

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 17026. A bill relating to former Speakers of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 17027. A bill to amend the National Visitor Center Facilities Act of 1968; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 17028. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the subsistence allowances payable to veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restrict the authority for inspection of tax returns and the disclosure of information contained therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (for herself, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. PEYSER):

H.R. 17030. A bill to prohibit the Federal Energy Administration from imposing any new tax or fee on gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 17031. A bill to amend the Duck Stamp Act with respect to the treatment of moneys received from sale of migratory-bird hunting stamps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. FISHER, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HUBER, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 17032. A bill to establish the fiscal integrity of the Government of the United States and its monetary policy, through the establishment of controls with respect to the levels of its revenues and budget outlays, the issuance of money, and the preparation of the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. YATES, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. TAYLOR, of North Carolina, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. HEINZ, and Mr. GUYER):

H.R. 17033. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide individuals a limited exclusion from gross income for interest on deposits in certain savings insti-

tutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 17034. A bill to extend the deadline for seeking assistance with regard to disaster relief under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 17035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that amounts not in excess of \$500 a year received by volunteer firemen shall not be subject to income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELMAN:

H.R. 17036. A bill to require certain records concerning foreign travel by Members of Congress and employees of Congress to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to require such records for certain executive branch appointees to be submitted to the respective Appropriations Committees and to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H.R. 17037. A bill to designate certain lands in the Mingo National Wildlife Refuge, Wayne and Stoddard Counties, Mo., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SYMMS:

H.R. 17038. A bill to repeal the earnings limitation of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 17039. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide service pension to certain veterans of World War I and pension to the widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.J. Res. 1153. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation designating January of each year as "March of Dimes Birth Defects Prevention Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRON:

H. Res. 1402. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that Federal buildings should be designed or modified so as to provide adequate recreational and athletic facilities for persons employed in such buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. Res. 1403. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States of America that the people of Wales be permitted to exercise the right of self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HOLTZMAN (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Res. 1404. Resolution directing the President to provide to the House of Representa-

tives information relating to certain services, facilities, and payments provided by the United States to Richard M. Nixon and members of his immediate family; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JARMAN (for himself and Mr. KUYKENDALL):

H. Res. 1405. Resolution expressing the concern of the House of Representatives with respect to the financial situation of United States flag carriers engaged in international air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 1406. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Rules; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. QUILLLEN:

H. Res. 1407. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Aging; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H. Res. 1408. Resolution concerning the safety and freedom of Valentyn Moroz, Ukrainian historian; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP:

H. Res. 1409. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be no continuation of the announced general program of amnesty for Vietnam-era draft dodgers or deserters until a full accounting is made of American servicemen missing in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 17040. A bill for the relief of Suk Chin and Hae Suk Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17041. A bill for the relief of Sang Kook Chung and Hwa Soon Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17042. A bill for the relief of Mee Kyung Cho and Hee Kyung Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17043. A bill for the relief of Ae Sook Song and Mi Yun Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

H.R. 17044. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Naval Ordnance Systems Command; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, 528. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Norman Malloyd, Parchman, Mississippi, relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE HOME HEALTH SERVICE AMENDMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the conferees will meet presently to consider H.R. 14214, the Health Services Act. This measure provides for Federal funding of family planning programs, community-based health centers for both primary treatment and mental health care, and

expanded health services for migrant workers, all through a program of revenue sharing.

In addition to these, the Senate version, S. 3280, includes an important provision for home health care programs that is not part of the House bill. That provision originally appeared as a free-standing bill, H.R. 15186, the Home Health Services Act, which was sponsored by Mr. STEELMAN of Texas and myself, along with a number of our colleagues. As a cosponsor of H.R. 15186, I strongly urge the conferees to adopt the Senate amendment which provides for home health care.

It has been argued that home health services do not provide significantly better patient care than that offered by institutions. I believe that, from both a medical and a psychological standpoint, home health care can be shown to be superior to institutionalization in most cases. To corroborate my position, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter that I recently received from Ms. Eunice B. Cooper. She is a community health nurse whose long experience in the field of home health treatment has led her to endorse the home health services plan.

The letter follows:

McLEAN, Va.,
September 3, 1974.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: I wish to state my support for your bill, H.R. 14120, co-sponsored with Alan Steelman of Texas. My qualifications for making this statement include the following:

I am a community health nurse of long standing, with experience in home health care in New York City, Boston, Massachusetts, Washington, D.C., and Northern Virginia. I hold the degree of Master of Science in Nursing and have been a member of the nursing faculty at two area colleges. My nursing experience has included considerable contact with nursing home patients.

It is my firm conviction, based on observation of patients both at home and in nursing homes, that geriatric patients frequently maintain a higher level of health, are more contented, remain in touch with reality and in the mainstream of life longer when cared for at home. It is my further conviction, based on experience, given adequate nursing support many families can learn to take care of their elderly members and would prefer to do so. I have observed that many patients require minimal nursing support for relatively long periods of time, but that without this support some form of institutional care becomes necessary.

Aside from the humanitarian aspects of home health care, the cost differential between this type of care and institutional care is considerable. As an illustration I should like to describe a personal experience.

This summer I had the privilege of assisting a neighbor in the care of her mother during the last six weeks of her life. The patient had been hospitalized, and transfer to a nursing home for the terminal phase of her illness was recommended. Instead, my neighbor chose to accept the responsibility for caring for her mother at home. I functioned in much the same way as a visiting nurse. The nursing support which I provided consisted of teaching the fundamental nursing skills required in the care of the patient, making adaptations to that care as the patient's condition declined; doing for the family a few things that they were not able to do for themselves, and helping the family prepare for the inevitable death. Extensive nursing care was required which the family was able to provide under my supervision. The patient's death was dignified and she remained able to contribute to the life of the family until the end.

If the patient had been in a nursing home it is unlikely that she would have received the consistently high quality, concerned and loving care given by her daughter and other members of the family. In addition, the family would have been required to meet the full cost of the nursing home, since the patient was 61, too young for Medicare and, although not wealthy, too affluent to qualify for Medicaid. The family investigated the cost of a nursing home in this area and found that for the intensive nursing care which this patient required, the cost would have been \$1500 per month. If I had been employed by a local Visiting Nurse Association, the cost would have been \$21 per visit, or approximately \$650 for the number of visits I made during this six-week period.

This is a single illustration of a widespread phenomenon.

Other community health nurses could cite many such examples.

Sincerely,

EUNICE B. COOPER, R.N., M.S.N.

PIERRE TO HOST NORTH AMERICAN FINALS

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, just over a month ago, this Nation witnessed the historic and unprecedented change of leadership when President Ford became the 37th President of the United States. Because of the magnitude of the significance of that occasion, other important events which occurred at that time escaped the attention of the Nation that they otherwise might have received. One such event was the North American Championship Buffalo Chip Flip which occurred in Pierre, S. Dak. Because my colleagues may not have noted that event for the reason stated, I would like to set forth the following article which foretold that significant occasion. The article, which was taken from the July 1974 edition of Buffalo, the official publication of the National Buffalo Association, follows:

PIERRE TO HOST NORTH AMERICAN FINALS

Historically, buffalo chips have been used for a wide variety of purposes including fertilizer and heating fuel, but on August 8 in Pierre, South Dakota buffalo chips will be put to an entirely new use as a missile in competition for the North American Championship Buffalo Chip Flip.

The international event is being sponsored by American Buffalo Association which is headquartered in Pierre and will highlight activities during 1974 Oahe Days, August 7-11 in Pierre-Ft. Pierre.

The open competition will be based on speed, distance and accuracy in men's, women's and kid's divisions. A grand champion will be awarded the Roy Houck Presidential trophy.

Roy Houck, president of National Buffalo Association and the largest producer of buffalo in the country will also provide the chips for the flip.

In commenting on the competition, Houck said, "The Pierre-Ft. Pierre area is the buffalo capital of the world, and it is only fitting that the North American finals be held here."

According to experts of the competition, there are two ways to launch the chip into flight. One is to sail the composition similar to a frisbee, and the other is to approach putting a chip into flight like a discus thrower.

Like rodeos, chip flipping is an original American sport which started before recorded history. Early hunters of buffalo used to throw the chips in frustration after missing a shot at the king of the plains.

Chip flipping reached a high in popularity during the 1860's and 70's when early pioneers collected them for heating and cooking. Developing an accurate flip allowed gatherers of the chips to cover a larger area without having to move the horse and wagon.

The sport died late in the 19th century when herds of buffalo disappeared from the Great Plains and chip production diminished.

From a herd of less than 100 raised by Scotty Philip in the Ft. Pierre area in the early 1900's, the total number of buffalo has grown to more than 40,000. Of this number, approximately 5,000 are in the Pierre-Ft. Pierre area.

As a result, the popularity of chip flipping is reviving. "We realize that chip flipping is not as popular as cow pie throwing, because cow pies are more common and accessible

to more people," said Houck, "but at the same time, a good cow pie thrower can become a chip flipper with very little practice."

In the North American Championships, each contestant will be allowed three tosses within 30 seconds with the best toss recorded for championship honors. The event is scheduled to start at 8 p.m. on August 8 in downtown Pierre, with \$1 entry fee.

AN ENGINEER IN CONGRESS TELLS IT LIKE IT IS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have in Congress individuals from a wide range of backgrounds. There are among us a large number of lawyers and businessmen; however, very few engineers now serve.

Our distinguished colleague, Vic VEYSEY, who has his engineering degree from California Institute of Technology and his M.A. from Harvard, by dint of his contributions has made an excellent argument for greater participation in the political arena by those from the engineering field. Vic has shown himself to be a thoughtful, conscientious and effective legislator.

A recent issue of Mechanical Engineering magazine featured an interview with Vic VEYSEY. That interview merits the consideration of all Members of Congress, and I would like now to share it with all readers of the RECORD.

AN ENGINEER IN CONGRESS TELLS IT LIKE IT IS

Victor V. Veysey (R. 43rd District, Calif.) was elected to the U. S. Congress in 1970. Veysey was born in Los Angeles. He received his engineering degree from California Institute of Technology and his MA from Harvard. He worked as an engineer on rockets and ordnance for the Navy and later for the Atomic Energy Commission; but he has also been a rancher, industrial relations manager, and plant manager. In his first term, Veysey served on the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Administration. Now in his second term, he is on the powerful House Appropriations Committee. What follows is an informal interview with Veysey by William P. Miller, ASME-Washington Representative; Ralph L. Clark, Director, IEEE Washington Office; and Nancy Rueth, News Editor, ME. Photographic coverage was provided by Mary Paris, Assoc. Editor, *Professional Engineer* magazine.

MILLER. As you are aware there are very few engineers who have entered the political arena. I wondered if you would give us your views on that.

VEYSEY. I think the technical type of mind is attracted to engineering and science, and they are not so prone to feel at home and venture into the intangibles and the imponderables of political life. That's the big difference. As an engineer I was always taught there is no physical problem that's not solvable if you have the time, money, and other resources. In the political arena, I am not at all sure that some of the problems can be easily solved. This makes engineers and scientists feel pretty uncomfortable—when they can't put numbers down and say with some confidence that this is so and that is so within a certain margin of error. You can't say that! The political field is

under a different set of rules than that of the physical laws. So I think most engineering types just don't find themselves comfortable in the political field, and that probably accounts for the disproportionate number of us who venture into it.

MILLER. Since there are a lot of legislative problems that involve technology, do you feel the engineer has an obligation to society to speak out?

VEYSEY. Well, I think he does. I think we would be much better off for having that input when important decisions are being made. All too often the practitioner in the political field doesn't understand the technology. But we are getting into a more and more complex technical society all of the time. You'd better be able to cope with that.

MILLER. I get this question when I go on speaking tours: How should we go about getting involved in our local community affairs? How do we get started?

VEYSEY. Well, it is awfully easy to get involved, really. The decision they have to make is that it is of interest to them to pursue these other areas and that there is value in the participation. Once they make that decision they have no trouble getting involved. There are many ways by which they can slip into it, anywhere from discussion groups in the neighborhood or precinct level or any level of politics.

RUETH. What if they are interested in advising government, but not getting involved in politics per se?

VEYSEY. Well, there are a lot of chances to do that too. I was just looking over the list of the Office of Technology Assessment Advisory Council. Of course this is a very high level. It's a distinguished group. The advice is needed at many levels of government, and I think we're changing our ways of handling that here in Washington. We did have a science adviser to the president for some time. The latest one was a scientist, a very well-qualified scientist, who never did learn how to function comfortably in the political arena; so I don't think he enjoyed his tour here, and maybe it was not as successful as it could have been. Now that function has been put in the National Science Foundation.

The Congress is going to have its own group to advise on the adequacy of our procedure in a number of technical fields. I have Senator Kennedy's news release describing a half dozen areas they have decided to investigate, including energy, the ocean, food and drugs, health, transportation, and materials.

CLARK. The president asked Dixy Lee Ray to prepare the overall energy R&D plan.

VEYSEY. Yes, Dixy Lee Ray prepared this energy program, which I wrote some criticism about. I applaud the direction it is seeking, but I detected in its makeup the same thing the press is now criticizing. That is a pretty heavy AEC bias. I criticized this several months ago, when it first came out. My particular pet interest is geothermal development in California. This is the coming thing and there is only slight mention of geothermal in that project. It suggests huge amounts for nuclear work and fusion way down the line. All of these things are great; I can't be against any of them. At the same time I'm not sure they are really looking at the close-range aspects, and I wrote her about it. She responded that if you look at the percentage increases, we only raised atomic energy by 60 percent while we raised geothermal by 100 percent; 100 percent of one dollar is only one dollar.

MILLER. I noticed that you wrote a bill on energy research and development and also a few on the oil problems. Would you like to say something about those bills?

VEYSEY. Well, I think that my bill on the overall field of energy is the only one I've seen moving on a number of different fronts at the same time, in such a way as to imple-

ment readily what she [Dixy Lee Ray] was talking about in terms of funding proposals—to get on down the road toward independence at the earliest possible time. We put together a number of different things in one bill and presented that as a package. However, that isn't the way things are going to move in the Congress. It makes a good talking position, but things move in various committees.

CLARK. What's your general reaction to H.R. 11510 that sets up the Energy Research and Development Administration?

VEYSEY. Well, we really need to get on with some of these organizational changes. We need a bill that sets up a unified office of energy, pulling together the efforts of the AEC, Interior, and wherever else it may be within the government. Then we need the research to back it up. I think the government ought to take the lead in putting a substantial amount of money in research and development in this field. Our R & D effort has been really declining if you consider inflation and things like that over the past several years. This is very unfortunate as it's an investment in the future we must really keep at a high level. I suppose that private business kind of parallels what the government does. The government does approximately 45 percent of the R & D investment, but that is an indication to others as to which way to go.

RUETH. Are you willing to make any guesses as to when we are going to have a bill like this? In light of the veto of the Emergency Energy Bill, it seems rather questionable whether we are really going to get any big energy bills or reorganization.

VEYSEY. Do you know the way I think reorganization is really done in Washington? The executive branch goes ahead and does it and everybody in Congress complains like hell. Then in about a year Congress comes around and cleans everything up. That's the way it's usually done. I think this is a sad commentary on the Congress. I don't think that with all of the complaining Congress does that it shows any leadership at all. There are a few exceptions—Mike McCormack is one good example.

CLARK. He's picked out particular items such as solar energy and geothermal energy to get something done before they're lost in the big shuffle.

VEYSEY. Exactly. I have worked with him on some of those things, testifying to the subcommittee on these matters. It's unfortunate there aren't more in Congress, especially those in leadership and power, who will move. You know they sit there and say, "Well, you know, the executive branch will send down a bill to us one of these days and we'll take a look at that and we'll fix it a different way and we'll send it back."

MILLER. I'd like to get your feelings on possible revisions to EPA clean air and water regulations versus our energy problems. Obviously some of these are going to be in conflict.

VEYSEY. Yes, you are right, and particularly when it comes to dividing a limited amount of federal dollars between energy sources and cleaning our environment. Somewhere along the line, that creates quite a real conflict. There will be no end to that type of balancing, and I think we can do both things reasonably well.

Going back to the Clean Air Act of 1969 or 1970 we really didn't have the right scientific information on which to act. Congress wrote into that bill hard and fast limitations on automobiles in terms of so many grams per mile there can be by such and such a date. They had no basis except the thinnest scientific data to lean on. Now we have found out more about some of the effects and noneffects on health. We'd probably take a different point of view and not

write the absolute numbers into the bill today if we were doing it today.

RUETH. Do you think they will revise the absolute numbers out of the bill?

VEYSEY. That is another matter. It is a little like revising down Social Security. To the engineer that's easy. If you make a mistake you correct it. Here you can't do that. If you get Social Security too high you can't take it away from the people. You raise everybody else up to match and remove the inequity that way.

Taking the numbers out of the bill is in effect saying we were wrong, and everybody would yell, "Wow, you've let the big oil companies and the auto industry do it to you again." We will have to find some way to get a solution to this technical problem. I was deeply concerned about this when I first came, back in 1971. We held an air-pollution conference in California attended by manufacturers, engineers, and the oil companies. We had somebody from the Justice Department present so they could not be accused of collusion or restraint of trade for something they said or did. We got some very interesting insight into this field. I came to the conclusion we were on the wrong track, not in terms of the long-range objectives but in terms of writing in absolute numbers.

RUETH. On pollution-control legislation, Senator Muskie has said that if you legislate a change and enforce it, the technology will come along. Do you give any credence to this?

VEYSEY. There is some credence in this, as people need a reason to solve a problem; either a financial reason, social reason, political reason, or legal reason. You have to be tough enough to stick with it. You can say we're going to shut Detroit down, that they're not going to build one car in the United States until they meet a certain standard no matter how wrong that standard is; and you'll get an answer. Now maybe it's an answer that is enormously costly in fuel, in money, in maintenance, in retooling, and everything else. Is that what you want to force on the people by saying we're going to make you go to 1.7 grams per mile and no more?

CLARK. The tragedy of the situation is that there are engineering projects that will potentially meet this requirement, like the stratified-charge engine, but Detroit is still going down the road with catalytic converters.

VEYSEY. That's right, because that's the simplest way to go in a hurry. The Detroit people say, "When you started phasing in the clean-air standards you forced us to divert all the engineers to the task of meeting the standard. You pressed us too fast. We didn't have people to look ahead to 1976 and how to meet those standards." I think it's partly an excuse. You can surely do both things.

I've been doing a little research with the Library of Congress on using methanol as a fuel augmentation and as a way to transport energy without going to cold-temperature technology. Solid waste and garbage, as well as coal, can also be converted to methanol.

CLARK. They say that 33 pounds of waste can produce a gallon of fuel.

VEYSEY. That's right. This is a technology we're going to have to get into—solving two problems simultaneously—energy and waste disposal. We can do it, too.

RUETH. Speaking realistically, could or will a lot of this be done by the private sector and the government working together as a team rather than as adversaries?

VEYSEY. I think we could get a lot of this done if we resolve to pull together. The first engineering work I did after college was rocket development with the Navy, and later atomic bomb work in the Manhattan Project. I stood in awe of what you can achieve when you single out just one clear objective and then have the government

bring the manpower, materials, and resources to focus on that objective. Our trouble is in deciding on the one thing we want to do and then clearly going about it.

RUETH. Now that the energy crisis is just a problem, are we really going to put forth this big unified effort?

VEYSEY. I hope we do, or we'll be right back in a crisis very soon. The Arabs are not going to stay put. They have learned that they could turn the valve off.

RUETH. In the area of mass transit, do you think there will be operating subsidies for commuter trains and buses?

VEYSEY. It's an awful can of worms because it's a rat hole you can never fill. The bigger the subsidy, the bigger they have to be. We ought to be moving stronger into the available types of mass-transit systems. I have to think of our unique situation in southern California, which is the worst problem of any area. Buses are probably the only answer there, and we need a rapid step forward in that technology. There is a whole generation of new ways of moving people coming along.

RUETH. Some mass-transit people say they cannot operate without either federal, state, or local subsidies.

VEYSEY. I don't know that the federal government ought to control subsidies. Considering the effectiveness and scope of the operation, I just don't think it would work satisfactorily.

RUETH. Then what can we do to increase and improve mass transit without making it too expensive?

VEYSEY. It depends on the price of gasoline. If it gets to one dollar a gallon people will use mass transit. They'll have to. If you start thinking in terms of a fixed-rail rapid transit system from the Los Angeles area going 60 miles in every direction, the subsidy would be a number that hasn't been invented yet.

CLARK. They had a system at one time.

VEYSEY. Yes, I used to ride the Pacific Electric system when I was attending Cal. Tech. During the war when we didn't have gasoline my wife and I would ride it to Los Angeles for an evening's entertainment. We lost what was a fairly good system and what could have been a good system today.

MILLER. Do you see any possibility of getting any OSHA amendments this year?

