation to respond affirmatively to President Ford's request for confirmation by prayers.

Accordingly, let us warmly greet this new era in our Nation's history with the knowledge and confidence that our Constitution is, indeed, in working order; that we have an outstanding leader of solid strength in the White House and that our Nation can and will meet the challenges which lie ahead under the capable leadership of our 38th President, our friend and former colleague, Gerald R. Ford.

IZAIAK WALTON LEAGUE ENDORSES LEGISLATION TO SAVE NEW RIVER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I have always admired the conscientious efforts of the Izaak Walton League of America to conserve our Nation's precious natural resources. Its 55,000 members are a vital force in promoting wise conservation policies for our country. I am proud that the Izaak Walton League supports legislation which would provide for the study of a segment of the New River for possible inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system.

I would like to insert into the RECORD the remarks of Maitland S. Sharpe, environmental affairs director for the league, given before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation:

STATEMENT BY MAITLAND S. SHARPE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am Maitland Sharpe, Environmental Affairs Director for the Izaak Walton League of America and a life-long resident of the State of Virginia. The League is a membership organization dedicated to the conservation and wise use of the nation's natural resources, our air, soil, woods, waters, and wildlife. We have more than 55,000

members nationwide, over 6,000 of whom live in Virginia.

The League strongly endorses H.R. 11120, which would designate the New River, from its headwaters in North Carolina to the vicinity of Galax, Virginia, as a potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. We recognize that the river, the hills that cradle it, and the valleys through which it flows could be dedicated to any of a number of competing uses. However, we are convinced that preservation of the river in a free-flowing condition constitutes the wisest use of the resource.

As you know, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act states that it is "the policy of the United States that certain selected rivers of the Nation which, with their immediate environments, possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historical, cultural or other similar values shall be preserved in free-flowing condition, and . . . protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations."

The New River scores high in each of these categories. The scenery varies from wooded mountains to a bucolic landscape of isolated farms along the bottom lands. Blessed with water of unusually high quality, the New is ideally suited to family canoeing and float trips. The upper reaches of the river have been said to offer the best small mouth bass fishing in North Carolina. The natural values of the New were well summarized by the Environmental Protection Agency when it stated that the river is a "major environmental resource of marked scenic, recreational, and biological value."

The biological resource is said to include over 60 species of fish, of which some eleven are thought to be rare or endangered. The botanical province through which the river flows displays an unusual variety of northern and southern plants growing near the limits of their ranges. For example, according to the *Manual of Vascular Flora of the Carolinas*, eight rare vascular plants are found in Ashe and Allegheny Counties, North Carolina. The extraordinary botanical diversity of the area constitutes an irreplaceable scientific resource.

The New also occupies a special niche in the geological history. The Chairman of the Geology Department of Marshall University has claimed that the New is the oldest river in North America—that it has been flowing for over 100 million years. Whether or not that exact figure is correct, it is well established that the New is a very old and geologically significant drainage—a remnant of the pre-glacial Teays River.

Finally, the New River and the valley that it drains possess notable cultural and historical values. It is inhabited by people who are deeply rooted in the land, people who are directly descended from the pioneers who settled the area in the 18th Century. It is one of those rare places where the names on the mailboxes can be matched with those on the decaying gravestones.

The history of the area is not one of great events or outstanding structures. It is, rather, a living, breathing history of everyday life—a continuous, unbroken thread of culture and heritage that stretches through more than two hundred years of American history.

Mr. Chairman, the biological, recreational, and scenic values of the New River have been examined in greater detail in the statement of Mr. Lorne Campbell, President of the New River Chapter of the League. But we believe that even this brief overview shows the New River to be a worthy addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The Izaak Walton League of America urges this committee to act favorably on this proposal to insure for future generations the benefits of a natural, free-flowing New River.

THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF
CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the observance of the 15th anniversary of Captive Nations Week here and abroad well demonstrate the deep dedication of countless Americans and friends to principles of liberty, freedom, and fundamental human rights. Despite the ambiguities of détente, evidence from all sections of the country indicates a growing doubt with respect to any policy that would mute these principles, so well enunciated in the Captive Nations Week Resolution (Public Law 86-90), and would seek to operate in some void of the basic reality of captive nations which extend from Central Europe into the Soviet Union, in Asia and to Cuba. Among other things, one of the major contributions of the past observance was the maintenance of official awareness and sufficient popular support of the captive nations and their fixed aspirations for freedom and national independence.