VEYSEY. Well, OSHA was passed before I came to the Congress. I think that's a good way to start this conversation. I sat on the Education and Labor Committee when we reviewed OSHA. There were and are darned few people who will stand up and say, "Let's throw OSHA out and kill people on the job." You know that just isn't right. You can't do that.

Now I think the application of OSHA and the way they went about enforcement was outrageous. We had hilarious examples. One I remember was a Navajo Indian from Arizona who said: "Hey, what's this OSHA? I got mine out there. Me, only me. They tell me I gotta have a telephone from the office to the bottom of the mine. When I'm in the mine nobody calls me. When I'm in the office there's nobody in the mine to call. What good is a telephone?"

MILLER. There has been a lot of controversy about OSHA's levying penalties on its first visit without any prior consultation.

VEYSEY. There is a bill that would soften OSHA in that area. It would provide for consultation to the smaller employer who does not have a safety engineer on the premises. I voted for deleting for a year or two the funding for enforcement against the real small employer. I said that you can't do the whole world in one day, so start where it makes the most sense. The bigger employers can cope with OSHA and do the job. That's why we delayed the funding for the small employer, but that doesn't mean he's immune. If you get killed with a small employer you're just as dead as if you were killed working for General Motors. Safety has to be an educational project for both the employer and the employee,

not a means for putting people in jail or levying fines.

MILLER. In metric legislation, will we see anything passed in this Congress?

VEYSEY. The AFL/CIO is dead set against it. We all know it is going to be and has to be accomplished. We also know it will be better once you get over the conversion. The conversion pains are more difficult for some people. You have to think about the little guy who's a member of the machinist's union, or something like that. Since you can't do it any better in meters than in inches, he cannot understand why he has to scrap his tools.

RUETH. Would you be willing to subsidize his retooling?

VEYSEY. Well, I think we're going to have to give it a little more time if we're going to get it done realistically. If you start subsidizing in the sense of buying everything for everybody, there is no way to stop, and the bureaucracy would be staggering.

CLARK. Tools are worn out and replaced.

VEYSEY. They are replaced in a few years. That mechanic is not going to have many of the tools in 10 years that he's got today. People are really conservative. They just don't want to change. They are afraid of having to change their thinking to go into the metric system. But, really, it will be easier than the present system.

CLARK. With some leadership in an orderly manner, the transition would be cheaper overall.

VEYSEY. I believe every other country has made the change. Aren't we just about the last to hold out?

CLARK. We are certainly the last large country.

MILLER. After this election, are there any particular committees you'd like to be on?

VEYSEY. Yes, I'd like to stay on the Appropriations Committee. I had a long hard battle to get on it and I believe it's a very important committee. I get more of an overview of what government is doing through appropriations than I could anywhere else. Everywhere in government they spend money, and their activities are reflected in appropriations. This involvement is what I like. I'd also like to get on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

CLARK. Do you have any thoughts about converting that to a "Joint Committee on Energy" as a whole?

VEYSEY. That wouldn't be bad, and we could do it. That might come about after the committee shuffling act is completed. Of course it would be an awful lot to preside over.

MILLER. Your colleagues are mainly lawyers. Have they sought you out at all for your technical knowledge?

VEYSEY. I'd say very rarely.

RUETH. Are you incognito? Do they know you are an engineer?

VEYSEY. No, I don't know whether it sticks out or not, as I don't carry a slide rule anymore, although I did for many years. Lawyers have an interesting way of believing that you really don't need any knowledge of the subject matter. All you have to know is the law; that will get you through. There are some exceptions. I know patent attorneys who were engineers first, and they are a different breed of cat. The types you meet in politics are the corporate-type lawyers or ambulance-chaser types. They gravitate toward politics.

I asked John Rhodes the other day how he got into politics. He went to Harvard Law School and fell into the trap like many young lawyers. Just out of law school you can't advertise. The best way to become known is to file for a political race, meet people, talk with them, and tell them how great you are. You talk about things they are worried about, and pretty soon you have a following that says you're a pretty fine guy. No matter whether you win or lose, you still win. I think John was the first Republican Representative elected in Arizona. He didn't expect to win, and it destroyed his law career.

MILLER. Is there any subject of national or engineering interest you'd like to discuss?

VEYSEY. I suppose I'm burdened a little bit, as everyone is, by thinking we are going through a wrenching set of changes in our approach and outlook on many things. I think we very seriously need the help, the participation of our technical societies.

I think that—not intending this as a criticism—by and large we have gotten less push in the political arena from the scientific and engineering professions. That used to be true of doctors, but they learned their lesson. Before I came here the Congress passed Medicare and several other pieces of medical legislation. Before they knew it the doctors were darn near federalized. Then they decided they'd better get with it, and now they do a very aggressive, active job in terms of their representation. The doctors come to me all the time and say, "Look, we are working on this and we want to do this and that."

Do the engineers speak out? No, I can't find them! One time the California Society of Professional Engineers presented me a legislative award. That's all I've ever seen of them except when I seek them out for some information as in the case of geothermal energy, solar energy, transportation, or something like that. The time has passed when engineers can say that certain people are running the country and we have confidence in them. Hell, nobody has confidence in anybody any more. They had better get into representation and help see that everything gets steered in the right direction.

On top of this is the rising intensity of technical implications on every part of our lives. Computer technology alone opens up so many new capabilities that we'd better have technical people more involved in government than they have been. My hope is for them to seek their new roles! The government has got to be willing to listen, to learn, and to seek out information that it needs in fields beyond its capability. Even more important is the need for the citizen engineer to come forward and make his presence felt.

CLARK. The problem is that engineers concentrate on their educational activities and their professional societies. They feel that getting into politics is beyond their scope.

VEYSEY. I know they feel that way. And this goes back to something more fundamental. Engineers have been pretty narrowly educated, and that's an error. I went to Cal. Tech. when it was more narrowly oriented, but they have evolved out of that program. Now they have many programs of interest to the engineer while he is still malleable and able to adapt to changes. The engineer has to be able to do more than solve the technical problems. He's got to be a very important, respected citizen in our society. He has to be able to assume roles of responsibility. As a highly educated individual, he has to be a leader.

CLARK. He's got to translate his technology into the social, economic, and political spheres.

VEYSEY. That's hard to do. But without his input we'll never get down to solving our problems; so we have to encourage them to be shakers and movers.

EDITORIAL CALLS FOR TVA RATE POLICY REEXAMINATION

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial published in the Tennessee newspaper of Nashville, Tenn., has called for a reexamination of rate

policies by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The editorial entitled "TVA's Rate Policies Need Reexamination" points out that the small electric consumer in the area is being directed by TVA to make an unequal sacrifice to conserve energy and stretch out coal supplies through the winter.

The small consumer actually pays more per kilowatt hour than large industries. Yet the small consumer is being asked to make the most sacrifice in conserving energy this winter, according to the editorial.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this vital and important matter, I place herewith a copy of the editorial in the RECORD:

TVA'S RATE POLICIES NEED REEXAMINATION

Once again the small electricity customer is being asked to make an unequal sacrifice to stretch out the region's scarce and expensive coal supply through the winter.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has asked for a voluntary reduction of 20% in the use of electricity by all customers, elderly widows and giant manufacturing plants alike. The threat of rationing or blackouts for periods of time has been raised to frighten us all into turning down the thermostat and dimming the lights.

TVA issued guidelines for residential customers that included tips like wearing coats indoors and putting more blankets on the bed.

It also issued guidelines for business and commercial firms and industry. Those lists dealt mostly with matters like outdoor lighting and advice to unplug the water cooler.

TVA has so far failed to mention the fact that families huddled in their overcoats inside darkened homes would add very little to the supply of power.

Last year, facing the same crisis, a Commerce Department official urged manufacturers to streamline their production processes.

The official estimated that almost 75% of the nation's energy supply is used by industry. He said that if industry could achieve only a 5% reduction in energy use, it would equal turning off every light in America for a year.

Yet the TVA continues to penalize unfairly the small customer by charging more per kilowatt hour than the big, bulk users.

It was the promise of cheap electric power which first lured manufacturers to the region. But while the supply of power has lately grown critical, TVA continues its philosophy of the 30s, telling its big customers, "The more you use, the cheaper it is."

It is time to reexamine that philosophy in light of facts of today. Coal has skyrocketed from \$4.50 a ton to \$30. A strike by the United Mine Workers is a virtual certainty.

Chances are, the last price hike, due to escalating contracts with coal suppliers, has made the residential customer a confirmed conservationist as a matter of economic necessity.

Only this week, in a Senate hearing on the problems of the elderly, a Ford Foundation official said the rate structure is to blame for the plight of the poor and aged, who may have to choose between food and fuel this winter.

"The poor pay high prices precisely because they use less," he told the senators.

Officials say that rates cannot be compared directly, because commercial and industrial customers pay demand and equipment charges that homeowners do not. But they also admit that use charges to the biggest customers are five or six times cheaper than to the smallest. Is that any incentive to use less?

Increased costs for power would ultimately be passed on to the consumer, of course. But industry might look for imaginative alternatives or at least eliminate waste if the rate structure were turned upside down.

TVA should at least begin to talk about treating all its customers fairly.

A LETTER RECEIVED FROM UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on September 11 the Under Secretary of the Navy answered my letter of July 23 which asked for the Navy's understanding of Congress' order that enlisted crewmembers be given 120 days' notice prior to grounding and loss of flight pay. The Navy, like the Army and Air Force, has tightened its procedures as a result of the insistence of the Military Compensation Subcommittee that Congress' order to the military services was meant to be obeyed.

Although the Defense Department and each of the military services have finally been heard from, the enlisted men whom Congress thought it was protecting are not yet guaranteed 120 days' notice of loss of flight pay. It may be that legislation will be necessary. In the meantime, the Armed Services Committee should monitor the situation closely and should require a periodic report of all cases where the required notice was not or could not be given.

My letter to the Navy, Under Secretary Potter's answer, and the relevant Navy directives follow:

JULY 23, 1974.

HON. J. WILLIAM MIDDENDORF,
Secretary of the Navy,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Subcommittee #4 of the Armed Services Committee has recently questioned General Benade and the Air Force's Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, General Roberts, about Congress' requirement that enlisted crew members cannot be removed from flying status without 120 days' notice. General Benade has said he needs legislative authority to accomplish this, but General Roberts has found the administrative measures available to him sufficiently flexible to allow his service to observe the order of Congress. The Air Force has now centralized grounding actions that cannot be accommodated at lower command levels and will allow temporary overmanning authority so that 120 days' notice of grounding can always be given.

The Subcommittee was asked to grant some exceptions to the 120 day requirement. These were crew members grounded for cause or because of medical disqualification for flying duty. The third exception was not enlisted noncrew members who are assigned flight duties for a period or for a task specified in orders. Since these categories are the same for officers and enlisted men and because they seem fully justified exceptions, the Subcommittee did not object to them.

General Roberts has suggested one other exception that could, in rare cases, be required. When aircraft are not available, the legal requirement of "frequent and regular aerial flight" might not be met. Since "frequent and regular" are defined by executive order, granting exceptions might be a way of avoiding the perhaps complex procedure to change executive orders. In any

event, this one area of exception does not appear to require a legislative solution.

Nevertheless, 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.

In addition to your legislative suggestions would you also comment on the Air Force's interpretations of the 120 day notice requirement? Please send me copies of whatever instructions or directives on this subject you have sent to your bases and units.

I am sending a letter similar to this one to General Benade and to the Secretary of the Army.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., September 11, 1974.

HON. LES ASPIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: This is in response to your letter of July 23, 1974, regarding the 120-day prior notification of involuntary removal from flying status for enlisted members. In addition to a discussion of recent statements by Air Force officials and General Benade, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Personnel Policy, you asked for comments on the instructions or directives on the same subject that were promulgated within the Department of the Navy.

With regard to commenting on Air Force interpretations or the need for additional legislation, it is considered that this is a subject for the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Department of the Navy views and comments in this area have been furnished the Secretary of Defense for proper consideration.

The Department of the Navy fully concurs in the intent of the Congressional statement of the 120-day notification provisions. Two additional exceptions to the 120-day notification not mentioned in your letter of July 23rd should be included to cover certain contingencies. First, an exception provision should be included for the unprogrammed deactivation of units which occur with less than 120 days prior notice. Such a situation occurs infrequently; however, some provision should be made for it. Second, an exception should be made in the case of unprogrammed manpower readjustments in which the overall number of aircrew billets within a command is reduced. This situation could occur in response to budgetary limitations, manpower reductions, or manpower realignments as a result of operational necessity (i.e., times of conflict, crises, or national emergency). With the inclusion of the two aforementioned exceptions, the 120-day notification requirement becomes a more viable policy.

The Department of the Navy has taken affirmative action to implement the will of Congress in regard to this area of importance to our enlisted members. The Navy has promulgated Bureau of Naval Personnel Notice 1326 of 25 July 1974 and implemented further guidance in NAVOP 139 dated 16 August 1974. The Marine Corps has issued Marine Corps Order 1326.25 and Marine Corps Bulletin 1326 of 25 July 1974. Headquarters Marine Corps is presently drafting a new directive based on additional Department of Defense guidance on 120-day notification. This new directive will be promulgated in the very near future. These directives emphasize and implement the will of Congress. Copies of the present directives are forwarded as enclosures for your information.

It is hoped the foregoing has satisfactorily answered your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

D. S. POTTER,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D.C., July 12, 1974.
BUPERS NOTICE 1326

From Chief of Naval Personnel.

To All Ships and Stations (less Marine Corps field addresses not having Navy personnel attached)

Subject Advance notification of involuntary removal of enlisted personnel from flight duty

Reference (a) BuPersInst 1326.3.

1. *Purpose.* To promulgate the requirement that enlisted personnel on indefinite temporary flight orders be given 120 days notice prior to involuntary removal from flight duty.

2. *Background.* In order to alleviate adverse financial impact on enlisted personnel and to assist in aviation personnel stability, enlisted personnel on temporary flight orders will be given 120 days notification prior to involuntary removal from flight duty.

3. *Action*

a. Effective immediately all commanding officers will take positive action to ensure that enlisted personnel on indefinite temporary flight orders will be given a 120-day notification prior to involuntary removal from flight duty. It is recognized there are certain situations under which it would not be feasible to give advance notification of termination of flight duties. Exceptions to the 120-day notification rule are as follows:

(1) Medical grounding where it is established the medical disqualification is permanent in nature.

(2) Failure to maintain qualifications as aircrew (i.e. NATOPS, Non-performance, etc.)

(3) Removal from flight status for cause.

(4) Deactivation of a command or aircraft transitions within a command.

(5) Unprogrammed manpower readjustment in which the number of aircrew billets are reduced within a command with a corresponding reduction of the number of flight orders available from the allocation manager.

(6) PCS Orders other than at normal Projected Rotation Date (PRD). (i.e. Humanitarian Transfers, Hardship Discharges, etc.)

b. Advance notification of termination of non-crew definite flight orders is inherent with the present system (i.e. the individual is aware of the effective period for the TFO's at the time they are issued.), therefore, formal 120 day notification is not required.

4. *Cancellation Contingency.* This notice is cancelled upon incorporation of its provisions into reference (a).

C. H. GRIFFITHS,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Acting Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel.

Message from Chief of Naval Operations,
16 Aug. 1974.

Subject Advance notification of removal of enlisted personnel from flight duty.

A. Bupersnote 1326 of 12 July 74.

B. Bupersinst 1326.3.

C. DODPM.

1. Ref. A. Promulgated the requirement that enlisted personnel on indefinite temporary flight orders (TFOs) be given 120 day-notice prior to involuntary removal from flight duty. Additional guidance as stated herein received from SECDEF is effective immediately until incorporated Ref. B.

2. Enlisted members being involuntarily removed from flight duty shall be furnished written notification by competent authority, or verbal notification confirmed by an appropriate memorandum for the record, at least 120 days prior to termination of TFOs,

except as specifically provided below. This notification may be furnished by a memorandum to the member from his command in the fifth month prior to the respective member's projected rotation date (PRD), scheduled decommissioning of the activity, or scheduled reduction of TFO allocation, etc., notifying him of expected transfer, etc., and required termination upon detachment/reduction in allocation.

3. The term involuntarily means through no fault of their own and does not include members removed due to their own actions or inactions.

4. Members removed due to medical disqualification shall be furnished written notification promptly, but no basis presently exists for payment beyond the date of final medical disqualification when permanent in nature.

5. An enlisted crew member may be removed from flight status without regard to the 120-day notification requirement when removed due to failure to maintain qualifications (NATOPS, non-performance, etc.) or removal from flight status for cause (unauthorized absence, etc.).

6. Assignments of enlisted air crewmembers will be closely managed by the chief of naval personnel and commanding officers in order to achieve the required advance notification prior to removal from flight status and the attendant loss of flight pay. Exceptions to the 120-day notification requirement may be granted only by the chief of naval personnel and will be considered in cases such as unscheduled (less than 120-days advance notice) decommissionings and unplanned TFO allocation reductions. The command to which the individual is attached will submit, by message or letter as appropriate, a request for exception to the chief of naval personnel (pers 514) with full explanation and only after consideration of possible alternatives. A member may waive the 120-day notification provision if he desires in which case a request for exception need not be granted.

7. Members being ordered to flight duty by orders of limited duration, i.e. definite TFOs shall be informed of the duration of the orders at the time of issuance.

8. Failure to adhere to the intent and letter of the above causes undesirable financial impact to enlisted crewmembers and violates the will of Congress and policy of the Department of Defense. Any instance of failure to observe the contents of this notice will be reported to the chief of naval personnel.

9. Nothing herein shall be construed as providing an exception to or basis for deviation from the provisions of REF C and other pertinent pay directives.

10. Report symbol Bupers 1326-6 has been assigned to the reporting requirement in paragraph 8.

THE GREAT DEPRESSION: NOT
LIKELY TO RETURN

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk about the economic conditions in our country. President Ford just completed his economic summit, but no big decisions were made. The country is worried about heading toward a depression. I think my colleagues will find the following article from the Washington Post of interest:

"THE GREAT DEPRESSION": NOT LIKELY TO RETURN

As the Ford administration works its way up to its economic summit, a good many

Americans, and apparently a lot of Western Europeans as well, seem to be working themselves into a mental replay of the Great Depression. The very word "depression" has become the terror image of an impending catastrophe. George Meany sees "every indication that we are going into a depression" possibly worse than that of the 1930s. Sen. Mike Mansfield says the current situation "has all the earmarks of the 1930s. And I don't want to see a return to that tragic period."

Nor does anybody else, even those who think the economy needs to be shaken down with a considerable dose of unemployment in order to halt the rampant inflation. But we are in danger of words. Most everybody agrees that the United States is in a "recession"—probably the only thing the economists can agree on. But "depression" or "the Great Depression"? We ought to think about it.

Nobody ever really knew how many Americans were out of work in the Great Depression, but the number ran into what now would be called "double digit" millions. Pictures of men selling apples for a nickel from street corner boxes come to mind. Herbert Hoover, the unlucky President of the times, had his name forever attached to the "Hooverville" wood and tar paper shacks in which uncounted thousands, probably hundreds of thousands, were forced to live. Youngsters by the thousands aimlessly rode the freights across America.

Worst of all was the psychology, the "fear itself" of which Franklin D. Roosevelt spoke in his inaugural: Will I be the next to take a pay cut or lose my job? Will my savings be wiped out in a bank closing?

To most Americans, the Great Depression is something from the history books. But to the elders, the Meany and Mansfields among them, it is a very real memory. There are still many who abhor buying on credit because of that recollection. If ever we had a generation gap, it is over the Great Depression.

Today the idea of something worse than the current combination of inflation and recession seems to be on the verge of permeating our society. The Arab oil squeeze on the industrialized nations adds to this anxiety. Mr. Nixon's utter failure in the realm of economics has been followed by the floundering around of Mr. Ford. His chief economic adviser tells representatives of the poor, the aged, the ill that Wall Street brokers have suffered the most, proportionately, from the economic decline. The Ford administration seems to be digging itself in as the old Republican Party of fat cats and privilege, as far as the public image goes, whatever its real intentions may be.

Beyond question there are very real reasons for very real concern. The pollsters and the politicians know what Americans are talking about and that it is going to be reflected at the polls in November.

Before this state of affairs reaches that of a self-fulfilling prophecy, we ought to look back at the Great Depression with a clear eye. It is hard to remember, but it is true, that in the Hoover era the dominant Republicans jacked up tariffs and insisted that relief of the farmer and city dweller was a job for local communities and the Red Cross. Hoover himself led a campaign for a Red Cross relief fund. Intervention by the federal government was still considered a violation of the American economic system, and it took the Great Depression to alter the popular attitude.

To very many Americans it was not the "black Friday" and the "black Tuesday" of the 1929 stock market crash but the bank runs and bank closings that really spelled disaster. There was no federal insurance of bank deposits.