As assembled by the National Captive Nations Committee here in Washington, further examples of the week's events and those leading into the observance should be of considerable interest to our Members as well as our citizenry. I am pleased to report the following: The proclamation of Gov. William G. Milliken of Michigan; the resolution of the Illinois House of Representatives; an editorial in "Remember Captive Nations Week" in the July 16 issue of the Phoenix Gazette; the extensive commentary in the periodical America's Future; and the stirring address delivered by Hon. ROBERT J. HUBER concerning Ukraine: WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, PRESENTS THIS EXECUTIVE DECLARATION IN OBSERVANCE OF JULY 14-20, 1974, AS CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Traditionally since 1959, the people of the United States have joined with free people throughout the world in expressing support for the just aspirations of captive peoples through observance of the third week in July as Captive Nations Week.

The desire for freedom and liberty which burns in the hearts of the people of the Albanian, Armenian, Bulgarian, Byelorussian, Croatian, Czech, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, Serbian, Slovak, Ukrainian, and many other nations dominated by the policies of Communist Russia, is of particular concern to the many people in America who trace their ancestry to these nations.

Freedom-loving peoples of all Captive Nations look to the United States as the vanguard of human freedom, and to the people of our nation as an aid and inspiration in their pursuit of freedom and independence.

Therefore, I, William G. Milliken, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby urge all citizens to join, through appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities, in expressing hope and support for the people of the Captive Nations, and to dedicate efforts to the goal of freedom and liberty for all people throughout the world.

STATE OF ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
HOUSE RESOLUTION

Whereas, In 1959 President Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Congress of the United States designated the third week in July as Captive Nations week in order to focus world attention on the plight of those nations who have lost their national independence as the result of direct and indirect aggression of world communism; and

Whereas, The National independence of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, Byelorussia, Rumania, Ukraine, Slovakia, Serbia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, North Korea, Croatia, Idel-Ural and other nations has been suppressed by their communist masters; and

Whereas, 1974 marks the 16th anniversary of Captive Nations Week, the observance of which will be marked by a series of special events throughout the United States; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, that we support the aims and aspirations of the people of these captive nations; and that commend the Captive Nations Committee for its valiant efforts in behalf of the restoration of freedom and democracy in these communist dominated countries; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded to Mr. Viktors Viksnins, Chairman of the Captive Nations Committee.

[From the Phoenix Gazette, July 16, 1974]

REMEMBER CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

This is Captive Nations Week. First proclaimed 15 years ago, the week is intended to serve as an annual reminder of some 25 peoples or nations that have been swallowed by the Russian bear since 1920.

Observance of Captive Nations Week is muted, to say the least. Detente is the big thing now. And even those who are opposed to the idea of detente seem to show little concern for the Lithuanians, the Croations, the Czechs, the Slovaks or any of the other groups under the U.S.S.R.'s Red thumb.

Most of the concern for Russian captives nowadays is focused on the plight of those Jews who want to leave the U.S.S.R. A large item in detente, whether the Soviet Union is to be awarded favored nation trade status, is being tied to the Jewish emigrant issue.

Without taking anything away from the plight of these Jews, it is important not to forget that many other peoples are the victims of Communist persecution and exploitation because of race or religion. Captive Nations Week, is, or should be more than it is, a useful reminder of this.

Has the character of the U.S.S.R. changed? That is the fundamental question to be answered before President Nixon's policy of opening relationships with Moscow should be pushed too far. So far the proof of such change seems thin indeed. Certainly it has not yet been enough to justify forgetting Captive Nations Week.

STILL CAPTIVE

With the hopes and fears of the free world centered on the current era of so-called détente and cooperation with communist regimes, the 15th anniversary this month of a special commemoration has a very definite connection with those hopes and fears. Taking place from July 14 to 20, it is known as Captive Nations Week. It was so designated 15 years ago by the American Congress, its purpose being to let the peoples of the numerous nations which form the communist slave empires of Soviet Russia and Red China know, in the word of the congressional resolution, "that the people of the United States

share with them their aspiration for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

Those words may seem to have a somewhat hollow ring in the light of all that has transpired. As the result of agreements reached during the era of détente, and of what has been called our "no-win" policy in Asia, the captive nations are not only still captive but their captivity in some cases has been hardened and made permanent.

Equally significant, as agreement follows upon agreement between the West and its avowed communist enemy, we and our leaders, with good intentions in seeking a peaceful world, tend to forget that many nations of the Red empire became captives as the result of previous good intentions culminating in agreements with communists. This does not mean that there should never be agreements. The West's basic fault seems to be in giving too much and getting very little in return, which stems from failing to understand communism's long-term aims.