Washington, with a government payroll to sustain it, was a lucky city. Not until Congress cut government pay by 8½ per cent and local banks got into trouble did most Washingtonians really feel the crunch.

Hunger marches and bonus marchers of course, had brought the word to the capital of what was going on back home.

In 1931, for reasons nobody ever fathomed, a run began on one of the city's stronger institutions, the Perpetual Building Association. Some \$800,000 was withdrawn one day by scared depositors lined upon the sidewalk. The run was stopped only after the President of the Riggs National Bank, Robert V. Fleming, rushed over to Perpetual, jumped up on a counter and from a sachel drew forth bundles of hundred and thousand dollar notes to show the depositors. The Washington Post the next day noted that "on the balcony running above the barricaded vaults, a picked squad manned a machine gun, prepared for any eventuality with a clean sweep of the two exposed sides of the building..." Newbold Noyes of the Evening Star "climbed into a window niche at the bank and reassured the crowd, declaring that he had just deposited \$25,000 on behalf of the afternoon newspaper he represented."

The scene was the same or worse in many American cities. I cite all this to get a fix on what the word "depression," in our historical context, really means. Of course, things could get that bad or worse. And I certainly am no advocate of a Coué theory of economics, the practice of government saying that "Every day in every way things are getting better and better;" Treasury Secretary William Simon the other day sounded a bit like that. One of the faults of the Hoover era was the constant reiteration of the corner turned and worst-over theme, almost to the depth of the Great Depression.

Today Americans expect their government to be activist about the economic crisis, and that is why Mr. Ford is having an economic summit. Whether it will produce a new idea, or a new technique of value may be something else again. But this is a very different environment from that to which Meany, Mansfield and others have been referring with recollections of the Great Depression. We ought at least recognize that and go on from there to meet today's problems.

INTRODUCTION OF CLEAN BILL ON CREDIT DISCRIMINATION

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency met this morning to begin markup of the bill H.R. 14856, to prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, or marital status in the granting of credit. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, I had introduced the bill on May 16 on behalf of 13 members of the subcommittee, and we held hearings on it in June. After four subcommittee markup sessions in August and September, we referred to the full committee a revised version of the legislation containing numerous amendments to improve its operation, but also including two which I vigorously oppose.

One of those amendments removed the bill's protections against discrimination for reasons of "color, religion, national origin, age" leaving only race, sex, and marital status. Another established a limit of \$100,000 or 1 percent of a creditor's net worth, whichever is less, on punitive damages in class action suits based on violations of the act. Both amendments were adopted in the sub-

committee by votes of 7 to 2, with 6 members absent. Had there been a full attendance, I am convinced these two anticonsumer amendments would have been rejected in the subcommittee. I hope they will be in the full committee.

I make this explanation because I am today introducing as a clean bill the version of H.R. 14856 approved by the subcommittee. I am doing this in order to overcome some procedural difficulties we ran into this morning in the full committee in considering a committee print of the bill showing all amendments approved by the subcommittee.

Unfortunately, the full committee got bogged down in a parliamentary dispute over a substitute for the subcommittee amendment deleting color, religion, national origin, and age, and although the purpose of the substitute was to restore those categories to the bill, there were so many misunderstandings about the amendment that the bells rang calling us to the House floor before the procedural questions could be resolved.

It was felt that a clean bill would enable the members to overcome these procedural difficulties in the consideration of the subcommittee version of the legislation, and that is why I am introducing such a bill today. I repeat, however, that I strongly oppose the two provisions I mentioned in the bill as I am introducing it, and will do everything I can to take them out of the bill at the next meeting of the full committee.

The discussion in the committee this morning made clear that many members of the committee join me in opposing the deletion of "color, religion, national origin, age" from the bill's coverage. If we take up a clean bill, it will then be up to those of us who oppose the subcommittee action on this issue to seek to amend the bill to restore the categories in question, instead of merely opposing the subcommittee-approved amendment. The same would be true on class action limitations.

EXPLANATION OF THE PENDING LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, as I explained to the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning, 13 of the members of the subcommittee joined in introducing the basic bill, H.R. 14856, on May 16, to prohibit discrimination in all areas of credit by reason of race, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, or marital status. Another member of the subcommittee introduced a somewhat different bill dealing only with sex and marital status. The subcommittee held hearings on June 20 and 21, copies of which were sent to all of the members of the full committee, including an appendix containing a vast amount of background information on this whole issue. The subcommittee held four markup sessions in August and September, improving the bill in numerous respects but, in my opinion, seriously weakening its consumer protections in at least two areas.

I shall, of course, vigorously oppose those two particular amendments adopted by the subcommittee. One eliminates from the bill's coverage the categories of color, religion, national origin, and age—thus leaving out Spanish-speaking Americans, particularly, and Indians, who are among the most dis-

criminated against citizens of this country in the credit area, and also people under 25 and over 65, who are also discriminated against for reasons which have nothing to do with their own individual creditworthiness. The other very controversial amendment agreed to in the subcommittee sets a limit of \$100,000 or 1 percent of net worth—which ever is the lesser—on punitive damages in class action suits.

Before going into those provisions, I will summarize the good things done in the legislation.

APPLIES TO EVERY FORM OF CREDIT

The bill applies to every form of credit in the United States—not just consumer credit, residential real estate lending, and agricultural credit, which are the only areas of credit covered in the Truth in Lending Act. So this bill applies to business credit, securities credit, and so on, which are not covered in Truth in Lending.

The National Commission on Consumer Finance, in going into the subject of discrimination against women in the credit field, pointed out that much of this discrimination has been the result of outmoded policies by the business community based on assumptions that no longer have any validity—that is, that married women generally do not work and are therefore dependent entirely on their husbands for support. As a result of the Commission's hearings on this issue 2 years ago, many of the major retailers, banks, credit card companies, and other creditors whose antiwoman credit practices were exposed in those hearings immediately changed their policies to begin to take into account the creditworthiness of the individual woman applicant.

But the Commission pointed out that many State laws dealing with alimony, support, dower and curtesy, homestead, and community property, insulate a married woman from the certain creditor remedies and thus make her less creditworthy than a single woman. The Commission called upon the States to re-examine any such laws on their books which inhibit the extension of credit to creditworthy married women in their own right, but few of the States so far have done so.

CREDITWORTHINESS IS CRITERION

Hence, this bill allows a creditor to take into account in determining a married woman's creditworthiness the provisions of State laws which limit the creditor's rights of recovery of the debt from a married woman. If we defeat the amendment of the subcommittee dealing with age, the same situation would apply—a creditor could inquire into an applicant's age for the purpose of determining if the applicant is old enough to contract, or if the debtor's age otherwise affects the creditor's rights and remedies in obtaining repayment.

Basically, however, what we do is to require the creditor to look at the individual's creditworthiness, not as statistics of loss experiences among a class of debtors, in making a determination as to whether to extend credit.

ENFORCEMENT STRUCTURE

The enforcement structure of this bill is in many respects similar to the en-

forcement machinery of the Truth in Lending Act. That is, the Federal Reserve Board would issue all regulations; would have the benefit of an advisory committee of creditors and consumers in establishing workable regulations; would make annual reports to Congress on the operations of the act; could make adjustments or exemptions for special situations or circumstances; and would supervise and correlate the enforcement work of the numerous Federal agencies responsible for assuring compliance among the creditors they normally regulate. Bank regulatory agencies such as the Fed, FDIC, and Home Loan Bank Board, would be responsible for compliance by banks and savings and loans; the Federal Credit Union Administration would have jurisdiction over credit unions; and the ICC and CAB would handle compliance by carriers under their authority. We have also brought in the Farm Credit Administration, the SEC, and the Small Business Administration for enforcement and compliance in their areas. The Federal Trade Commission would handle everything else, just as it does in truth in lending. This system of multiple agency enforcement sounds cumbersome, but it actually works well in truth in lending and avoids establishing a new bureaucracy to handle this field. A further provision allows the Attorney General to initiate enforcement action whenever he discovers a pattern and practice of discrimination.

AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE PENALTIES

The bill as amended prevents double jeopardy for a creditor if, in a particular transaction, he violates both this act and the Fair Housing Act—he could be assessed damages only under one or the other, not both—the penalties in this bill are higher than under the Fair Housing Act—up to \$10,000 in punitive damages in this bill instead of the \$1,000 limit in the Fair Housing Act. Since there are now many State laws prohibiting credit discrimination, no one could collect damages under the Federal law if recovery has been obtained under a state anti-discrimination law for the same transaction.

SPECIAL LOAN PROGRAMS FOR PARTICULAR GROUPS

Concern was expressed in the hearings that a law prohibiting discrimination in credit by reason of race, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, or marital status would prohibit credit unions set up to serve a limited membership—such as a church-affiliated credit union—from turning down for a loan someone not eligible for membership in the credit union; and might outlaw Small Business Administration loans to minority enterprises, or special programs by banks and other lenders to help disadvantaged groups. An amendment was adopted in subcommittee to make clear that special loan assistance programs expressly provided for by law, or operated by nonprofit organizations for their own members, were not contrary to this act. Also, profitmaking organizations can operate special loan programs to meet social needs, under standards to be set down by the Federal Reserve Board.

DELETION OF "COLOR, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, AGE"

When the subcommittee amendment is reached deleting "color, religion, national origin, age" I will oppose it as vigorously as I can. I hope other Members will join in voting it down. In my opinion it is completely unjustified to allow discrimination for these reasons if we disallow it for race, sex, or marital status.

THE CLASS ACTION LIMITATION

Similarly, I will oppose the limitation on punitive damages for class action damage suits. The 1 percent of net worth limitation means that a creditor who borrows the money he lends out and has little net worth would be able to violate the law with virtual impunity from punitive damages. The \$100,000 limitation is only a slap on the wrist for a really large bank or other creditor. The credit industry has been trying for 5 years to get a similar limitation written into the Truth in Lending Act because the prospective damages in a class action are the biggest deterrent to violations.

Unlike the situation in Truth in Lending class actions, there is no minimum recovery under this bill, and the courts have full discretion to limit the punitive damage recovery to reflect the magnitude of the offense, the actual damages sustained, the persistence of failure to comply, the resources of the creditor, the number of persons affected, and the extent to which the offense was intentional.

PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS

Certain State laws prohibit separate extensions of credit to husband and wife, because, under graduated usury ceilings, the splitting of a dual husband-wife account into two separate accounts would result in higher finance charges for the same outstanding total of credit. This bill permits husband and wife to voluntarily ask for separate credit, knowing they might thereby have to pay a higher finance charge. In such a situation, the wife and husband are made solely responsible for debts they separately and voluntarily contract for, regardless of the provisions of State law to the contrary.

TEXT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE-APPROVED BILL

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit the text of the legislation as it now stands, following subcommittee action, as follows:

H.R. 16963

A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, sex, or marital status in the granting of credit

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Equal Credit Opportunity Act".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that there is a need to insure that the various financial institutions and other firms engaged in the extensions of credit exercise their responsibility to make credit available with fairness, impartiality, and without discrimination on the basis of race, sex, or marital status. Economic stabilization would be enhanced and competition among the various financial in-

stitutions and other firms engaged in the extension of credit would be strengthened by an absence of discrimination on the basis of race, sex, or marital status, as well as by the informed use of credit which Congress has heretofore sought to promote. It is the purpose of this Act to require that financial institutions and other firms engaged in the extension of credit make that credit equally available to all creditworthy customers without regard to race, sex, or marital status.

SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "applicant" means any person who applies to a creditor directly for an extension, renewal, or continuation of credit, or applies to a creditor indirectly by use of an existing credit plan for an amount exceeding a previously established credit limit.

(2) The term "Board" means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(3) The term "credit" means the right granted by a creditor to a debtor to defer payment of debt or to incur debt and defer its payment or to purchase property or services and defer payment therefor.

(4) The term "creditor" means any person who regularly extends, renews, or continues credit; any person who regularly arranges for the extension, renewal, or continuation of credit; or any assignee of an original creditor who participates in the decision to extend, renew, or continue credit.

(5) The term "person" means a natural person, a corporation, government, or governmental subdivision or agency, trust, estate, partnership, cooperative, or association.

EQUAL RIGHTS UNDER THE LAW TO OBTAIN CREDIT

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any creditor to discriminate against any applicant on the basis of race, sex, or marital status with respect to any aspect of a credit transaction.

(b) The declination of credit on terms offered pursuant to—

(1) any loan assistance program expressly authorized by law for an economically disadvantaged class of persons;

(2) any loan assistance program administered by a nonprofit organization for its members or an economically disadvantaged class of persons; or

(3) any special purpose loan program offered by a profitmaking organization to meet special social needs which is specifically approved by the Board or meets standards prescribed in regulations by the Board; shall not constitute a violation of this section.

REGULATIONS; ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall prescribe regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act. These regulations may contain but are not limited to such classifications, differentiations, or other provisions, and may provide for such adjustments and exceptions for any class of transactions, as in the judgment of the Board are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this Act, to prevent circumvention or evasion thereof, or to facilitate or substantiate compliance therewith.

(b) In prescribing regulations under subsection (a), the Board shall provide—

(1) that an inquiry by or on behalf of a creditor for the marital status of any applicant is not a violation of section 4 if the inquiry is to ascertain the creditor's rights and remedies; and

(2) that a request by or on behalf of a creditor for the signature of both parties to a marriage to create a valid lien, pass clear title, waive inchoate rights to property, or to assign earnings is not a violation of section 4.

(c) The Board shall prescribe its regulations as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this Act, but in no event later than its effective date.

(d) The Board shall establish an advisory committee to advise and consult with it in

the exercise of its functions under this Act. In appointing the members of the committee, the Board shall seek to achieve a fair representation of the interests of creditors and consumers. The committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Board. Members of the committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings of such committee, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Board, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including travel-time. Such members may be allowed travel expenses, including transportation and subsistence, while away from their homes or regular place of business.

ADMINISTRATION ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) Compliance with the requirements imposed under this Act shall be enforced under—

(1) section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, in the case of—

(A) national banks, by the Comptroller of the Currency,

(B) member banks of the Federal Reserve System (other than national banks), by the Board and

(C) banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (other than members of the Federal Reserve System), by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(2) section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, section 407 of the National Housing Act, and section 6(i) and 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (acting directly or through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation), in the case of any institution subject to any of those provisions,

(3) the Federal Credit Union Act, by the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration with respect to any Federal Credit Union,

(4) the Acts to regulate commerce, by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to any common carrier subject to those Act,

(5) the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, by the Civil Aeronautics Board with respect to any air carrier or foreign air carrier subject to that Act,

(6) the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (except as provided in section 406 of that Act), by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any activities subject to that Act, and

(7) the Farm Credit Act of 1971, by the Farm Credit Administration with respect to any Federal land bank, Federal land bank association, Federal intermediate credit bank, and production credit association;

(8) the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, by the Securities and Exchange Commission with respect to brokers and dealers; and

(9) the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, by the Small Business Administration, with respect to small business investment companies.

(b) For the purpose of the exercise by any agency referred to in subsection (a) of its powers under any Act referred to in that subsection, a violation of any requirement imposed under this Act shall be deemed to be a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act. In addition to its powers under any provision of law specifically referred to in subsection (a), each of the agencies referred to in that subsection may exercise for the purpose of enforcing compliance with any requirement imposed under this Act any other authority conferred on it by law. The exercise of the authorities of any of the agencies referred to in subsection (a) for the purpose of enforcing compliance with any requirement imposed under this Act shall in no way preclude the exercise of such authorities for the purpose of enforcing compliance with any other provision of law not relating to the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of race, sex,

or marital status with respect to any aspect of a credit transaction.

(c) Except to the extent that enforcement of the requirements imposed under this Act is specifically committed to some other Government agency under subsection (a), the Federal Trade Commission shall enforce such requirements. For the purpose of the exercise by the Federal Trade Commission of its functions and powers under the Federal Trade Commission Act, a violation of any requirement imposed under this Act shall be deemed a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act. All of the functions and powers of the Federal Trade Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act are available to the Commission to enforce compliance by any person with the requirements imposed under this Act, irrespective of whether that person is engaged in commerce or meets any other jurisdictional tests in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(d) The authority of the Board to issue regulations under this Act does not impair the authority of any other agency designated in this section to make rules respecting its own procedures in enforcing compliance with requirements imposed under this Act.

CIVIL LIABILITY

SEC. 7. (a) Any creditor who violates section 4 or any regulation prescribed under section 5 shall be liable to the aggrieved applicant in an amount equal to the sum of any actual damages sustained by such applicant acting either in an individual capacity or as a member of a class.

(b) Except with respect to any government or governmental subdivision or agency, any creditor who violates section 4 or any regulation prescribed under section 5 shall be liable to the aggrieved applicant for punitive damages in an amount not greater than \$10,000, in addition to any actual damages provided in subsection (a), except in the case of a class action the total recovery shall not exceed the lesser of \$100,000 or 1 per centum of the net worth of the creditor. In determining the amount of award in any class action, the court shall consider, among other relevant factors, the amount of any actual damages awarded, the frequency and persistence of failures of compliance by the creditor, the resources of the creditor, the number of persons adversely affected, and the extent to which the creditor's failure of compliance was intentional.

(c) Upon application by an aggrieved applicant, the appropriate United States district court may grant such equitable and declaratory relief as is necessary to enforce section 4 or any regulation prescribed under section 5.

(d) In the case of any successful action under subsection (a), (b), or (c), the costs of the action, together with a reasonable attorney's fee is determined by the court, shall be added to any damages awarded by the court under such subsection.

(e) No provision of this Act imposing any liability shall apply to any act done or omitted in good faith in conformity with any official regulation or interpretation thereof by the Board, notwithstanding that after such act or omission has occurred, such rule or interpretation is amended, rescinded, or determined by judicial or other authority to be invalid for any reason.

(f) Any action under this section may be brought in the appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy. No such action shall be brought later than one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation, except—

(1) whenever any agency having responsibility for administrative enforcement under section 6 commences its enforcement proceeding within one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation and obtains compliance with this Act by a creditor who was in violation of such Act, or

(2) whenever the Attorney General com-

mences a civil action within one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation in an appropriate United States district court under this section against a creditor who is found by the court to be in violation of this Act,

then any applicant who has been a victim of the discrimination with respect to the administrative action under paragraph (1) or the judgment of the court under paragraph (2) may, within one year after the date of compliance with the administrative action or within one year after the date of the judgment of the court, as the case may be, bring an action under this section against such creditor.

(g) The agencies having responsibility for administrative enforcement under section 6, if unable to obtain compliance with section 4, are authorized to refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted.

(h) When a matter is referred to the Attorney General pursuant to subsection (g), or whenever he has reason to believe that one or more creditors are engaged in a pattern or practice in violation of this Act, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

(i) No person aggrieved by a violation of this Act shall recover under this Act on any transaction for which recovery is had under the laws of any State relating to the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of race, sex, or marital status.

(j) No person aggrieved by a violation of this Act and by a violation of section 805 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 shall recover under this Act and section 812 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, if each such violation is based on the same transaction.

ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 8. Not later than February 1 of each year after 1976, the Board and the Attorney General shall, respectively, make reports to the Congress concerning the administration of their functions under this Act, including such recommendations as the Board and the Attorney General, respectively, deem necessary or appropriate. In addition, each report of the Board shall include its assessment of the extent to which compliance with the requirements of this Act is being achieved, and a summary of the enforcement actions taken by each of the agencies assigned administrative enforcement responsibilities under section 6.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Consideration or application by a creditor of any State law which relates to the creditor's rights and remedies against the applicant in the event of default is not a violation of section 4.

(b) Any provision of State law which prohibits the separate extension of consumer credit to each party to a marriage shall not apply in any case where each party to a marriage voluntarily applies for separate credit from the same creditor: *Provided*, That in any case where such a State law is so preempted, each party to the marriage shall be solely responsible for the debt so contracted.

(c) When each party to a marriage separately and voluntarily applies for and obtains separate credit accounts with the same creditor, those accounts shall not be aggregated or otherwise combined for purposes of determining permissible finance charges or permissible loan ceilings under the laws of any State or of the United States.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This Act shall take effect one year after the date of its enactment, except section 5 shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

TEXAS ENERGY AND NATIONAL POLICY

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it now seems that each day we become more acutely aware of this Nation's need to realize the objective of Project Independence: To make our Nation self-sufficient in energy resources.

While the time that this goal will require remains questionable, the instability of world petroleum supplies and the prices that are draining away our monetary resources into the coffers of oil exporting nations really leave us little choice. For the sake of America's future we must pursue and achieve that goal.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that the State of Texas has played a major role in supplying this Nation's energy resources in the past. I also know that with our experience and the talent amassed in Texas, we can play a leading role toward achieving Project Independence.

With those thoughts in mind, I would like to share with my colleagues the following testimony by Dr. Allen Commander, director of the Energy Institute at the University of Houston, presented in Houston on September 17, 1974, to the regional hearings on Project Independence held by the Federal Energy Administration:

TEXAS ENERGY AND NATIONAL POLICY
(Statement by Dr. Allen Commander)

INTRODUCTION

The special position of the state of Texas in national energy production and utilization prompted the State Legislature in 1973 to provide funds to the University of Houston for the establishment of an Energy Institute. The Institute's missions include sponsoring and conducting policy and technological research and the gathering and dissemination of energy data. Recently the Institute sponsored a study of energy flows and forecasts for Texas. A historical survey of the years 1960 and 1970 provided the basis for prediction of the growth of energy demands and estimates of supplies for 1980 and 1985. From these projections it has become clear that important policy decisions and legislation, both state and federal, will be required in the near future in order to preserve and enhance economic health in Texas, and indeed, in the nation.

TEXAS AS AN ENERGY ECONOMY

The Texas economy is particularly important to the rest of the nation, as Texas has about 27 percent of the country's refining capacity, and that percentage is likely to increase in the next few years. The world's largest single refinery is being completed by the expansion of a major refining complex near Houston, and will be refining over 700,000 barrels of oil per day in 1976.

Texas contributes a major proportion of the nation's petrochemicals; approximately 36 percent of the carbon black, 54 percent of the propylene, 67 percent of the methanol, and 87 percent of the butadiene for the country is being produced in Texas. Texas not only plays a significant role in the manufacture of petroleum based products, but because of the supply of natural gas and oil, (in 1970 Texas contributed 40 percent of the nation's crude oil and 39 percent of its natural gas) a large industrial base has grown up in the state.

Texas is the largest consumer of energy in

the nation by a wide margin, exceeding the consumption of the next nearest state, California, by over 30 percent. The availability of energy has led to the location in Texas of large basic metal and processing facilities. Because of the size and climatic character of the state, it is the nation's largest supplier of ten food and fiber commodities and a major exporter of agricultural products. Given the reliance of agricultural production on chemical fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, etc., that are petroleum derivatives, Texas production of energy assumes a role of great importance in the economy of the state. Two of every seven non-farm jobs in Texas are directly related to the petroleum resources of the state, and industry is the largest single consumer of energy.

Since fossil fuel energy dominates the state's economy, the impact of a diminishing supply over the next ten to fifteen years is likely to be heavy. From our point of view, the Texas economy must be optimized to accommodate future constraints of diminishing supplies of petroleum and natural gas.

ENERGY PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTIONS

Short and intermediate term solutions to the problems caused by energy imbalances can be achieved mainly through conservation, but a long term program based on limiting usage would be contrary to the American tradition of free choice. We must, therefore, improve technology in the energy field, develop new energy resources, and pass legislation which will guarantee the success of these actions.

The Energy Institute of the University of Houston is undertaking a number of studies designed to aid policy-makers at various levels. Two of my colleagues will be reporting to you later this week on specific results attained so far. Dr. Michael Johnson, Professor of Law and Associate Dean of the Bates College of Law, will talk to you Wednesday concerning state regulatory policy as it relates to national regulation in the energy industry. On Thursday, Dr. David Gottlieb, Professor of Sociology and Acting Dean of the College of Social Sciences, will present the preliminary results of a study of the impact on the Texas citizen of the recent energy crisis, with implications for policy-makers. Because of time limitations in these hearings, rather than testifying, I have asked another colleague, Dr. Bill Thomas, to submit for the record a brief of his important work, a regional econometric model for energy analysis.

In addition to policy research, technology research which has been ongoing at the University of Houston for some years has been supported and enhanced by The Energy Institute. On Thursday you will hear from Dr. Alvin Hildebrandt, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Physics at the University of Houston, as he describes progress and needs for work to make solar energy practical as a means of generating electricity on a large scale in the very near future.

This afternoon I would like to touch on four points:

Energy conservation and environment.

The importance of support for energy research and development.

The collection and dissemination of energy data.

The importance of treating energy producing states and regions of the country differently from energy consuming areas, in order to achieve maximum energy supplies for the whole country.

CONSERVATION AND ENVIRONMENT

The transition from a surplus of energy to a temporary shortage of energy has major implications for housing. The housing of people and industry must reflect higher conservation efficiency, but at the same time be responsive to the psychological needs of human beings. Decisions concerning the location of cities and towns must begin to be related to the production and consumption of energy. We have at The Woodlands, just

north of Houston, an exciting new city under construction by the Mitchell Energy and Development Corporation, which embodies this type of planning.

Research and development in the integration of energy conservation requirements into construction systems needs performing. This kind of urban systems oriented research and development is being accomplished in the Architectural College of the University of Houston and federal support of this effort needs enhancing.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE NEW SOURCES OF ENERGY

Whole solar energy has been utilized on a limited scale for water heating, space heating, and air conditioning, the sun offers an unlimited source of power of non-polluting character for electric power generation. There is much promise in the work at the University of Houston, which Dr. Hildebrandt will describe Thursday, of developing technology for using the sun's heat to economically generate electrical power which could become a part of the nation's electrical power grid. I would like to point out that this work, if properly supported, could proceed at a more rapid pace than heretofore. We understand Washington currently plans to provide \$288 million over the next five years for the central power solar energy concepts. It is important that these amounts be authorized and that an effective government management mechanism be created for utilization of the funds. The University of Houston is now organizing all of its research on solar energy into a single administrative unit in order to make a major contribution in this area.

One final thought on energy R & D. Traditionally, when massive resources are marshalled in this country to address a complex problem involving efforts of both the public and private sector, there is the ever present danger of overlaps and duplication of effort.

This could be avoided if Washington would implement the concept of "lead laboratories" where solar research, for example, could be focused in one facility charged with the responsibility to coordinate the research of other labs around the country and provide, in addition, a single entity for information exchange.

Along with national economic information related to energy, data on energy research and development needs collation and dissemination, since energy companies, colleges, universities, special research organizations, under federal, state, and local sponsorship are at work on energy research and development. There is a need to establish a national clearinghouse on energy research and development, perhaps building on the previous work of the Science Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution, but extending it far beyond its present capabilities.

COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION OF ENERGY DATA

Sound public policy decisions are based on accurate, up to date, and properly analyzed data. Presently, national and state energy data are collected and housed in various agencies. In Texas alone, energy data are the province of three state agencies, The Railroad Commission, The General Land Office, and The Comptroller's Office. At least three separate data banks are maintained, each of which is incompatible with the others. Since there is no central collection point, there is no way to cross check data in these systems. Thus no central source of information exists for decision makers.

The Energy Institute at the University of Houston has recommended to the state of Texas that one fully automated and centralized state energy data system, with necessary standardized formats and cross indices, be built. We recommend to the Federal Energy Administration that a national data system be set up in cooperation with each state. The

City of Houston represents a natural location for a national data center, because of the tremendous concentration of energy industry here. Arrangements for collecting and analyzing data with the cooperation of the outstanding industry data scientists would be easy to make.

From the energy data it would be appropriate to construct the special kinds of econometric models which would permit analysis of energy related problems. Production levels could be related to employment, income, energy utilization and trade patterns could be studied so that the impact of changing resource prices on production of new energy sources could be predicted. This is the kind of research presently being conducted by Dr. Thomas that I referenced earlier.

DIFFERENTIATING AMONG ENERGY PRODUCING AND CONSUMING STATES IN POLICYMAKING AND REGULATION

The implications for interstate commerce caused by Texas' position as an export state in oil and natural gas are such that there should be greater coordination between Texas and the federal government, and Texas and other producing states. Specific agreements between states are prohibited by the Constitution without authority from Congress. The following suggestions all need Congressional approval:

1. Joint action should be encouraged between states especially where one state supplies raw materials and another state produces end products. Sharing resources and revenue would be mutually beneficial. For example, coal might move from another state into Texas to be converted into gas in Texas refineries and ultimately utilized in chemical plants to be made into other profitable items. There should be mechanisms to return to the people of the coal originating state a share of the revenue so produced.

2. Discussion has centered on the need to conserve natural gas for use as a feedstock instead of being burned for industrial heat. Coal could be substituted, but it is far dirtier with respect to the environment. Plants which switch from gas to coal would pollute their communities. Some mechanism needs to be devised to provide an incentive to convert, and the incentive then used to install cleaning devices. Interstate agreements should be provided so that one state does not profit disproportionately from conversion from a clean to a dirty fuel in another state.

3. Texas is the only state in the union which does not have a readily recognizable utility commission. Statutes regarding energy regulation need to be developed so that the clear authority of states and the federal government concerning the end use of oil and natural gas and other resources is spelled out. A single state agency should be designed for each state as the primary promulgator of regulations concerning the siting of energy production facilities. Applicants should deal with only a single group in securing state and federal approvals.

4. Because Texas economy has derived a large percentage of the total tax dollar from the oil and gas industry, Texas has not had to levy personal and business income taxes which have been required of most states. In the event of federal allocation of energy resources, there should be a careful study of the impact of such allocation on Texas energy industries, the state budget, state taxes, and federal needs.

5. Deep water oil and gas unloading facilities need to be made available for the Texas refining industry, and while there are controversies over the types of facilities to be constructed and whether they should be privately or publicly owned, there should be early federal resolution of these problems so that construction can begin. The time is near when such facilities will be required in view of our projections of the lessening of

supplies of Texas resources over the next ten years.

In closing, I am appreciative of the major problems which the Federal Energy Administration is dealing with, in a complex economy, with a complex energy supply and consumption system. We realize that there are no simple solutions to our energy problems, but the University of Houston is pledged to play our part as a means of conducting and communicating to the various publics the results of research and the implications of research for policy decisionmaking.

The University of Houston Energy Institute will be host to a symposium on federal-state energy relationships on October 31 and November 1. I would like to extend an invitation to those present to attend. Members of the Federal Energy Administration, other federal government agencies, state and local officials along with the academic community will be present for further exploration of some of the items which I have just discussed. Thank you.

MAN SHOT ACCIDENTALLY IN GUN SHOP

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 I introduced legislation to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968 in an effort to prohibit possession of handguns except for the police, the military, licensed pistol clubs, licensed security guards, and antique gun collectors.

The statistics in this regard are appalling, and paint a profile that is all too clear. Where gun ownership is highest, deaths caused by guns are also highest.

An article, "Man Shot Accidentally in Gun Shop," by John Cullen, which appeared in the September 23, 1974, issue of the Boston Globe, explained that—

People want to carry guns because of psychological needs. Many feel that everybody in the world is out to get them or they just want to feel safe when they take a walk.

Granted that people feel strong impulses to cling to "symbols" of self-sufficiency, handgun owners must realize that their perceived means of self-protection are in reality a potential means of self-destruction. The available evidence, sparse as it is, indicates that handguns do not afford real security for their owners. The Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence concluded from a study of Detroit, for every thief confronted by a homeowner bearing a handgun, four of those homeowners or their relatives were killed in handgun accidents. The Commission also observed that only about 2 percent of home robberies result in the trespasser being shot by the homeowner. The Commission concluded that—

Possession of a gun undoubtedly provides a measure of comfort to a great many Americans. But the data suggest that this comfort is largely an illusion bought at the high price of increased accidents, homicides and more widespread illegal use of guns.

It seems to me that firearms are at the root of a uniquely American tragedy; in an attempt to protect ourselves against criminal elements and preserve a measure of self-sufficiency, we have ended

up killing ourselves and our neighbors instead.

It is appalling that in 1972, guns were used in 2,900 accidental deaths, 10,000 suicides, and 200,000 accidental injuries. In 1973, according to the National Safety Council, 2,700 people were killed by "accidental discharge of firearms." The Boston Globe article describes just one of the many accidental shootings that have occurred this year.

Would those accidental killings and injuries have taken place if the possession of handguns was prohibited—or is it reasonable to assert that the same consequences would have occurred through the use of alternate weapons. Would those 10,000 people have committed suicide if the United States had responsible gun control laws? I feel that the answer is no.

Since the day the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock, guns have been an important part of American life. Not only were they sources of pride and power, but in those days they held the key to survival. It is almost 1975, and the handgun is no longer a key to survival in any sense. In fact it may hold for us the master key to destruction.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the article which appeared in the September 23 edition of the Boston Globe for the information of my colleagues.

The text follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Sept. 23, 1974]

MAN SHOT ACCIDENTALLY IN GUN SHOP

(By John F. Cullen)

BOXBORO.—A 20-year-old Lunenburg businessman's attempt to buy a gun Friday night led to his being seriously wounded in a freak shooting accident.

Police say a gun fell from a cabinet in a gun store and discharged, wounding Ronald Pursley in the head.

The gun had been taken from a holster by the store owner and placed on the cabinet a short time before the accident took place, police said. Pursley yesterday was reported in critical condition at Emerson Hospital in Concord after five hours of surgery. He owns an auto parts shop in Ayer.

HANDGUNS IN AMERICA

Boxboro Police Chief Bruce Barker said Pursley entered the Leisure Time Living Sports Center, 674 Massachusetts av., shortly after 7 p.m. and had been in the store about 30 minutes when the accident took place.

Chief Barker said Pursley had gone to the store to purchase a gun and was looking at a gun catalogue when the shooting occurred.

Chief Barker said store owner Donald K. Griffin had been carrying a .38 caliber gun in a holster and then placed the gun on top of the cabinet. Police quoted Griffin as saying he opened the cabinet drawer to get some catalogues when the gun fell to the floor and discharged.

"The doctors at the hospital are very confident that Mr. Pursley will live but he still isn't out of danger yet. However, they did say that the bullet passed through the back of the skull—missing the brain by less than an inch or so," Chief Barker said.

For Bruce Barker, 26-year-old police chief of Boxboro and Littleton, the shooting pointed to need for tighter firearms controls.

"This shooting doesn't make me feel good because I feel that perhaps the shooting could have been prevented," Chief Barker said.

Barker said requests for gun permits are up substantially. "People are afraid that

pretty soon they won't be able to get them—so now we are having a run on permits," he said.

"People want to carry guns because of psychological needs. Some people feel that everybody in the world is out to get them or they just want to feel safe when they take a walk.

"I'm not saying that this incident was one of those cases but I guess I honestly have to ask myself why someone carries a gun in a store unless they are expecting trouble. Boxboro is a number of miles from the Combat Zone," Barker said.

"Most likely Pursley will recover and feel very few side effects. But that won't be the case with Mr. Griffin—he is very much down and will be for a while.

"I wish that people with guns on their sides would take a couple of minutes out of a day to stop and think about how they would emotionally deal with the fact that they have just taken another human being's life or made a person nothing but a vegetable," Barker said.

"It's not a pleasant thought, granted, but it's reality. And people have to begin to be consciously aware that guns are killers and maimers."

CHILDREN LEARN CAPITALISM THROUGH "MINIECONOMY"

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, one of the real shortcomings of American education has been its inability to explain to young people the essential elements of economics.

Because so many Americans are ignorant of the basic rules of economic life, they find themselves unable to understand the causes of the inflation under which they are now suffering and, as a result, do not know which kinds of policies and approaches to support in an effort to end it and to restore stability to the Nation's economy.

Only through economic education which begins at the earliest possible moment in the educational process can we reverse the current trend. Fortunately, there are a number of men and women working to provide such education.

One example of real success in economic education can be seen in California where a new program, known as the minisociety is being used to encourage creativity and independence.

Under this program, upper elementary schoolchildren—grades 3 through 6—generate a miniature economy in their classroom. Students freely interact and bear the consequences of their decisions. The teacher's primary role is an advisory, not an authoritarian one.

Dr. Marilyn Kourilsky, an economist, who is now director of the UCLA Center for Economic Education, and architect of the minisociety, states:

Students participate in a classroom environment where economic concepts are concrete realities rather than mere abstractions. They learn about scarcity because they experience scarcity; correspondingly, they learn to cope with scarcity by living in a classroom community where economic mechanisms to cope with scarcity spontaneously evolve.

Discussing this important new program, Arnold Steinberg, formerly an assistant to Senator JAMES BUCKLEY of New York and editor of the New Guard, the magazine of Young Americans for Freedom, writes:

Dr. Kourilsky and her associates are now engaged in a seminar-type program to explain the minisociety to elementary school teachers throughout the United States. Dr. Kourilsky warns teachers that the purpose of the minisociety is not behavior modification, but a learning experience to teach students to interact, accept responsibility, and cope with reality.

Mr. Steinberg concludes:

When public schools began teaching sex education, it was predicted that the teachers would make sex as dull as everything else they teach. It can be said with certainty that everything else remained dull. Hopefully, the introduction of the minisociety can make other subjects as exciting as economics.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article, "Children Learn Capitalism Through 'Minieconomy,'" by Arnold Steinberg which appeared in the August 24, 1974, issue of Human Events, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

CHILDREN LEARN CAPITALISM THROUGH "MINIECONOMY"

(By Arnold Steinberg)

A new approach to education, which teaches elementary school children the fundamentals of economics and responsibility, is challenging the public school system's preoccupation with mediocrity.

The "mini-society" is an innovative, highly motivating instructional system designed to encourage creativity and independence. Upper elementary school children (grades 3 through 6) generate a miniature economy in their classroom, but the mini-economy is no game or simulation. Students freely interact and bear the consequences of their decisions. The teacher's primary role is an advisory, not authoritarian one.

"Students participate in a classroom environment where economic concepts are concrete realities rather than mere abstractions," according to Dr. Marilyn Kourilsky, an economist who is now director of the UCLA Center for Economic Education, and architect of the mini-society. "They learn about scarcity because they experience scarcity; correspondingly, they learn to cope with scarcity by living in a classroom community where economic mechanisms to cope with scarcity spontaneously evolve."

Scarcity is, of course, the most pervasive economic fact of life: Human wants exceed the resources available to satisfy those wants. From the mini-society's inception, the children experience scarcity, consistent with Dr. Kourilsky's assumption that learning is enhanced when children participate in:

- (1) *real* as opposed to *vicarious* experience;
- (2) *active* rather than *passive* roles in the learning situation; and
- (3) *actual decision-making* whose consequences they will bear.

Scarcity is illustrated when the teacher selects, and makes accessible to the students, materials (puzzles, tape recorders, games) which are in high demand. When the children eventually complain that there is not enough of a particular item, the teacher stimulates a discussion group to identify the problem, establish a list of behaviors (e.g., classroom participation, punctuality) which will be rewarded by income, and to assign a value to labor.

Children will identify alternative means of distribution: "divide up" (egalitarian), "first come, first served" (speed), "pick a number"

(lottery); they will discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using "force" to distribute the goods, or accepting "need" as the criterion. Since the children eventually assign a positive value to various types of behavior, and a negative value to undesirable behavior, it is only natural that the rewards generated by their behavior are used to purchase the desired materials.

The entire process cannot be detailed in this brief article. The children, however, inevitably choose the price mechanism as a way to allocate the scarce resource. Within a few days a currency system is developed, and a regular system of paydays. Spontaneous buying and selling of small items (pencils, erasers, snacks) teaches the children to learn from their mistakes.

The teacher, a catalyst who acts as a consultant to the students, raises questions in discussion groups. The teacher can also guide the group. For example, if the class does not, on its own, decide to have an auction, the teacher can suggest it. The auction process usually leads to the formation of a bank, since some students will overbid and require loans from their friends (to honor their bid).

The teaching methodology, developed over a five-year period of testing in 30 classrooms in 15 public schools, primarily in the Los Angeles area, is described by Dr. Kourilsky in *Beyond Simulation: The Mini-Society Approach to Instruction in Economics and Other Social Sciences* (Educational Resources Associates, \$3.95). The program, typically one hour of classroom time a day, has been successful in both suburban high-income and inner-city schools. It works best in the upper fourth grade.

In her teaching manual, Dr. Kourilsky explains how banks, loan companies, insurance companies, a stock market, a newspaper and even consulting arrangements emerge spontaneously in the children's economy. Even the teacher's advice to the youthful entrepreneurs is no longer given free.

As Dr. Kourilsky explains, "the concept of the teacher as a paid consulting agent carries over to other parts of the school day. Without warning, the teacher may announce that (s)he is now selling time, and anyone wishing to take advantage of the opportunity can do so for a stated rate. . . .

"Many children ask questions to which they already know the answers, simply to get reassurance or attention from the teacher. They often reconsider and work without extra help when they realize there is a price tag attached to their possible choice of actions."

To insure continued innovation, student aides from neighboring junior high and high schools can be brought in for "consulting."

An exciting film, describing five classrooms' experience with the mini-society, shows activities ranging from tutorial services to pawn shops, entertainment to accounting. The common denominator of every good or service is relevance to an actual miniature economy in which the children assume *real* roles in *real* situations.