Two years ago, following the first batch of agreements in the current era of détente, James Burnham, a foremost authority on communism, made some very prophetic comments in National Review. He noted that those agreements helped to reduce pressure on Soviet Russia in some areas so that she could concentrate on activist policies elsewhere. Those agreements of two years ago, in defiance of the Captive Nations Resolution, seemed to accept and confirm Soviet domination over Eastern Europe. Therefore, Mr. Burnham said, Communist Russia could now use seemingly gentler touches to consolidate her position such as "European security conferences, mutual troop reductions, more disarmament talks, diplomatic recognition of East Germany and its UN admission, strengthening of Soviet industry through trade with western nations."

That, of course, is exactly what has transpired as we in the West, ignoring the just aspirations of the captive nations, continue to seek peaceful agreements with a regime to which peace means world domination by communism.

ENORMITY AND MEANS

Perhaps it is natural, in this era of so-called détente, that not enough attention is paid to the commemoration of Captive Nations Week and the continuing plight of the numerous peoples and nations enslaved in the Russian and Chinese communist empires. But we in the West ignore at our peril both the enormity of those empires and the means by which their peoples became slaves of communism.

Therefore, a bit of history, particularly for our younger citizens many of whom do not get it in their schools, is in order. First, the names of the captive nations: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Georgia, Idel-Ural, North Caucasus, Ukraine, Far Eastern Republic, Turkestan, Mongolian People's Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia (comprising Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc.), Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, Hungary, East Germany, Mainland China, North Vietnam, and Cuba.

Nearly half these nations, now inside the Soviet Union, fell to communist aggression more than half a century ago. Others lost their independence and freedom a quarter of a century ago following the Second World War, and still others more recently. *Détente* or no *détente*, there are two reasons why we must not forget their fate. For one, the United States, in her relatively brief history as a nation, always has been an example and a beacon for liberty-loving peoples everywhere. For another, there are grave lessons for us in the West in the manner in which some of these nations fell under the iron heel of communism.

The European phase of World War II, one of the bloodiest wars in the history of mankind, was set off because of combined communist and Nazi aggression against Poland. It was in defense of her freedom and independence that the West went to war. But Poland is now, and has been since the end of the war, one of the captive nations of the Red empire. She became so as the result of agreements reached between our leaders and the dictator of Soviet Russia at the war and post-war summit conferences in Teheran and Yalta. That was also the fate of Czechoslovakia. As the war neared its end in Europe, the allied armies under the famous General George Patton were about to capture its capital, Prague, from the Nazis. But General Patton was ordered to hold back and let the Russians, then known as "our noble allies," take Prague.

At the Yalta conference, Germany was carved up, the eastern part going to the communists. In the case of Berlin, Germany's ancient capital, the allied armies were stopped in their tracks from taking the city so that the Russians could get their first. The city itself was subsequently cut in half, with free West Berlin left more than 100 miles inside Communist East Germany.

Also at the Yalta conference, the groundwork was laid for the communist takeover of mainland China and the communization of North Korea, which led to both the Korean and the Vietnam wars. The record of other post-World War Two captive nations is a similar and a long one which we do not have space to detail.

The answer frequently made to this sorry record is that the western leaders of the time negotiated agreements with the Reds in good faith, which undoubtedly was true, and that all they really intended was that Soviet Russia exercise a certain degree of leadership over Eastern Europe until and on the promise that free elections were held in the various nations. The contention is that Soviet Russia broke the agreements by not holding free elections, which is also true. But Soviet Russia always breaks agreements whenever it suits her purposes. And were western leaders really so unsophisticated that they believed Communist Russia would ever hold free elections anywhere?

SERIOUS LESSONS FOR THE WEST

There are very serious lessons in all this for the West, particularly for those beguiled by détente. Making agreements, concessions and accommodations with communists, with no quid pro quo or very weak ones for the West, does three things: (1) It helps entrench in power the communist bosses, whose economic system is so shaky it cannot function without help from free nations. (2) It convinces the Reds that the West is weak, perhaps foolish, and can be had. (3) It weakens almost fatally the morale of the ground-down populations in the captive nations—indeed even inside Red Russia and Red China—who hunger for freedom but see the citadel of liberty, the United States, to which they always have looked for inspiration, speaking and acting not for their just and good cause but to shore up and help the regime of their slave masters.

There is another very dire consideration, which we repeat because it was made by a topflight expert on the captive nations, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University. He said: "National dishonor in Vietnam, Moscow's attainment of military superiority, economic regress in world markets, and further moral decline in our nation can easily reduce us to a second-class power, and with our striking incapacities in the art of political warfare, it is no frightful exaggeration to state that we, too, would become a fitting candidate for the captive nations list."