The California Council for Economic Education noted that the mini-society represents a real-life economy for the children:

"... mini-economies developed in each classroom are different—not by design, but because the children are different. To sum it up, if you asked the teacher 'How do the children know what to do in their mini-economy?', (s)he might answer with another question: 'How do you know what to do in your economy?'"

The concepts, which usually emerge spontaneously and are reinforced in discussion groups with the teacher, include scarcity, economic cost, cost-benefit analysis, present consumption vs. capital accumulation, sunk cost ("Don't cry over spilled milk"), demand, supply, market price, effects of price ceilings and floors, money and inflation, and property rights.

The mini-society profoundly affects the entire educational process:

A Los Angeles Times article (Oct. 12, 1973) reported that a class using the mini-society approach improved its reading scores from the 50th percentile to the 99th percentile and ranked third highest in reading scores in a district of approximately 437 schools.

Students dramatically improve mathematical skills. They quickly learn that basic computational skills are necessary to buy and sell goods, compute profit, allocate one's income, pay interest, etc.

The mini-society provides an incentive for students to devote more attention to "regular" subjects. Children soon learn that to advertise one must write copy, to make signs one must learn design and art. In short, students are alert during the entire learning process for new knowledge and skills to enhance their performance in the mini-economy.

Since the mini-society requires a high degree of social interaction, normal segregation barriers (e.g., sex, ethnic background) give way to the cooperative effort which usually characterizes productive enterprise. Children who have never succeeded on the basis of nice clothes, athletic ability or achievement in a single academic field gain recognition and achieve success in a special field of endeavor. Each child acquires the self-respect and dignity uniquely associated with individual achievement.

Unlike most elementary school children who equate fairness with "sharing," the students in the mini-society understand that "fairness" is subjective, depending on one's position and outlook. The children grasp the meaning of responsibility, and the need for an individual to bear the consequences of his decision, as evidenced in their discussion of topics like government subsidy.

The children learn that money is not an end in itself, but a means to achieve a variety of other ends. They understand scarcity—that no one can satisfy all his wants simultaneously, so choices must be made. Money simply helps to measure the value consumers place on alternative goods, services—even their time. Money does not necessarily measure satisfaction.

Finally, children are more enthusiastic about school. One teacher in a "ghetto" school noted that her class experienced a significant increase in attendance.

Dr. Kourilsky and her associates are now engaged in a seminar-type program to explain the mini-society to elementary school teachers throughout the United States. Dr. Kourilsky warns teachers that the purpose of the mini-society is *not* behavior modification, but a learning experience to teach students to interact, accept responsibility and cope with reality. She urges teachers to allow their young students the freedom to make mistakes and bear the consequences of their decisions.

When public schools began teaching sex education, it was predicted that the teachers would make sex as dull as everything else they teach.

It can be said with certainty that everything else remained dull.

Hopefully, the introduction of the mini-society can make other subjects as exciting as economics.

EQUALITY FOR FILIPINO AMERICANS: AN OPEN LETTER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, an open letter was published as

an editorial in the September 5, 1974, edition of the Bataan News, of Sacramento, Calif. This letter was intended as an attempt to let the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress know that equality is still not yet extended to the Filipino Americans.

I wish to thank Mr. M. H. Jacaban, publisher of the Bataan News, for bringing this sorry situation to my attention. One can not help but agree that the problem of equality of opportunity deserves national attention and that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the best forum by which Members of the U.S. Congress can be alerted to the intense desire of the Filipino Americans to be equal with the rest of the American population, not only before the eyes of the law, but equal in the opportunity to improve their future.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this time the text of this timely letter into the RECORD:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT FORD

SEPTEMBER 5, 1974.

DEAR SIR: You will please note that by your declared intention of keeping the door of the White House open and listen to the voice of the people, I am constrained to write this letter to you regarding the intense desire of the Filipino Americans to solve their problems of inequity which they are still faced with. It is my most sincere hope and fervent prayer, and I am sure that it is also the hope and prayer of all Filipino Americans, that their demand for equality with the rest of the American population touches a responsive chord in your heart.

We very well realize the enormity of your responsibilities in the exercise of your office as President of the United States of America, and the preciousness of your time that you must devote to keep up with the daily business of the most powerful nation on earth, but the Filipino Americans are also an important part of the American population as a whole, and whose problems must become also the problems of the White House.

It must be mentioned here, sir, that the Filipino Americans have poverty problems, but those problems are not their own making. They are neither lazy or indolent. Their poverty problems are results of racial bias that was extended them in times past. Justice demands that the Filipino Americans be made equal with the rest of the American population.

The desperately critical problems that the Filipino Americans are faced with are:

1. Housing. A large number of them are especially the elderly and farm workers, living in rat-ridden dwellings. Reports show that quite a number of them who are living in those unsanitary conditions, have contracted tuberculosis. Poor housing conditions and improper diet are given as the causes for the prevalence of TB among Filipino American elderly.

It is estimated that 200,000 housing units are needed to meet the needs of the Filipino Americans.

2. Employment discrimination. Equal employment opportunity has not as yet been fully extended to the Filipino Americans. There are Filipino engineers, attorneys, and other professionals who are working as farm workers, porters, busboys and dishwashers because employers have refused to give due recognition to their professional qualifications.

There are among Filipino Americans professors of Colleges and Universities, physicians and surgeons, writers and journalists, priests and ministers of the gospel, public administrators, etc. Yet there are only two Filipino Americans who were appointed by the previous administrations in Washington.

Even then, those two appointments are only honorary. And there are thousands of Blacks and hundreds of Chicanos who are now assuming federal positions of responsibility with salaries ranging from \$40,000 a year and up.

3. Education. Because of the racial bias extended them in the past, the Filipino Americans were relegated to the lowest paying jobs. Hence, the Filipino American families had not saved enough money to be able to send their children to higher institutions of learning.

4. Drug addiction. Due to the lack of proper guidance, the Filipino American youths are the subject of immoral assault regarding drug traffic. The Filipino families were close-knit unit, but because of these illicit drugs gnawing at the morals of our Filipino youths, many Filipino families are being broken.

The Filipino Americans are definitely an important part of the American population... they have been proven during World War II the most loyal group among the ethnic minorities to the principles of democracy. And they are a neglected minority within a minority (because they are categorized as Spanish-surname) whose poverty problems are real and critical.

It must also be mentioned here that a large number of those who are victims of poverty are those who had served in the reconquest of the Philippines from the Japanese and had participated in the battles of Leyte and Lingayen. Some are sons and daughters and widows of the men who, in spite of the overwhelming odds against them, stood to the last and finally died in the heroic defense of Bataan and Corregidor. Some are the survivors of the infamous "Death March" between Bataan and Manila.

Could America have the heart to deny equality to those Filipino American heroes who have laid their lives on the line in defense of America in her greatest hour of need?

Equality must not be denied to the Filipino Americans. They must be made a part of the mainstream of American life. They must be allowed to take part on equal terms in the realization of the American dream.

Your devoted servant,

M. H. JACABAN,

Chairman, National Association of
Filipino Americans.

A CENTURY OF MORAVIAN SISTERS

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Col. Michael Kovats, the Hungarian-American hero of the Revolutionary War, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues his activities among the Pennsylvania Moravians, only a small part of his total war effort on behalf of the American Colonies:

Elizabeth Lehman Myers writes in her fine book, "A Century of Moravian Sisters" about the visit of Count Casimir Pulaski and Col. Michael de Kovats to Bethlehem, Pa., the center of the Moravian Church:

It was these very dangers and troubles (of the warring times) however, that were responsible for one of the most famous romantic stories of the Revolution, the story of the Pulaski banner.

Count Casimir Pulaski was first in Bethlehem on Maunday Thursday, in the Holy Week of 1778, accompanied by Colonel Kobatsch (i.e. Kovats), a Prussian officer. The two foreigners attended the church service always held on Maunday Thursday, and at that time in the Old Chapel on Cedar Square, and were very much impressed by the solemnity of the occasion.

While Count Pulaski may have been in Bethlehem for the first time, we know—again from the various notes of the Moravian chroniclers—that Colonel Kovats visited the Pennsylvania Moravians as early as in September 1777, when the diary of the Nazareth Moravians make the first mention of the presence of Colonel Kovats, the "famous Prussian Hussar officer" who had already been in the country for some time. Kovats' fame thus preceded him everywhere among the Moravians, the followers of Count Zinzendorf, whose estates and activities in the German lands around the middle of the 18th century were well known to Kovats who, from 1745 to 1761, served in the army of Frederick, the Great, King of Prussia.

It has to be accepted also as a historical fact that the news about Kovats' past was spread most eagerly by the deaconess of the Moravian Sisters, Countess Susan von Gersdorf, who came from a prominent German family deeply grateful to the Hungarian-born Hussar officer. Kovats' last assignment as a commander in the Prussian Army was with a unit known as the "Gersdorf Free Hussars," the remnants of a famous regiment which, without its own fault, was captured by the Austrian Army and, as was the rule in Frederick's army, fell into disgrace. Known for his excellent character traits and professional abilities as a cavalry commander, Michael Kovats, then a captain of the Hussars, was appointed as the commanding officer of this corps, whose soldiers and officers were burning with desire to restore their high reputation in the eyes of the Prussian King. Kovats did an impeccable job and earned the gratitude of the Von Gersdorf family.

In the United States, Count Pulaski, himself a Catholic, must have followed the suggestions of his Hungarian friend, a Protestant, to establish close contacts with the Protestant Moravians. Later events focused all attention upon the colorful and impressive personality of the young Polish aristocrat, and, thus, we find the following story of the presentation of the "Pulaski Banner" in the above-mentioned source:

Pulaski made several visits, and was shown around the village by the guide appointed for such purposes. The brethren found it necessary to have an official guide, as so many people came to visit Bethlehem, that it took up entirely too much time for the pastor or his assistants, and so a special position was created, and a brother appointed to fill it.

Count Pulaski was charmed with all that he saw and heard in Bethlehem and when again unruly troops threatened the seclusion and peace of the poor sisters, he, too, detailed a guard for its doors, and one night stood guard himself.

The sisters were so grateful to him that they desired to express their appreciation in a substantial way. Sister von Gersdorf suggested the making of a banner for the Gal-

lant Pole, and placed the matter in the hands of Sister Rebecca Langly.

Becky, as she was called, was an expert needle-woman, who had introduced the making of fine embroideries into the Sisters' House, and she designed the banner. Six young women, one of whom was her sister, Erdmuth, assisted her, and when completed it was a thing of beauty. Not large, it was designed to be carried on a lance. Made of scarlet silk, with a green fringe, it had a very elaborate design upon it embroidered in yellow.

I regret to say, there is no record of a presentation such as there was of the gift of General Gates, and so the beautiful poem written by Longfellow, is only exquisite fancy. But the lines,

"The warrior took the banner proud
And it was his martial cloak and shroud"

were partly true, as Pulaski fell at the battle of Savannah while carrying it.

Wounded unto death, he was carried aboard a vessel in the harbor. His first lieutenant caught the banner as it fell, and through him it was sent to Baltimore, where it was finally presented to the Maryland Historical Society in whose care it now is. The brilliant crimson is darkened by time to a reddish brown, the yellows are dulled, but the exquisite stitchery is still there, put in by the skilled fingers long since crumbled to dust.

The banner was carried in the procession which welcomed Lafayette to Baltimore in 1824. Perhaps the sight of the banner recalled the sweet Moravian sisters to Lafayette, for once more he came to Bethlehem. His faithful little nurse (who cared for him in 1778 while, wounded, he rested at Bethlehem) lay in the old graveyard, her ministry over; but he chatted with his step-mother then living in the Gemein House . . .

The colors of the banner, long faded, approximated those of the Hungarian national flag, red-white-green, reflecting the same composition of colors in the uniforms of the Pulaski Legion which were designed by their "Colonel Commandant," Michael de Kovats. As it appears in George Gray's mural in the Hotel Bethlehem, the uniforms of the Pulaski Hussars were similar to those of the contemporary Hussar regiments which, following the Hungarian example in the training and organization of the light cavalry, further emphasized their "true Hungarian character" by the adoption of the Hungarian Hussar uniform and armament.

However, far beyond such impressive episodes of lasting memory, it was here, in Bethlehem and its environment, where the smaller units of the Pulaski Legion conducted their assigned duties and received their progressive training in the Hussar type tactics of light cavalry, that the thoughts of Pulaski and his Hungarian senior officer crystallized and led to improved concepts of a new American cavalry as an independent branch of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The everlasting memory of their chivalric and gentlemanly behavior might have helped to cement the acceptance of the cause of liberty and independence of the United States on the part of the Moravian Brethren whose position on this important matter was formally defined by a conference of 30 ministers in Bethlehem in 1781—as reported in the splendid work, entitled "Bethlehem of Pennsylvania, the First One Hundred

Years, 1741 to 1841," a publication of the Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce issued in 1968. The agreement took the form of a covenant, called the "Brotherly Agreement," and carried the assurance that the Brethren who were, by the way of their worldwide contacts and affiliated organization in England, very often adversely influenced against the American cause, will henceforth cordially subject themselves to the government that is in power over them, and "will conform to all human ordinances of the land" in which they live.

The soldiers of the Pulaski Legion were largely recruited from this same area, Col. Michael de Kovats, partly by his fluency in German, conducting the recruiting here till the early months of 1771. It is noteworthy that a "Recruiting Ballad," dated in 1778, and extolling the virtues of the new "Pulaski Chorus" was found among the relics of this age, and published by John Joseph Stoudt in his collection "Pennsylvania German Poetry, 1685-1830," in the 1955 volume of "Pennsylvania Folklore."

Many are the relics and memories which will help us and dedicated scholars and public leaders to recall the spiritual and political heritage of the most important period of American history, the dramatic founding years of this democracy.

The service rendered by Col. Michael de Kovats of Hungary to this country will always be remembered and will be regarded as the foundation of the friendship and mutual dedication to the cause of freedom, liberty, and democracy by Americans and Hungarians alike.

CATHOLIC BISHOPS URGE UNITED STATES HELP IN WORLD FOOD CRISIS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Executive Committee of the U.S. Catholic Conference has taken a firm stand for U.S. leadership in helping the world meet the challenge of the food crisis. In a statement issued September 19, 1974, the bishops called for U.S. Government support at the forthcoming World Food Conference for an international food reserve, short-term emergency relief in areas threatened by starvation, and technical assistance to help increase food production in developing countries. The statement also urges that the United States in implementing such policies, should protect the domestic interests of Americans by seeing that "those Americans least able to pay do not bear the brunt of our policy."

A resolution now pending in the Committee on Foreign Affairs includes all of the main elements of the policy recommended by the Catholic bishops. The resolution was produced as a result of hearings held in the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and is based on two like-minded resolutions introduced some months ago by our colleagues JOHN CULVER, of Iowa, and

PIERRE DU PONT, of Delaware. This resolution deserves the support of the full House when it comes to the floor.

I include the statement of the Executive Committee of the U.S. Catholic Conference in the RECORD:

CATHOLIC BISHOPS' BODY URGES JUST U.S. POLICY ON WORLD FOOD CRISIS

WASHINGTON.—The Executive Committee of the United States Catholic Conference (USCC) has called on the U.S. government to "bring a broadly conceived and just policy" to the World Food Conference which will take place in Rome in November.

"To be in the U.S. position as prime exporter of foodstuffs is an awesome responsibility: we are literally involved in judging who will live or die," the USCC body declared in a statement on the international food crisis.

While the average per capita consumption of grain in the developing nations is approximately 400 pounds per year, in the U.S. and Canada it is 1,000 pounds per year. The U.S., with 6% of the world's population, accounts for approximately 40% of its consumption of overall resources.

The Executive Committee statement urged a U.S. food policy embracing:

An international food reserve permanently available to meet global emergencies;

Increased short-term emergency relief to areas where starvation threatens;

Technical assistance to developing nations to help them increase food production.

Members of the USCC Executive Committee are John Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia, President of the conference, John Cardinal Dearden of Detroit, Coadjutor Archbishop Leo C. Byrne of St. Paul and Minneapolis, Archbishop Thomas A. Donnellan of Atlanta, and Bishop James S. Rausch, General Secretary of USCC.

Following is the text of the statement:

"In the face of a global food crisis, we wish to highlight certain moral implications. The right to eat flows directly from the right to life. Food, therefore, is a unique commodity. To be in the U.S. position as prime exporter of foodstuffs is an awesome responsibility: we are literally involved in judging who will live or die.

"As a nation, we must treat our food resource as a sacred trust, not simply a matter of money and markets. In the past, we have helped to feed others from our surplus; today, we are asked to share our scarcity. Where once we shared in charity, we must now share in justice. The law of the market, like every human creation, has its moral limits. When it denies food to starving people, it must be modified.

"We urgently appeal to our government to bring a broadly conceived and just policy to November's World Food Conference. We encourage those in our government who would support:

"First, an international food reserve to provide a permanent supply to meet global emergencies;

"Second, an increase in short-term emergency relief to areas threatened with starvation;

"Third, technical assistance for developing nations to increase their food-producing capacity.

"Meeting our international responsibilities will have domestic implications. We appeal to our government to see that those Americans least able to pay do not bear the brunt of our policy: specifically, the independent farmer, often the most vulnerable person in the chain of food production, processing and sales, and the consumer from the middle and lower income categories.

"The American food policy must be characterized by justice as we share our scarcity with those whose right to eat is now in our hands as a trust and responsibility."

ANOTHER SWEETHEART WHEAT DEAL

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Egyptian Government announced the other day that we have agreed to supply 100,000 tons of wheat to its country in the first quarter of 1975 in what can be judged only as a sweetheart deal of absurd proportions.

The wheat, valued at \$16 million, is to be paid for over a 20-year period at an interest rate of just 3 percent, a ridiculous figure in this era of high-cost money. Can anything more gullible be imagined as far as we Americans are concerned?

In the first place, we may not have the wheat to share in the months ahead because of the recent drought in the Midwest which has cut harvests sharply in some areas. And, although 100,000 tons is not a large amount compared to our total wheat production, the fact remains that it could be enough in an overall shortage situation to start another round of price increases here on bread and other bakery items.

We well remember what a similar bargain-basement deal on wheat to the Russians did to our supply 2 years ago. We sold our surplus to the Soviets at below cost to us and, unwittingly I am sure, created the grain shortages here which began the continuing explosion of prices in the food markets. Are we to play the same game with the Egyptians?

The size of our wheat stocks in the first quarter of next year is still a matter of guess by those who keep track. But even so, the money terms of the sale to Egypt already are agreed upon, according to the Cairo announcement as carried by the Associated Press. Egypt is to pay on the installment plan at the token 3 percent interest charge.

This means, of course, that our Government will have to borrow the money to buy the wheat in the first place. Deficit ridden, it has no money on hand for anything. It will be compelled to go into the tight money market to get the \$16 million needed and pay interest rates for it almost three times that which it has agreed to charge Egypt. The latest Treasury issues were sold for more than 8½ percent, according to Business Week magazine.

So we will be borrowing money at more than 8½ percent to buy up still scarce and highly expensive U.S. wheat to turn over to the Egyptians who will pay us back at the rate of 3 percent stretched over two decades. The deal comes down to that simple fact. And yet the American public is expected to stand for it on the explanation that it might have something to do with the success of our foreign policy which, I might add, has a very poor track record. The deal is glossed up for popular acceptance as being part of the food-for-peace program.

The Egyptians may need wheat either from us or from some other source. I do not question this at all. But what I do

question is why, as an ally of the oil-rich Arab States, Egypt must be subsidized by us. If the nation is so hard up, why doesn't it borrow from the bulging treasuries of its Middle Eastern confederates? A report in the Pittsburgh Press recently said Saudi Arabia has cut its spending budget because it has more money piled up than it has the means to spend.

It is significant that our Egyptian giveaway was arranged at the same time that Saudi Arabia reached a decision to purchase "several billion dollars" of what the New York Times describes as a "special bond issue" by the U.S. Treasury. Although the Times said the terms are still to be worked out, it is certain the interest we will pay on this issue will far exceed what we are charging Egypt. It would be the height of irony if part of the proceeds of these bonds went to buy the wheat.

And Saudi Arabia is not the only oil-gouging ally of Egypt to be eyeing U.S. bonds. Kuwait also is reported involved in a deal to invest its riches here.

How much longer, Mr. Speaker, can we go on robbing our people in the manner of the Egyptian wheat sale? I ask this question mindful that the deal already made, according to the Cairo report, is for only the first quarter of 1975. There are indications of more such bargains in the offing. I enter my protest against them now and hope that others in Congress will join me.

DOLLARS LOSING ENERGY

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Howard T. Odum, professor of environmental engineering sciences at the University of Florida, was interviewed in a recent article on the relationship of money and energy on the world marketplace.