Let us hope he is too pessimistic, that we will wake up before it is too late. Part of that awakening is to understand not what we, but what the communists mean by détente. The journal which speaks for communist parties all over the world, the World Marxist Review, sees détente as a "formalized acknowledgment on the part of U.S. imperialism of the position of power occupied by the socialist [that is, communist] community of states."

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN BOB HUBER

WASHINGTON, June 22.—Attached are remarks prepared for delivery at 2:00 p.m., Saturday, June 22, 1974, by Congressman Robert J. "Bob" Huber of Michigan's 18th Congressional District who is representing the House of Representatives on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the unveiling of the Taras Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C.

"This monument, it will be recalled, was unveiled by the former President Eisenhower and this occasion, during which his family is to be represented, will again provide an occasion for articulating the cause of freedom for the Ukrainians as well as for all captive nations everywhere in the name of this renowned Ukrainian intellectual and freedom fighter," Huber stated.

SHEVCHENKO STATUE, SATURDAY, JUNE 22, 1974

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to be present today and share this tenth anniversary of the unveiling of this statue of the distinguished Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko.

I will not, nor need I, recite what is going on in the Ukraine today. The Ukraine is, and continues to be, a prime center of unrepentant nationalism and cultural unrest that struggles against Communist domination. It has nearly always been so, and this is not strange since the cradle of some of the best in Slavic civilization and culture arose from the so-called Kievan State. In the best tradition of the area, dissent came and comes from the writers, the poets—the intellectuals. We all hear of the Solzhenitsyns and the Sakharovs, but every day in the Ukraine and in the other captive nations, hundreds—perhaps thousands—of little people are working to burst the Communist shackles, unbeknownst to many of us.

In the Congress, we have a special responsibility in this regard at the present time, because we are living through a period of so-called "Detente", during which our differences with the Communist Governments are being muted by some in our government in favor of trade and certain agreements such as Salt I and Salt II, which we can all take with just a grain of —. Therefore, since many of our spokesmen in the Executive Branch now only speak of trade and détente, it falls to us in the Congress to speak of freedom, human rights, and self-determination for those living in the captive nations. It is we who have to assist persons like yourselves in speaking out for human freedom and dignity on both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. If no one appears to listen, the Congress can and should write these matters into law and forbid the President from making trade concessions to the Soviet Union until such time as we see real concessions to the Ukrainian people and others indicating that a minimum of human rights, such as freedom of emigration, as generally conceived by most people of the world, are being accorded persons behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Now there are those who say that the Congress should not take these actions—that we are usurping too many foreign policy prerogatives of the President and that we should not interfere in the "internal af-

fairs" of the Soviet Union. One might then ask, since when has the Soviet Union stopped interfering in our "internal affairs"? Certainly, there is no evidence to indicate that the Soviets have dropped the Marxian concept of the "class struggle" nor their view that there will never be a peaceful world until all nations are Communist Nations. A good Communist considers it his or her duty to proselyte for Marxism-Leninism. We can and should do no less, indeed we should do more, in the cause of Ukrainian freedom and freedom for all the captive nations.

Again, another criticism that is heard says that declarations and speeches in the Congress as well as resolutions are not noticed and do not affect the actions of the USSR. But they do and the case of Solzhenitsyn proves it, in my view. The Soviets are very sensitive to these things. I know from personal experience that a copy of my press release discussing the resolution I introduced to grant Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov honorary U.S. citizenship had not been on the United Press International wire for more than an hour before the number three man in the Soviet Embassy here arrived at my office and asked for a copy of the resolution as well as inquiring about the bill's prospects.

So, in my view, the gathering here today is a re-dedication to the fight for freedom by again honoring one who won his laurels in the struggle against Tsarist autocracy—Taras Shevchenko. I know that most of you are very active on this front and I know that sometimes you get discouraged, as I do, about the tide of battle, but we cannot and will not give up. I pledge to you to continue and intensify my efforts on behalf of the Ukraine and all captive nations and hope you will join me in the redoubling of your efforts. In this way, we can render the greatest honor possible to a great man whose statue looms over us—Taras Shevchenko. Thank you.

MOBILE HOME POSTAL SERVICE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, last week I wrote to Postmaster General Klassen concerning a serious problem that many mobile home owners are experiencing—the refusal of local post offices to accept change of address records from mobile home owners.

This situation has caused a great deal of inconvenience for many of our citizens who have chosen to live in mobile home parks. Very often their mail is not forwarded properly after they move since the change of address cards are held by the mobile home park operators and not the local postmaster. Of course, the park operators have other concerns and keeping track of address changes probably does not rate too high on the list of their priorities.

For this reason I have asked Postmaster General Klassen to initiate new procedures in the Postal Service to insure that change of address cards are held at the local post offices, rather than at the mobile home park.

I think this change in policy would make a great deal of sense because mo-

bile home owners should be receiving the same kind of mail service that conventional home owners expect. From recent statistics we have learned that fully 50 percent of the new housing market in this country is in mobile home ownership. To continue this kind of discrimination is neither equitable nor good postal policy.

I hope my colleagues will join me in urging the Postmaster General to rectify this anachronistic practice.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 12, 1974

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I greatly regret that due to commitments in my State I was unable to return to Washington in time to vote in favor of H.R.

14214, the Health Revenue Sharing and Health Services Act of 1974. I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for this measure, which extends and improves several of our Nation's most important health programs. These efforts are vital to maintaining and strengthening the standard of health in this country, and I am very pleased to note the overwhelming support that this measure has been given today by my colleagues.

SENATE—Tuesday, August 13, 1974

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, we thank Thee for the demonstrated durability of our institutions and the dependability of our instruments of government. Make us good men for good times in a good land. Manifest Thy presence and power in our daily work. Move us to a deeper dedication to a high national purpose, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to heal our divisions, and to do what must be done for the moral and spiritual renewal of this Nation and for the coming day of justice and peace among the nations of the world.

We pray in His name who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 12, 1974, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD copies of letters I have written to constituents who have written to me relative to S. 3657, a tax reform measure which Representative WILBUR MILLS and I introduced in the 92d Congress but did not reintroduce in the 93d Congress, and a letter relative to my position on H.R. 636, the new Tax Policy Review Act, introduced in the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C.

Dear _____: This will acknowledge your communication regarding S. 3657, a tax reform measure Congressman Wilbur Mills and I introduced in the 92nd Congress.

I have received a tremendous amount of mail on this proposal and I wish to take this opportunity to tell you that the bill has not been reintroduced in this 93rd Congress. Therefore, the issue will not come up for discussion.

The bill was introduced in 1972 in an effort to bring about a review of all of our tax laws. It would have required attention to each item under the law but in no way took a predetermined position as to whether or not existing exemptions or benefits should be repealed, strengthened or maintained as they are.

As a matter of fact, the proposal relative to churches would have been retained. That, certainly, was my intention and I have no doubt whatsoever but that that would have been the case had the hearings been held on the tax reform measure.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C.

Dear _____: This will acknowledge receipt of your communication expressing opposition to H.R. 636, the new Tax Policy Review Act introduced in the House of Representatives.

This measure has not been introduced in the Senate and I want you to know that I am opposed to any change in the existing tax provisions which provide benefits for contributors to religious and charitable organizations.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

THE SELECTION OF A VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, former Vice President Marshall used to say that what this country needs is a good 5-cent cigar. What this country does not need is a 5-cent Vice President.

As the search goes on, I hope—in fact, I am quite sure—that the President will consider the attributes of many men and women who are well fitted for this office. He will consider the Governors and former Governors, men and women in civic life, in the ranks of labor, and people of all colors and creeds.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I am glad to yield. As an expert on the Vice-Presidency, I yield to the Senator from Missouri. [Laughter.]

Mr. EAGLETON. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania consider as a relevant qualification past practice, however brief, in aspiring to the office of the Vice President?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I would be delighted to consider past practice and expertise. In my judgment, the Senator from Missouri always has been a good Vice President. [Laughter.]

Mr. EAGLETON. Would the Senator from Pennsylvania consider putting me on his list, at least as a footnote?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I would be glad to do so, as I have done with other Senators on the Democratic as well as the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. EAGLETON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I was about to say that we have great talent in this body among Senators who are qualified to be Vice President, talent in the other body, talent among the Governors and former Governors, and in many other areas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The attendance has been so good this year, that I would hope the distinguished Republican leader would not push that idea too far. [Laughter.]

I also would hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania would not forget to mention the possibility of a woman Vice President. Who knows more about inflation than women, and who could perhaps do more to keep us out of war than they?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Those are two excellent points.

I did discuss with the President, on Sunday, the qualifications of various women. Among those considered were Anne Armstrong, of Texas; MARGARET HECKLER, of Massachusetts; MARJORIE HOLT, of Maryland. I discussed our Senators. I could run the whole roster.

I discussed for example, Senator COOK, Senator STAFFORD, Senator TAFT, Senator BAKER, Senator BROCK—and if my time were not limited, I would go all down the list. I particularly discussed Senator GOLDWATER. I would like the RECORD to show that I discussed all Senators and discussed them all favorably, and I want them all to know it. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METZENBAUM). Without objection, the RECORD will show that the Senator discussed all Senators.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I want the RECORD to show that I am