The interview is included in an article by Ted Brooks, energy editor of the Wichita Eagle and Beacon, entitled "Dollars Losing Energy." I am grateful to Tom Robertson of the Energy Center, University of Florida at Gainesville, for bringing this article to my attention and would like to share it with my colleagues:

DOLLARS LOSING ENERGY

(By Ted Brooks)

One of civilized mankind's most reassuring axioms is that money and capital are the source of temporal and physical power and worldly happiness. Since the beginning of the industrial revolution 200 years ago it has been undisputed.

Another revolution—the current energy revolution—is clouding anciently conceived economic theory with grave doubts. There is a growing army of ecologists, environmentalists and biologists—even a few economists—who insist the axiom is piffle.

The 200 years of unrestrained growth enjoyed by the developing world, they say, has resulted from a borrowing and profligate use of stored fossil fuels from the world's energy bank. The run on the bank has been so ex-

cessive that now the end of nature's savings are in sight. The loans are beginning to be called.

But dollars alone won't repay the loans, they contend. In fact, they insist, dollars are but representative mediums of exchange around which an entirely distorted view and system of economics has grown.

At a recent growth conference in Monterey, Calif., one of the crusading ecological economists, Jean Matthews, contended the world's overall system of energy flow and use has been obscured by preoccupation with the dollar. People insist that the primary reality is the number of dollars in the bank. "Even when these dollars begin to shrink, in alarming but predictable proportion to the shrinking supplies of energy, we continue to focus on 'the economy' alone—as though the economy of dollars were real compared to the ecology."

Energy, Matthews insists, is the real powering action that runs the worldwide, integrated process of which people and their institutions and their possessions are but a part. "In other words, energy does work, as opposed to dollars, which are nothing more than pervasive symbols of work and work potential."

Matthews' view is representative of a total world energy system of economics that is growing under the acknowledged leadership of Dr. Howard T. Odum, professor of environmental engineering sciences at the University of Florida. Essentially, they view the earth and all of its plant and animal inhabitants as being a single integrated system, carefully balanced by eons of selected growth under that life-sustaining source of virtually all energy, the sun. Of all the creatures derived from this process, man has achieved the capacity to accelerate the flow of energy and alter the ecology and environment to satisfy his short-term desires. He thus has the capacity to upset the balance and destroy himself.

Odum and his followers are not alone. Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen, Vanderbilt University economist, has outraged classical economists with similar conclusions. In his book, *Entropy Law and the Economic Process*, he contends current economic theory assumes unlimited supplies of materials and energy. Abundance is no longer assured, he says, and we are experiencing the result as inflation.

The new school of thought thus supplies an answer to the mystery of "stagflation" which has baffled conventional economists—unbridled inflation accompanying unemployment in violation of historic economic dogma.

The new wave in ecological economics is beginning to be taken seriously by many who once thought it a crackpot theory.

The Florida legislature is considering a "carrying capacity" plan inspired by Odum. It is based on an analysis of Florida's ability to support a swelling population as energy resources dwindle.

In Oregon, Gov. Tom McCall has set up a council which will use Odum's energy accounting principals in which energy units are substituted for dollars in proving cost effectiveness.

The Bureau of Mines in Washington, the Federal Energy Administration, Environmental Protection Agency and Council on Environmental Quality have all started to include energy cost effectiveness in their studies.

Corporations are interested. Texaco Inc., one of the nation's largest oil companies, recently decided to forego bidding on oil shale as a result of net energy studies.

"It was hard not to make a bid, but we couldn't justify it," a Texaco executive was quoted in a recent issue of *Business Week*. After developing necessary technology, building plants, moving tons of earth, reclaiming the land and processing the rock, the energy

consumed would almost be equal to the energy produced. It was considered an energy standoff.

Implied by the Texaco decision is the practicality of using the energy cost effectiveness principal. While many firms, figuring in terms of utterly unknown future dollars, decided oil shale development would be commercially feasible, energy studies indicate it is touch and go. If energy is the real thing, rather than dollars, there will not be enough money around in the shale future for a pay-out.

By the same token, if dollars continue to be accepted as the supreme measure of reality, the Kansas oil man may end up with a truck load of \$1,000 bills worth nothing. In other words the money-to-energy ratio loses connection with reality. People may end up trading goods and services rather than swapping depreciated dollars.

MR. ADAM PETERSEN

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, in visiting our beautiful Virgin Islands, certainly many of my colleagues have had the opportunity to enjoy the unique cultural traits of our people, particularly that of quadrille dancing.

One very understanding individual who is a significant contributor to the preservation and growth of this very popular performing art is Mr. Adam Petersen, affectionately known as "Mr. Adam," who is still very active at the age of 73. Mr. Adam is especially admired for his gifted talent in this traditional dance, his untiring efforts to pass on his knowledge to the younger generation, and his capable role as quadrille floor-master.

Mr. Adam only completed "book four" in what was then the Danish school system. Nevertheless, this fine man has always taken great pride in his work, despite a very unfortunate injury he had in 1951 when the middle section of his body was crushed by a loaded trailer while working at a local sugar factory. The fine qualities, and exemplary character of this man most certainly epitomizes the character and determination of the people of this great territory.

On my visit to the islands recently, I was most fortunate to attend a testimonial ceremony held for Mr. Adam and therefore join with all Virgin Islanders to pay our highest tribute to this fine citizen.

At this time, I wish to share with my colleagues the following article written by Ms. Hortense M. Rowe, commissioner of conservation and cultural affairs, which summarizes Mr. Adam's productive life and contributions:

The article is as follows:

ADAM PETERSEN

(By Hortense M. Rowe)

He was born November 15, 1900 at Estate Hope, St. Croix (now the site of Amerade-Hess Oil Refinery), and proudly boasts that he has never left the island, neither by plane nor by boat. "I have never travelled, not even as far as the Cay", meaning the Protestant Cay, the nearest land mass to Christiansted,

St. Croix. His parents raised him and were both natives of St. Croix. His mother Roslyn Williams died in 1941, and David Petersen his father in 1921; both were buried in the Christiansted Public Cemetery. He had four brothers and three sisters. The only other surviving member is his sister, Miss Elizabeth "Betty" Petersen of Frederiksted. His sister has three children, and four grandchildren, who are his nieces, nephew, and grandnieces.

He is affectionately known as "Mr. Adam", an active Roman Catholic and he has no children. He stands 6'3" tall. His trades include being a saddler, field-foreman, tractor operator, and floormaster. He has been a resident of the Herbert Grigg Home for the Aged since 1953, after a long illness.

EDUCATION

His education was at the Peter's Rest school, under the leadership of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph, the schoolmaster and schoolmistresses. He recalls very fondly that they came here from the "islands", referring to an island in the Eastern Caribbean unknown to him. He recalls also that unlike today his teachers resided on the school premises. Also mentioned were Georgiana Payne and Viola Petersen, an assistant schoolmistress. He completed Book Four, according to the system during the Danish times.

WORK EXPERIENCE

At Estate Castle Coakley, he was a part of a small gang they called 3rd class. After school, he would go home to get a bite and proceed into the fields to work earning four cents (\$.04) per afternoon, and on a holiday working all day he would earn eight cents (\$.08).

He chose the trade of a saddler, and told an interesting story as to why he left that trade at an early date to take up a job with his father as a water carrier, carrying water for the gang. The other jobs he occupied were, "direct hard work" with the "hoe and bill, also known as a Tommy Hawk", then to a "cartman". He later moved to Estate Bethlehem where he worked at the Sugar Factory as a "Coal timer" or "Fireman". These jobs were held from 1916 to 1929.

Between 1929 and 1934, he worked at the Public Works Department, Frederiksted, running an asphalt boiler. He returned to the sugar industry when he worked for the Virgin Islands Corporation (VICORP), from 1934 to 1951. He worked as a foreman in the fields until the time of his accident.

On Friday afternoon 24, of August 1951, he was the victim of a serious accident at Estate Bethlehem yard, when he fell under a trailer. The trailer was loaded with people and ran over the central portion of his body. The accident caused him to spend one year and twenty-five days in the Frederiksted Hospital. During this time he underwent both minor and major surgery.

SPECIAL WORK OCCUPATION

Today he is known to us as a master Floor-master. The motivation to this vocation was as a direct result of his love for dance and music as well as the respect he had for those men considered to be great in the field. He and a friend Ezekiel Sammuell wanted to emulate two older men who were friends like themselves. These men were the late George Richards, and Ambrius Williams.

He recalls also that during 1914 and 1915, after school Mr. George Richards kept dancing practices at a dancing house at Estate Jerusalem. A tent built with "posts" of cedar or manjack wood and coconut branches was constructed, this was known as a dancing house at that time. Dancing practice he defines as "an activity where people went to learn how to dance at a dance house". His friend Ezekiel Sammuell (deceased since 1923), and he wished to emulate two other friends namely George Richards, and Ambrius Williams". He describes Mr. Richards as

a "mannish" fellow, and he admired such people.

By 1917 "we were acquainted with the orders, and were qualified to go into the ring, and ironically both George Richards and Ambrias Williams stopped calling at that time". The two young pioneers set forth to call such dances as the Original Quadrille, all the different round dances, and the Pola Quadrille, also the Lancers.

From 1917 to July 3, 1951, he worked as a Floormaster, conducting his last dance at the famous dance hall in Christiansted, known as "Happy Hours". He recalls that 1966 was the first time he left the "Home" to go anywhere. Since his retirement to the Kingshill Home for the Aged, he has been active on a part-time basis. His activities involve an attempt to impart his knowledge to the young, the middle aged, and to old, who express a serious interest in learning to dance, as well as to call folk dances. He teaches at Kingshill, as well as outside. These persons include children at the St. Joseph High School, Mr. Milton Payne (his cousin), members of the St. Croix Cultural Dancers, Inc., and many others.

He explained that "one of the key things in teaching and calling, is the ability of the teacher or caller to be able to dance. If you the Floormaster is lively, then the dancers are bound to be lively also. I can no longer dance because of my past injuries, but please take note of this name, Mr. Vincent Harris". Thus, it was necessary for him to ask Vincent Harris, (brother of the deceased Ambrias Williams, one of his teachers) to assist him in teaching.

Today he feels very useful and insisted that I include in this short story of his life, those persons whom he feels indebted to forever, as in his words "they saved his life". He continued "to the best of my memory those persons are, Dr. Melvin Evans, Governor, Dr. Eller (deceased), Dr. Karrell, Dr. Conrad Stevens, Miss Ingeborg Nesbitt (deceased), Miss Octavia Bolling, Miss Clarissa Milligan, Miss Ina Pedro (now married), Mrs. Vera Allick Daniels, Mrs. Dolores Walcott Brewster, the staff and management of the Herbert Grigg Home for the Aged, and many many others."

He is seriously interested in "giving of his talent to persons interested, before it is too late," saying "when I go it goes with me, and it would be of no use to me, whereas, now I am happy and willing to give it to all who are interested."

Speaking of talent, he has high praise for Mr. Stanley Jacobs, the flutist. He recalls with pride that it took him three days to learn to play the Lancers, when I taught him. He considers him to be the only flutist on the island today qualified to play the Lancers. Another person he would like to work very closely with Mr. Ira Sammuell of Frederiksted, the saxophonist. He likes the way Mr. Sammuell plays one of his favorite songs, "Who been sen you go eat dove pork and okra fungi".

To Adam Peterson, a long, healthy, happy, and comfortable life.

PAN AM SUBSIDY SHOULD BE REJECTED

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial published in the Nashville Banner of Nashville, Tenn., points out that a proposed Federal subsidy of Pan American World Airways which President Ford has rejected would have

benefited only a favored few businessmen and tourists.

The editorial entitled "Pan Am Subsidy Rejection Just" contends that fewer than 6 percent of Americans have ever been abroad, and that the request for \$10 million per month subsidy for the airline would have disproportionately benefited businessmen and tourists who can afford to travel to foreign countries.

In addition, this editorial suggests a number of belt-tightening measures the airline can take to reduce its losses.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this vital and important matter, I place in the RECORD herewith a copy of the editorial.

The editorial follows:

PAN AM SUBSIDY REJECTION JUST

A giant step for all taxpayers was taken by President Ford in rejecting Pan American World Airways' plea for an emergency \$10 million-a-month emergency federal subsidy.

Not only that, the President even offered some suggestions as to how Pan Am might improve its foundering financial position.

Mr. Ford said the subsidy was unfair to taxpayers, a view shared by the Civil Aeronautics Board, which not only also rejected that subsidy, but ordered an investigation of Pan Am's financial and managerial practices.

The CAB also turned down an \$80 million-a-year subsidy request by Trans World Airlines.

Pan Am blames government policies for much of its difficulty, so it believes the government should bail it out.

Since 1969 the airline has lost money every year. These losses through 1973 total \$173 million. In the first half of 1974, its losses amounted to \$32.8 million. Pan Am has kept itself aloft through massive borrowing, but bank loans are harder to come by now.

Pan Am is not alone. TWA which, like Pan Am, is in international service, lost \$25.8 million in the first half-year of 1974.

Pan Am says its imminent financial crisis was triggered by the oil price increase. TWA also blames its dilemma on the soaring price of jet fuel.

The CAB said it was not convinced that Pan Am had taken "all the belt-tightening measures" necessary to ease its financial crisis. The administration offered some:

A campaign to persuade Americans to make overseas flights on U.S. airlines.

Fair hikes "more closely reflecting" rising airline costs.

Discussions of possible air route mergers with other airlines.

Agreements with foreign airlines to cut excessive passenger capacity.

It should be pointed out that fewer than 6 per cent of Americans have ever been abroad and the subsidies would have disproportionately favored trips of businessmen and of tourists who can afford a vacation in Europe.

Hopes of encouraging more travel abroad, however, have dimmed with an announced further 10 per cent hike in Atlantic fares, bringing total increases in 1974 to nearly 30 per cent.

Pan Am says it is hurt by subsidized foreign airlines. More than 30 major airlines serve overseas routes. About 65 per cent of all transatlantic passengers are Americans, yet Pan Am and TWA together get only about 45 per cent of the business.

Pan Am contends it must serve as many foreign cities as possible in order to maintain its reputation as the premier American international air carrier. Now this "prestige before profit" has come to haunt the airline. By law, it must serve all its routes or give them up, yet Pan Am is hanging on to all of them.

A better solution than dipping into the public purse would be a merger of Pan Am with another airline to provide the domestic feeder service that is vital to successful international service.

Instead of merging with TWA, which has been rumored, it seems to us it would be better for it to merge with a strong domestic carrier which is seeking international routes.

As Mr. Ford indicated, there is no reason for the American taxpayer to underwrite Pan Am's mistakes, even though some of the errors were compounded by poor federal policies, which could be corrected, or improved upon, with a revision of international air travel routes and rules which now encourage discrimination against American-flag carriers, and to promote efficiency rather than cut-throat competition.

DOMESTIC ENEMY NO. 2

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, all Americans—and we in the Congress especially—are very concerned with the causes of and solutions for inflation. A few months ago I inserted an article into the RECORD by Mr. A. W. Clausen, president of the Bank of America, because it represented what I thought was a unique approach to inflation—an approach that I thought was worthy of attention by those of us here in the Congress.

Now, another article has come to my attention which I believe represents another unique view of our economic problems—and because of my intention to insert items into the RECORD which will expand our scope of inquiry on this subject, I am pleased to insert an article by Mr. Arnold Saltzman, president of The Seagrave Corp. Mr. Saltzman is a well-respected member of the business community who has served four U.S. Presidents on a variety of economic and foreign policy assignments. The following article was printed in the New York Times, and it details some of Mr. Saltzman's views on our current economic plight.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 20, 1974]

DOMESTIC ENEMY No. 2

(By Arnold A. Saltzman)

We are suffering from two terrible illnesses—not just one.

We are being throttled by Recession, not only Inflation.

To improve one while we die from the other is not good medicine.

To say that the whole world has the same trouble is not true.

Germany and Japan have inflation but no unemployment.

Iran and Kuwait have no unemployment and a heck of a lot of our money. And they'll have lots more of our money while we keep discussing our make-believe energy program.

Since when is America satisfied to be less than the best, and do less than the best for its people?

Who says we can stand 6% or 7% unemployment before we react to the suffering of our people? Since when are Americans statistics instead of living, breathing, hungering individuals? One percent more unem-

ployment means that 900,000 fathers or mothers come home to face their families with no work—no money—no pride.

Since when is 12% interest rates the only way to cure inflation—or even the best? With 12% interest, we can't build housing. Without adequate housing, rents go up—and so does crime.

Of what use is a Monitoring Board to tell us what we already know—that prices are too high—and with no authority to roll them back?

It's time we got off the dime. It's time we looked to where we ought to be, not where we have been. It's time we realized how great and strong this country and its people are and stopped being afraid to do what is necessary to insure the future for ourselves and our children.

Let's expand with jobs for everyone, not contract into stagnation and hunger. Every day a man doesn't work, the potential wealth he creates—bricks, shoes, a sewing machine, bread,—is wasted. It's like pouring milk down a sewer.

We have not only money problems, we have people problems. Ask the employed people, "How do you feed husband, wife, and three children, drive to your jobs with 60¢ gasoline, and make the payments on your house with property taxes 300% higher than when you bought the house?"

Ask the unemployed people in Harlem, the South Bronx, Buffalo, and Long Island, how they feel about the advice to help cure inflation by "spending less." Ask the 25% of disadvantaged young people getting out of school with no jobs where they will get the self-confidence and hope to keep out of trouble.

Everybody needs something to look forward to, to have a reason to wake up in the morning. Telling us we need patience for two or three years is not good enough. There was a time when only the poor people were in deep trouble. Now there is trouble enough for everyone—including the factory owner who is half shut down because of shortages of commodities we ship out of our country.

We can eliminate Public Enemy No. 1 if No. 2 is sapping our strength and our will. We must and can destroy them both simultaneously.

Inflation and Recession can be cured by producing lots more of everything—not creating scarcity.

Inflation and Recession can be cured by first keeping for ourselves everything we need and shipping only the excess out of the country.

Inflation and Recession can be cured by reducing the interest rate which at 12% and more contributes to Inflation and Recession both.

Simultaneously, Government must legislate real price, wage, rent, interest, money and export controls.

Government should roll back the prices of all grains and soybeans and thus reduce the price of bread as well as milk, meat, cheese, eggs and poultry. Subsidizing the farmer is by far the cheapest place to reduce food costs.

Government should buy all surplus food for export and make the profit instead of the speculator. Such profit can help with subsidies and with bonuses for increased production.

Our Government refuses to establish real controls. Big Business—Big Labor—Big Agriculture don't want them. But who speaks for people?

Trying to starve Inflation feeds Recession. Trying to starve Recession feeds Inflation. We must tackle them both together and with strong medicine. Our country is still strong and rich. We will get out of this mess when the people understand the facts and the politicians face up to them.

The media and your Government are not getting and sending the messages to and from the people.

That's the reason for this message.

That's why, as a concerned citizen, not running for anything, I'm raising my voice, and ask that you do the same now. Tell Washington, and Albany, and your Mayor, newspaper and TV station that the American people are not afraid to carry the burden of renewing America's greatness. All we ask is that the burdens be equally shared.

SEND FERTILIZER, NOT JUST FOOD, TO STARVING COUNTRIES

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the recent world population conference did not produce solutions to the problems of a population explosion, it did heighten awareness of world food supplies becoming more and more inadequate.

With nature's devastating effects on this year's crops, the prospects of world wide food shortages are suddenly very real. It is hoped that some global food policy can be evolved at the upcoming World Food Conference in Rome, but long-range planning coupled with international cooperation will be essential.

In this context, I would like to insert a thought-provoking column from the Buffalo Courier-Express of September 20, 1974.

SEND FERTILIZER, NOT JUST FOOD, TO STARVING COUNTRIES

(By Peter C. Andrews)

WASHINGTON.—Buffalo's internationally recognized food production expert, Dr. Raymond Ewell, at a recent hearing in Congress pointed out that it would be much more efficient for the United States and other industrial nations to ship fertilizer to the starving nations of the world than to send them food.

Of course, this requires a little advance planning, since people cannot eat fertilizer, and in emergency situations food shipments may be necessary, but the food-short areas of the world are relatively predictable. With this fact, it simply becomes a question of sending those nations with food problems the required amount of fertilizer and let them grow their own food—which they could do in a year if they use proper methods.

It may seem strange, but in the last few weeks, food has become widely recognized as being as important as oil in international diplomacy. As a matter of fact, it is one of the major weapons in the United States economic arsenal.

The importance of food is underscored by the fact that the total population of the world is expected to increase from the present 4 billion to 6.5 billion by the year 2000. Of this 2.5 billion increase, 2.1 billion is expected to be in the developing countries, which by and large have not yet taken advantage of the use of fertilizer to increase food production.

President Ford and Secretary of State Kissinger have both made a major point of stressing food in international relations in recent speeches.

The most important single factor in increased food production in the last 20 years has been the increased use of fertilizer.

There is an acute world fertilizer shortage, which Dr. Ewell thinks will probably be with us the rest of the foreseeable future of mankind.

One of the primary reasons for this is that it takes enormous amounts of capital to build

modern fertilizer plants. The world capital expenditure needed to build fertilizer plants this year is \$8 billion, according to Dr. Ewell, and this will rise to about \$12 billion per year by 1980, he adds.

The production of nitrogen fertilizer in the next four years will increase 6 per cent a year, while demand will increase 9 per cent a year.

An optimistic note, he states, is that through the use of fertilizer, world food production can be made to increase at a faster rate than the anticipated rise of total world population.

During the last 20 years, although the world population has increased 48 per cent, total grain production per capita has increased 20 per cent because grain production has increased 77 per cent. This was accomplished largely through a 345 per cent increase in the use of fertilizer, Dr. Ewell observed.

It should be noted, however, that the developed countries of the world (U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Europe, etc., 30 countries in all) have been getting most of the benefit from the increased world grain production. The population of those countries in the last 20 years has increased 25 per cent while grain production per capita has increased 49 per cent.

The developing countries (China, India, Brazil, Mexico, Nigeria, etc., 106 countries in all) have made only a 5 per cent gain in grain production per capita during this period and have had a population increase of 59 per cent.

It is interesting to note that many of the starving countries in the world have it within their power to lift themselves out of this dilemma by converting into nitrogen fertilizer the large supplies of natural gas they are now wastefully burning off in flares.

Of course, the nations with the largest unused supplies of natural gas are those oil-rich Arab nations that are now causing world economic disruption through their high oil pricing policies. They could put some of their vast oil revenues into the building of fertilizer plants and thereby alleviate some of the world food shortage—and increase still further their stranglehold on a vital factor in world economics.

The complex equipment needed in modern fertilizer plants is only produced by the developed nations of the world—the U.S., Europe, the U.S.S.R. and Japan. But since these are the nations that need a major export to pay for their oil consumption needs, the manufacture of this equipment would be of benefit to both the buying and the selling nations.

The economics of sending fertilizer instead of food to starving nations is pointed out by Dr. Ewell's calculations that the fertilizer needed to produce 4½ million tons of wheat costs only \$230 million, but sending the wheat itself would cost \$760 million.

China, that new addition to the world superpowers, was about even with India in food production in the middle 1950s. It has less land under cultivation than India does, and yet through the more efficient use of fertilizers, produces substantially more food today than India does now and is able to feed her population of 800 million while India, with (only) 600 million, is starving.

There is a lesson for all of us here.

THE BARTLETT ANTI-ABORTION AMENDMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the conferees will meet again tomorrow on H.R.

15580 the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill. They are facing the important decision on whether or not to include the Bartlett amendment of the Senate version in the final measure. That amendment prohibits the direct or indirect use of funds appropriated under the act "to pay for or encourage the performance of abortions," except in cases where the mother's life is endangered.

This amendment, if passed, could have far-reaching consequences for groups such as all Medicaid recipients, and those served by Community Health Services, Public Health Service hospitals, and Community Mental Health Centers, among others. It further raises problems concerning the instruction of abortion techniques by medical schools receiving HEW funds—as virtually all of them do, and the performance of abortions by hospitals and other health facilities functioning under HEW-supported programs.

Finally, the language of the amendment permits no exceptions for women who have had rubella during pregnancy or for victims of rape. The Bartlett amendment thus effectively prohibits the constitutional right to abortion from being made available equally to all American women. Therefore, I urge the conferees to exclude it from the conference report on H.R. 15580.

To further illuminate this issue, I wish to share with my colleagues an article which appeared last Friday in the Washington Post. It illustrates the profound effect which the Bartlett amendment would have upon abortion services in the District of Columbia. Such stark predictions of its consequences for one urban area should offer us insight into the Bartlett amendment's potentially deleterious effects upon our Nation as a whole. The article follows.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 27, 1974]

ABORTION FUND CUTOFF OPPOSED
(By Elizabeth Becker)

Congressional efforts to cut off federal medical aid for abortions would apparently affect thousands of low income women in Washington, according to city statistics.

From July 1, 1973, through June, 1974, Medicaid paid for 5,626 abortions in the District of Columbia, the city said yesterday. The year before, 4,759 abortions were covered by the federal program, according to Department of Human Resources statistics.

The so-called Bartlett Amendment to the House Labor and Health Education and Welfare appropriations bills, now awaiting committee action, would prohibit the use of Medicaid funds for abortions.

The bill's sponsor, Sen. Dewey Bartlett (R-Okla.), has said that he felt it was wrong to make the taxpayer foot the bill for abortion and his office said the senator is totally against abortion. Yesterday, the House Appropriations Committee adjourned without taking action on this or 97 other amendments.

The National Association for the Repeal of Abortion Laws is lobbying against the amendment on the grounds that it is unconstitutional.

"In two cases before U.S. District Courts this year, judges ruled that public funding limitations violate the equal protection of poor women who seek to terminate pregnancies," said Gall Rosenberg, co-director of the abortion law repeal association.

Directors of several Washington abortion clinics say they are opposed to the amendment.

"In the D.C. area in particular the effect will seem discriminatory because most Medicaid abortion patients are black," said Gretchen Wharton of the Hillcrest Abortion Clinic whose patients are primarily black and many on welfare.

Under a District Court ruling, Washington was one of the first cities to have liberal abortion regulations, and in 1971 became a center for women from states in the South and East where abortions were banned. About 40,000 abortions were performed here in 1972, according to the most recent city statistics.

In 1973 the Supreme Court ruled that abortion was a matter between a woman and her physician during the first three months of pregnancy. The number of abortions in Washington seems to have dropped since the ruling by about 25 per cent, according to clinic directors.

"Our volume has stabilized," said Liz Abernathy of Preston Clinic, "and we begun concerning ourselves with the quality of abortions. This (Bartlett) amendment would be a real setback."

All the clinics have some sort of deferred payment system to cover the women who can't afford an abortion and aren't covered by Medicaid.

"We can all provide some free abortions but we can't take up that load if the amendment passes," said Lee Mersh of Washington Hospital Center's Woman's Clinic. "We're talking about a lot of unwanted pregnancies."

Besides attacking the amendment as unconstitutional, the abortion law repeal group and abortion clinics say it is impractical.

"Instead of spending federal funds on abortions, the government will be financing unwanted children for 18 years since most women on Medicaid are also on welfare," said Florence Kissling of the Laurel Clinic.

A number of former Hillcrest Abortion Clinic patients, both on or ineligible for Medicaid have written to congressmen saying they would rather pay for abortions than provide welfare for unwanted children.

"But I don't think women will have their unwanted babies even if the amendment passes," said Kissling. "The bill will send the poor to someone who does a bad job or force women to start self-aborting as they did years ago."

OPPOSITION TO MASS TRANSIT OPERATING AID IS PENNYWISE BUT POUND FOOLISH

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Ford administration has been increasing the level of rhetoric in opposition to operating subsidies for mass transit systems. This is an unfortunate and contradictory stance for the President to take, given his expressed desire to reduce inflation. When the Congress considered the Federal Mass Transit Assistance Act of 1974, I argued that assisting mass transit systems was anti-inflationary.

The House, however, at the insistence of the White House, slashed operating assistance funding, and now the bill, even in its skeletal state, faces a Presidential veto.

Otto Eckstein, who served on the Council of Economic Advisers during the Johnson administration, has found, on the basis of a just concluded economic study, that it would be pennywise but pound foolish to stop the use of Federal mass transit funds to meet operating deficits.

I include herewith an article which appeared in the September 25 edition of the New York Daily News describing Mr. Eckstein's findings:

FINDS WE ALL WOULD SAVE BY TRANSIT AID

WASHINGTON, September 24.—The Ford administration's opposition to the use of federal funds to help the nation's mass-transit systems meet operating deficits may turn out to be penny-wise but pound foolish, according to economist Otto Eckstein.

Eckstein, of Harvard, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers during the Johnson administration, has concluded after looking at all the facts that it would be less inflationary for the government to provide the operating subsidies than to sit back and do nothing.

Using an economic "model" perfected by his firm, Data Resources, Inc., he forecasted that the Consumer Price Index would be slightly lower in 1975 and 1976 if operating subsidies were approved by Congress than if they were not.

Nationally, the difference is not significant—a 16.7% rise in consumer prices over the two years with the subsidies, as opposed to a 16.8% hike without them. But the impact is much greater in individual localities like New York City.

If the present 35-cent fare was raised by 25 cents to cover the Transit Authority's 1974-75 operating shortage of \$266 million, Eckstein says it would mean 28% more inflation for the New York-Northern New Jersey area over the next year.

Among other things, the economist warns that the higher fare would mean a loss of 10,200 manufacturing jobs in New York City alone. Ridership would decline 15% to 20%, he predicts, and those still using the subways to commute to work would be paying almost double for the privilege, triggering pay hikes linked to the Cost of Living Index. Those switching to cars would add to the city's traffic congestion and air pollution.

New York Mayor Beame will be armed with the Eckstein study when he appears before an extraordinary public hearing of a Senate and House conference committee tomorrow to plead for a stopgap appropriation to help save the 35-cent fare for New York.

In citing the Eckstein findings, Beame will make the point that New York is not alone in its need for federal transit operating subsidies. He will point out that transit fares in the 23 largest cities in the nation account for 1% of the Consumer Price Index.

FATHER RICHARD MADDEN OF YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, CELEBRATES 25TH ANNIVERSARY AS A PRIEST

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 22, 1974, Father Richard R. Madden, O.C.D., nationally known retreat master and founding superior of the Carmelite Monastery in Youngstown, Ohio, celebrated the 25th anniversary of his ordination into the priesthood.

A jubilee mass was concelebrated for Father Madden at St. Columba Cathedral, followed by a reception at Powers Auditorium which was attended by more than 500 of Father Madden's relatives, friends, and well-wishers.

Father Madden was ordained on December 14, 1949, in Washington, D.C.,

by Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle. An accomplished writer, Father Madden has authored three books: "Father Madden's Life of Christ," "Men in Sandals," and "A Boy and His Teens," countless articles, including a weekly column that ran 18 years in Hi Time magazine, a magazine used nationally by high school CCD students, and he has served as editor of Mt. Carmel magazine.

In addition, Father Madden is an instructor of the Carmelite minor seminary in Washington, vocations and rector at the minor seminary in Holy Hill, Wis., 1951-57, and helped found the St. Theresa Monastery in 1957, serving as superior until 1960. He was reelected superior in 1969 and still holds the position.

As a retreat master, Father Madden has worked with Air Force men and high school students throughout the United States and in foreign lands. He has worked with juvenile delinquents and prison inmates as well. He has served on the board of the "Jobs for Vets" campaign and the Northeast Ohio Drug Abuse Commission. A recipient of the Don Bosco Award for his nationwide influence on youth, Father Madden is listed in the Who's Who of American Catholics.

Last year, Father Madden gave the opening prayer in the U.S. House of Representatives. Father Madden's prayer contained an important message, and I insert his prayer in the RECORD at this time:

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Richard R. Madden, superior, Carmelite Monastery, Youngstown, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, so many times we stand before You, as now, and say nothing. So many times, we praise You with our lips, while our minds are far from You. But at this moment, we beg You, hear us.

You have entrusted us with high dignity. You have made us the fond hope of our great land. Give us the wisdom to understand that we are only Your instruments—that You use our hands, our eyes, and our minds to accomplish Your will. And let us never forget that far more important than our own personal needs are the needs of our people, who have no one but us.

Help us know that you made an imperfect world deliberately, so that each one of us, by our integrity, by our strength, and by our love, might add our finest touch to Your great masterpiece. In Jesus' name. Amen.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my sincere congratulations and best wishes to Father Madden for the great service he has performed to the Catholic Church and for his fellow man.

INCOME AND EXPENSE TAX INFORMATION SUMMARY

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, my income and expense records for the years 1971, 1972, and 1973 are submitted herewith along with a statement of my current assets and liabilities:

Item	Year		
	1971	1972	1973
Congressional salary.....	\$42,500	\$42,500	\$42,500
Honoraria.....	150	0	2,500
Dividends and interest (less exclusions).....	1,226	1,345	1,482
Net income from commercial real estate.....	4,060	5,405	5,134
Net capital loss.....	(1,000)	0	0
Miscellaneous income (loss).....	885	249	(1,126)
Adjustment to income (travel expense etc.).....	(8,231)	(8,644)	(7,047)
Adjusted gross income.....	39,590	40,855	43,443
Itemized deductions claimed.....	(7,459)	(7,889)	(8,762)
Exemptions claimed.....	(3,375)	(3,750)	(3,750)
Taxable income.....	28,756	29,216	30,931
Federal income tax paid.....	7,161	7,539	8,243
California income tax paid.....	1,398	1,899	1,722

Net worth statement as of July 31, 1974, for John H. Rousselet

Assets:	
Bank accounts.....	\$7,480
Commercial real estate estimated fair-market value.....	110,000
Other assets.....	30,531
Total assets.....	148,011
Liabilities:	
Accounts and notes payable.....	\$12,793
Trust deeds payable on real estate.....	45,050
Lease deposit.....	1,050
Total liabilities.....	59,447
Net worth.....	88,564
Total.....	148,011

SAVING FARMLAND: A NATIONAL PROBLEM

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly apparent in recent years that one of the most pressing problems facing this country is the loss of prime agricultural land to development of all kinds. Indeed, each month thousands of acres of farmland are being lost from food and fiber production under the constant pressure of suburban sprawl and speculative development. In addition, with the corresponding rise in property taxes that often precedes and accompanies development, many farmers are finding it economically impossible to remain on the land and farm.

At a time when food demand is rising, this problem is becoming a national issue that affects every citizen. The facts speak for themselves: In California 375 acres of land is lost to development daily; in New Jersey, "America's Garden State", nearly 44 percent of the farmland has been bulldozed since 1950; and in the Nation as a whole cropland is being lost at such a rate that if left unchecked there will be none at all within 100 years. This land cannot be replaced.

The question we must ask ourselves in the light of increasing food shortages and rising food prices is whether we, as a nation, can let this irrational waste of our most valuable resource go on? I submit that we cannot, and that we must direct our efforts on the national, State and local level to reverse this trend.

A recent article in Audubon magazine by Constance Stallings entitled "There Are Ways To Protect Our Vanishing Farmland" provides an excellent description of the problem and of some of the various ways in which we may save this Nation's indispensable croplands. I submit it to the Members' attention:

THERE ARE WAYS TO PROTECT OUR VANISHING FARMLAND

(By Constance Stallings)

It may not be strictly true that what's good for the farmer is good for the country, but the statement is more valid than for an automobile manufacturer. Not everybody drives, but everybody has to eat.

When the value of farmland increases, so does the price of food. And the value of American farmland has been increasing since World War II as more and more of it disappears—turned into housing developments and shopping centers.

The decline has other implications. The agricultural industry accounts for substantial employment. Farmers contribute to tax rolls. Most people prefer a local supply of fresh produce to canned and jarred commodities. Farms are buffers between expressways and suburbia. Not least of all, preserving farmland assures a legacy of open space.

Farmland typically vanishes like this: City-wear people move into developments in the country. Frequently these are "leap-frog" subdivisions whose builders have jumped over farmland to areas where land is cheap, the taxes are low, and the local government has done little about zoning. Residents of the new developments soon demand sewers, schools, street lights, better roads, more fire and police protection.

To finance these services, the communities raise property taxes on surrounding farmland. But the farmers' income remains static as their tax bills rise. Some give up and sell to land speculators, who eventually sell to developers at a big profit. The developers build more houses, new residents demand more services, and local officials again raise taxes.

In a few years all the farms are gone, and the green environment that was the suburbanites' mecca dwindles to a point where it is not much of an improvement over the cities they fled. So they look for another community to move to, farther into the country, and the process begins again.

Meanwhile, although there is less productive farmland, the demand for food keeps growing because the population keeps growing. Last January the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced that the number of American farms had declined 18 percent during the previous ten years. With increased demand and decreased supply, the price of food goes up and up.

Many states have tried various ways of keeping the farmer down on the farm. Nine states have preferential assessment laws, according to a recent Department of Agriculture report. The land is assessed on its value for agricultural production rather than its potential as housing sites or shopping centers. New Hampshire's 1973 open space law may be the most thorough; it applies not only to farmland but to forests, wetlands, flood plains, and recreation land.

Agricultural assessments often are coupled with tax deferrals; if a farmer eventually sells his property, he pays the difference in taxes between its agricultural value and its market value for a retroactive number of years. States with such laws include New Jersey, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Michigan, and California. A few states, among them Hawaii and California, have established agricultural zones or conservation districts, where farmers pledge not to sell out for a specified length of time.

Vermont has linked property taxes to the landowner's income, enabling poor and elderly farmers to stay put when the selling price

of land around them skyrocketed. And to discourage speculators from buying land with the intention of selling quickly at a big profit, the state established an enormous capital gains tax—as high as 60 percent—on land sales. Vermont hopes to protect farmland further by requiring permits that are granted only after developers meet stringent environmental requirements.

Another promising method of keeping farms farmed is the purchase of development rights by the taxing government. The farmer still owns and works the land and pays his taxes. This scheme is the successor to the scenic easement, which conservationists touted during the 1960s.

But the surest way to control use of land is to buy it. During the 1960s the National Capital Commission in Canada purchased 37,000 acres of farmland around Ottawa and leased it back to farmers. The province of Saskatchewan, after losing 42 percent of its farms in two decades, is operating a multi-million-dollar land bank: it buys farmland from the poor and elderly and leases it at an annual 5 percent of the purchase price (with an option to buy) to young people who are eager to farm but lack the capital. Officials claim they are saving Canada's farms from being devoured by American corporations.

Purchase and leaseback of farmland has been studied in the United States, but not adopted anywhere. Reasons abound. Professor William L. Park, head of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Marketing at Rutgers University, in New Jersey, says: "In my opinion it would not be a very satisfying arrangement for the farmer. Leasing rates could become a problem. Also unless the farmer is given a long-term lease, like 99 years, he's not going to have the incentive to care for the land and upgrade his facilities."

Professor Howard E. Conklin of the Department of Agricultural Economics at New York's Cornell University finds other drawbacks. "Once the government owned title, do-gooder organizations would come in and say, 'Since the people own the land, we shouldn't use migratory labor. We shouldn't use pesticides, either.' Once the public owns the land they will quickly make it economically unfeasible to farm it."

Nevertheless, purchasing and leaseback almost became a reality in Suffolk County on eastern Long Island. Suffolk has long been New York's most important agricultural county, growing everything from cauliflower and lettuce to nursery stock and sod. Potatoes are the biggest crop; the people of Suffolk like to tell you it is the third largest after Aroostook, Maine, and Boise, Idaho.

What has happened to Suffolk since World War II is a familiar story.

Suburbia first swallowed up the rich potato farms of Nassau County, immediately to the west. Today Nassau is 96 percent developed, buried under housing tracts, neon strips, and shopping centers. Then the bedroom communities jumped into Suffolk as the extension of highways made commuting feasible. For 20 years Suffolk has had the greatest growth rate of any country in the United States. In 1973, building permits for a thousand new houses were issued in just one 89,000-acre town, Southampton.

According to the New York Department of Agriculture and Markets, the statewide decline in farmland from 1963 to 1973 was 30 percent. In Suffolk County, the number of acres being farmed fell from 123,346 in 1950 to 68,000 in 1972, a drop of almost 45 percent, and today there are only 45,000 acres left in production. The growing days of those farms, moreover, are numbered. In one town alone, Riverhead, speculators have purchased 10,000 of the 18,000 acres of farmland left; the original owners remain only as interim tenant farmers.

In January 1972, Suffolk's new county executive, John V. N. Klein, decided to face the problem. "I was flying in a helicopter and was awe-struck by the tremendous value of the

farmland from not only an economic but an environmental standpoint. I decided to salvage as much as possible. In my first annual report I proposed that we preserve farmland, and I formed a committee of 14 farmers to identify their problems and determine how we could deal with them." The result was a plan, approved by the county legislature, to acquire 9,000 acres of farmland for \$45 million over a period of three years.

But the farmers of Suffolk County were not enthusiastic. Many were apprehensive about the possibility of unilateral action by the county once it held title.

Klein and his Agricultural Advisory Committee kept on, however. "We consider every approach"—from local agricultural districts, to scenic easements, to legislation in Congress reforming farmers' inheritance taxes. Ultimately, there was a major switch in emphasis. Suffolk's Farm Preservation Plan now is based on the purchase of development rights. The county will acquire all rights except ownership and use of the land for farming.

Klein estimates that development rights constitute 80 percent of a property's value. When a farmer sells those rights, his taxes will become proportionately lower. Additionally, his heirs will not be forced to liquidate to pay steep inheritance taxes. And by selling his development rights he will receive an equity he can use to expand his operation by buying other farmland.

Suffolk County will not have to use condemnation proceedings, Klein believes. "There is sufficient support within the farming industry so that we'll have more real estate than we can handle." Priority will be given to farms of more than 200 acres or to adjacent farms which amass 200 acres, and the county has budgeted \$60 million to obtain development rights to 12,000 acres over the next four years.

Klein has received inquiries about the Long Island program from 30 states. It is obvious that Suffolk County has taken an important lead in land-use control. And the State of New Jersey may not be far behind.

The reason for New Jersey's shrinking farmland is its geography. It not only has several large cities of its own, but it is adjacent to New York City and Philadelphia. Ten thousand New Jersey farms disappeared between 1951 and 1961. Special agricultural assessments and tax rollbacks have slowed the process but have failed to solve the problem. According to Professor Park at Rutgers, "Forty-two percent of New Jersey's farmland has been lost during the past 20 years." New Jersey and imports 85 percent of its food supply—a disgraceful comedown for America's Garden State.

In 1971 New Jersey's governor appointed a 21-member commission to develop recommendations for preserving the one million acres of farmland that was left. Its report pointed out that: agriculture exists in the public interest; New Jersey farmers don't need New Jersey because they can sell and farm somewhere else, but New Jersey needs its farmers; agriculture provides tax-paying open space; New Jersey's rich crops of blueberries, tomatoes, corn, and asparagus are highly desirable to local consumers; \$1 billion a year of the state's income is dependent on agriculture; and farms are a good way to preserve land for future generations.

The commission recommended a "development easement purchase plan" under which each New Jersey municipality would be required to set aside 70 percent of its prime farms in open-space preserves. The land could be used only for agriculture and related purposes, and the owners could sell their development rights to the state. The purchase would be financed by a four-mill real estate transfer tax that would bring in \$26 million. In effect, New Jersey would tax escalating real estate values to pay for saving its farms.

The Farm Bureau Federation, New Jer-

sey's major farm organization, has endorsed the plan; and in a straw vote of 3,200 visitors at the New Jersey Flower and Garden Show in Morristown, 97 percent favored establishing agricultural open-space preserves and buying development rights, while 84 percent favored a transfer tax as the method of financing.

Some individual farmers are still extremely apprehensive about the plan. "I can't blame them," says Professor Park. "We're talking about a lot of land. But unless something is done, New Jersey's agriculture has numbered days."

The success of this and other schemes for keeping farmland in production will do much to determine the ability of the United States to preserve its fertile land, and will even affect its ability to remain a bounteous source of food for a shortage-plagued world.

TINIAN "WE LOVE AMERICA COMMITTEE"

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, as the ongoing negotiations between the United States and the residents of the Northern Marianas proceed to a conclusion, it is only natural that individuals with widely differing opinions will speak out.

Earlier this month, at the request of the duly-appointed officials and several residents of the island of Tinian, I inserted in the RECORD a statement of their concern over the plans by the Department of Defense to occupy two-thirds of that island for a military base.

Today, I insert in the RECORD another side of the coin, so to speak. This time, I am pleased to receive the request of the members of the "We Love America Committee" of Tinian. These individuals have presented to me a petition signed by other Tinian residents who urge that status negotiations between our country and theirs proceed swiftly. The agreement would provide for the establishment of a major military facility on Tinian in return for a Commonwealth status with the United States for the North Marianas Islands. In recent weeks, others on the island have voiced their disapproval of the proposal to take two-thirds of the island for military purposes and the relocation of the village of San Jose. The "We Love America Committee" wishes to take this opportunity to express their support of the Marianas Political Status Commission efforts to establish more permanent ties with the Northern Marianas.

In this day and age, it is not often that Americans are privileged to encounter such overt enthusiasm for our goals amongst foreigners. I, for one, find it gratifying to know that there are individuals who are desirous of being a part of the American Commonwealth Community.

Thank you.

The petition follows:

WE LOVE AMERICA COMMITTEE,
Tinian, M.I., July 10, 1974.

Hon. Jose R. Cruz,
Tinian Representative to the Marianas Political Status Commission, Tinian, M.I.

DEAR MR. CRUZ: The undersigned, WE LOVE AMERICA COMMITTEE, respectfully submits the enclosed PETITION OF TINIAN PROC-

LAMATION, dated May 29, 1974, and signed by two hundred six (206) Tinian qualified voters, of which please forward same to the U.S. Ambassador Franklin Haydn Williams for his kind attention and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Antonio S. Borja, Chairman; Leonardo F. Diaz, Member; Jose B. King, Member; Mrs. Ann SN. Cruz, Member; Maria Evangelista (Mrs.) Member; Juan C. Villagomez, Member; Harry L. Cruz, Member; Alfonso Borja, Member; Jose Pangelinan, Member; Juan B. King, Member; Manuel Dela Cruz, Member; Paulino SN. Manglona, Member.

TINIAN PROCLAMATION

We, the undersigned, of legal age, citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and residents of Tinian, Mariana Islands District, do hereby proclaim as follows:

1. That we do not share the decisions reached by the Tinian Proclamation, dated May 19, 1974, instituted by the Tinian Committee for Justice; and
2. When the Tinian Proclamation, dated May 19, 1974, was circulated, it was written in English and was never translated nor fully explained to us; and
3. The Tinian Committee for Justice exerted undue influence and coercion to gain public support and more particularly in obtaining signatures on the document; and
4. We recognize and respect the mandate of the Marianas Political Status Commission as the duly constituted body to negotiate for all the people of the Mariana Islands District with the United States to develop a status of commonwealth of the Marianas; and
5. The undersigned support the Marianas Political Status Commission in its efforts to represent and negotiate for the people of the Mariana Islands District of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and
6. We supported the original United States proposal to relocate the village of San Jose, and we recognize the benefits that would have accrued to the people of Tinian by such relocation; and
7. We recognize the many advantages from the establishment of a Multi-Service Military Complex on Tinian; and
8. We, the undersigned, hereby urge the Marianas Political Status Commission to negotiate and reach decisions in the many important areas of close association such as land needs, economic needs, political status, and transition to and for the benefit of all the people of the Mariana Islands District.

Dated this 29th day of May, 1974.

Signed by Jose B. King and 206 others.

VIC MILLER: ATTORNEY GENERAL

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the office of attorney general of the State of Wisconsin has been blessed with men of exceptional capability over the years. Our distinguished colleague, VERNON THOMSON, has held that post, as have three lawyers who are now Federal judges, John Reynolds, Thomas Fairchild, and Robert Warren.

Bob Warren has been confirmed by the Senate, and he will take over his new duties as Federal judge on October 8. To replace him as State attorney general, Gov. Patrick Lucey has selected a man I am proud to count as one of my constituents, Attorney Victor A. Miller of St. Nazianz. That the Governor would

make the decision to reach out to Vic Miller and ask him to accept this position on an interim basis until a new attorney general is elected is, I think, a tribute to Vic's special qualities and his extraordinary talents. Immediate past president of the State Bar of Wisconsin and a practicing attorney for more than 34 years, he has gained the deep respect of all those who know him.

I commend to your attention an article from the September 13 Manitowoc Herald-Tribune-Reporter on Vic Miller:

MILLER IS INTERIM ATTORNEY GENERAL

Atty. Victor A. Miller, 58, of St. Nazianz, immediate past president of the 9,000 member State Bar of Wisconsin and a practicing attorney for more than 34 years, has been appointed interim attorney general by Governor Patrick J. Lucey.

Miller will replace Atty. Gen. Robert Warren who resigns Oct. 8 to become federal judge of the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Warren will be in office until within an hour of taking office as a new federal judge at Milwaukee, and Miller will then officially be the new attorney general.

The governor's office called Miller about a week ago regarding the appointment. The interim assignment will be until Jan. 1, 1975.

Normally, the interim appointment might have gone to deputy Atty. Gen. David Mebane, but he has been appointed a U.S. Attorney and is expected to assume that job soon.

"We've talked about a briefing session with Warren prior to the changeover," Miller said Friday.

Miller emphasized that he will continue his law practice.

"I don't plan to surrender my residence here or my concern for my community and this area, as this is only very temporary, and I have no great governmental ambitions beyond that," Miller stated.

"I do this out of a sense of duty and a lawyer's respect for the office," Miller said.

Except for work with the Democratic Party and concern for government, Miller has never been a candidate for political office.

Governor Lucey said earlier that he was considering appointing the winner of Tuesday's Democratic primary for attorney general to the interim post, but the four candidates all said they would prefer not being named.

However, Lucey is expected to appoint the winner of the November election to serve the rest of Warren's term, so Miller's service will probably be brief.

The candidates are former Atty. Gen. Bronson LaFollette, a Madison Democrat, and Republican State Sen. Gerald Lorge of Bear Creek.

"The attorney general has a staff of over 400 people," Miller noted. "He heads the Department of Justice which is of legislative creation, and spans activities ranging from training in law enforcement to investigating practices of corporations."

The department also cooperates with local law enforcement officers in crime detection and solution, Miller said.

"The job (of attorney general) has two faces," Miller stated. "On the one hand you are counsel for the state and on the other the State Legislature has moved the whole Department of Justice into that office."

Miller plans to be the chief counsel of the state "and that will be top priority," he stated.

"The state needs advice of counsel and its departments require it. That must be an independent and totally impartial judgment," Miller declared.

"I am an interim appointment, but that office demands daily concern and I plan to be totally committed to the concerns of that

office as if I was full term," Miller also declared.

He said he could recall no other such (internship) situation for the attorney general's office in the past.

"The state has had many great lawyers in this position and three are currently on the federal bench," Miller said, naming Judge John Reynolds, Thomas Fairchild and now Warren. He also noted that Vernon Thompson, another former attorney general, is now in Congress.

Miller earned a degree in business administration in 1938 and his law degree in 1940 from Marquette University, and has practiced law in St. Nazianz since he and his son, John have a law firm there.

Early in his career he became recognized as a farm tax and farm law expert and has lectured extensively on these subjects.

He currently is advisor to the regional commissioner of Internal Revenue and formerly to the State Department of Internal Revenue.

Miller also currently is a member of the Consumer Credit Review Board of the State Department of Banking.

He has continued his interest in the farm equipment business and is now on the National Dealer Council of the International Harvester Co.

Miller is an officer of the John Miller Supply Co. He recently received a 25 year award from the Pontiac Division of General Motors.

Miller, who was appointed to the Board of State Bar Commissioners for a term of seven years in August, 1971, said he will continue to complete this seven year term.

He is vice president of the St. Nazianz State Bank and in April, 1974 was named to the Equestrian Order of the Knights of St. Gregory by Pope Paul VI. This is one of the highest orders a Catholic layman may receive in the church.

Attorney and Mrs. Miller, the former Isabel Gimm of Whitelaw, have five children, Attorney John Miller, a Georgetown University graduate; Mrs. Patrick (Mary) Caldwell, in Germany where her husband is a captain in the U.S. Air Force; Jane, who is working at Madison; Meg, a recent graduate of Northwestern University with a bachelor of arts degree is now working in the Manitowoc County area and planning to continue her education in the study of the aging at some university later this year, and Mark, a senior at JFK Prep.

AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE REFORM AMENDMENTS

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today offering several amendments to the resolutions reforming the structure, jurisdiction, and procedures of the committees of the House of Representatives. It seems to me that committee reform is probably a good thing and my amendments are offered to cure, what I consider to be, certain defects in the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974. My amendments:

First, strike out the provision of only one major committee for each Member; Second, puts administration of the Panama Canal Zone back into the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries where it formerly was; and

Third, takes Subversive Activities from the Committee on Government Operations and puts it in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Copies of the proposed amendments follow. They are drawn so as to apply

either to House Resolution 988 or to House Resolution 1321, as the case may be. Points 2 and 3 above, in each case, require two amendments. Texts of the amendments are as follows:

Amendments to House Resolution 988 by Mr. Dennis:

No. 1. Page 39, line 19, strike out lines 19 through 24 inclusive, and on page 40 strike out lines 1 and 2.

No. 2. Page 10, lines 8 and 9, strike out in lines 8 and 9 the words "and the administration and Government of the Canal Zone".

No. 3. Page 16, after line 2, insert the following: "(7) The Administration and Government of the Canal Zone."

And renumber subsequent lines accordingly.

No. 4. Page 11, strike out lines 12 and 13.

No. 5. Page 14, after line 7, insert the following:

"(19) Communist and other subversive activities affecting the internal security of the United States."

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1321 by Mr. DENNIS

No. 1. Page 41, line 1, strike out lines 1 through 8 inclusive.

No. 2. Page 11, strike out in lines 18 and 19 the words "and the administration and Government of the Canal Zone".

No. 3. Page 17, after line 16, insert the following:

"(7) The Administration and Government of the Canal Zone".

And renumber subsequent lines accordingly.

No. 4. Page 16, after line 2, insert the following:

"(19) Communist and other subversive activities affecting the internal security of the United States".

And renumber subsequent lines accordingly.

No. 5. Page 12, strike out lines 24 and 25.

PULASKI DAY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, October 11, 1779, was a black day for all American colonists for on that day 195 years ago a burst of grape shot from British guns took the life of one of America's greatest and most revered Revolutionary War heroes. It was, indeed, a tragic loss to Gen. George Washington and his Continental Army when this gallant young Pole lost his life at the battle of Savannah. Not only did Washington lose one of his finest general officers, but he lost a warm and admired friend.

The name Pulaski is known to almost every man, woman, and child here in America. This is partly true because of the numerous monuments, bridges, highways, and parks which bear his name. It is true also because of the splendid efforts of Polish-American organizations all over America to pay just and lasting tribute to this young Polish cavalry officer who lived, who fought, and who died for his adopted country.

Casimir Pulaski was born of wealthy

parents who were among the elite of Poland. His schooling and training was that of patriotism and love of Poland. Early, he chose friends from all walks of life who plotted secretly to overthrow the rule of Russia. In consequence and at the age of 20 he joined in the bloody rebellion against Russia and fought valiantly to free his country.

Because of his military type schooling and his expert horsemanship he was made a leader of the horse troops engaged in the uprising which was destined to fail. Many of the leaders were arrested, imprisoned or executed. Pulaski was able to escape in exile to France where he continued to work on behalf of Poland's independence. In this cause of freedom he met one of America's foremost colonial leaders, Benjamin Franklin, who was in Paris seeking French assistance for his own country's fight for independence.

Pulaski, following Franklin's appeal, made his way to Philadelphia where General Washington accepted his offer of service and appointed him to his own staff.

Pulaski soon distinguished himself at the Battle of Brandywine and other engagements with the overwhelming British forces. Washington was so impressed with the young officer's ability and military accomplishments that he recommended that the Continental Congress commission him as a brigadier general. Soon thereafter General Pulaski asked and was granted permission to form an independent corps of cavalry which became known as the Pulaski Legion. This unit and its leader soon became famous for its prowess in battle. Consequently, Pulaski and his troops were dispatched to the South to bolster General Lincoln's command. It was here during the Battle of Savannah that Pulaski suffered his fatal wounds.

As Americans, we are all indebted to Pulaski for his prowess as a soldier and for his leadership in developing raw recruits into trained and well-disciplined troops. We are grateful that he was the founder of our famed American cavalry which earned honor and glory for itself in every subsequent war.

But, Mr. Speaker, America is proudest of the fact that Casimir Pulaski taught us that independence is not a mere theory or a way of life and that liberty is not just a noble aspiration. Through his own magnificent example he showed us and the world that independence and self-reliance are attainable by all who are willing to fight for them.

These teachings of this young Polish zealot, combined with his magnificent personal leadership, earned for Pulaski an eternal place of honor among the hallowed great of the United States of America.

It is fitting, therefore, that on this coming Sunday afternoon Pulaski Day will properly be celebrated in New York City with the annual Pulaski Day parade up Fifth Avenue participated in by many hundreds of thousands of paraders and viewers.

MR. BOB MOSS

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, one of the best known and most respected media personalities in the Virgin Islands, Mr. Bob Moss, is leaving his post as president and general manager of WBNB-TV. Often controversial, but always fair and responsible, Bob will be greatly missed by the viewing public. In the best traditions of the communications profession Bob Moss distinguished himself through his community service and dedication to public service causes. The esteem with which he is held in the Virgin Islands is indicated by the editorial comment on Bob's departure, two examples of which I am pleased to insert in the Record at this point:

[From the St. Croix (V.I.) Avis, Sept. 25, 1974]

WELL DONE, MR. COMMUNITY

We in the news business sometime receive press releases which give pause. Such was delivered the other day and duly reported in the AVIS columns. From the new proprietors of WBNB, Channel 10, St. Thomas. It listed its plans for the future in which it was stated "We aim to establish a firm bond with the community." To which we can but add that if the bond becomes any firmer, we'll be gasping for breath, so to speak.

The new owners—and we wish them well—might not be aware of the station's present and past bond with the community, certainly one to be admired and which is in large part due to the indefatigable Bob Moss, who has been at the helm since the station, the first in the Virgin Islands, went on the air thirteen or fourteen years ago. And with him a staff to which long hours meant little so long as there was a community effort at stake. The telethons, for instance, which enriched the Community Chest, the Red Cross, the Blook Bank, etc. And gratifying have been Bob Moss' hard-hitting editorial stands in which he hesitated not to tell it as it was. For sure he made enemies for the station and himself, but he can be smug in the knowledge that they are by far outnumbered by friends in all walks of Virgin Islands life.

It is understood that Mr. Moss will remain with the station for one year on a consultant basis. We earnestly hope that during this time the new owners heed his expertise in maintaining the established and enviable rapport which he has built and the fine entertainment he has provided day in, day out.

The new guiding hands, in their press release stated "We will transform Channel 10 into a first rate television station in both performance and capability."

We always felt that is what we have had.

[From the Daily News, Sept. 25, 1974]

A MAN WHO'LL BE MISSED

With the changing of ownership at WBNB-TV, Channel 10, a familiar personality will be missing from Virgin Islands' television screens as Bob Moss steps down as the station's president and general manager.

As one of those who pioneered television in these islands, he has been responsible in the past decade for what a great many people were watching and listening to every night. As such, he was inevitably a controversial person, being the one everybody blamed if the tape for their favorite program got lost or delayed, if the show they wanted

to watch was preempted or never scheduled to be aired at all, and a host of other matters for which the viewer tends to become enraged at the television station.

All too often in such matters, the complaints sometimes outweigh the praise for few of us are as quick to commend as we are to condemn. On the whole, however, Bob Moss must be credited with scheduling and programming in a responsible manner. While there are undoubtedly things that some feel were omitted or under-covered, it seems here that for the most part Channel 10 under his management devoted a substantial amount of responsible coverage to community matters of importance and interest.

More important than general coverage, however, is the fact that in a media which tends to shrink from taking public stands, Bob Moss was willing to stand up and state his opinions. While we did not always agree with him, we must acknowledge that he presented his ideas in an eloquent and capable manner, and that he spoke as a man sincerely dedicated to the betterment of the community. As such, even for those who disagreed with his opinions, his editorial comments were valuable because of the discussion they aroused and the thinking they stimulated.

Bob Moss also deserves substantial credit for his community involvement, both as president and general manager of Channel 10 and as an individual. The Community Chest, Boy Scouts, Blood Bank and other worthwhile community activities have all benefited from telethons and promotional activities by the station, and he has donated generously of his own time and effort to such projects.

The new owners of Channel 10 are fortunate in that, through the efforts of Bob Moss, they have acquired an organization with a tradition of public service and community concern. We trust that they will continue to build on this foundation.

ATTICA AND THE ROCKEFELLER NOMINATION

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks a number of vital issues pertaining to the qualifications of Nelson A. Rockefeller to serve as Vice President of the United States have been raised. One of the most important is the manner in which he handled the disturbance at the Attica prison in September 1971—a tragic event which resulted in the deaths of 39 men. It becomes very important that the events which took place during this period be thoroughly reviewed in order that we may know what led to Governor Rockefeller's decision to order the armed attack.

Last week Mr. Rockefeller responded to a number of questions on the Attica affair during his Senate confirmation hearings. I was very interested to learn of his comment that members of the observers' committee at Attica, during a crucial point in the negotiations, left one by one "fearing their lives." I served as a member of the observers' committee and know for a fact that this was not the case. In fact, we pleaded with the Governor for additional time and for the opportunity to personally meet with him to further explore the situation. We had been at Attica for 4 days and were willing to remain for 4 weeks if necessary if

the crisis could have been resolved peacefully. Unfortunately, the Governor did not heed our requests for additional time. After the attack, while still at the prison, my reaction to the need for the Governor's action was "There's always time to die. I don't know what the rush was."

My good friend and colleague on the observers' committee—Tom Wicker—has prepared a very timely and perceptive article comparing Mr. Rockefeller's recent Senate testimony and the actual conditions which prevailed at the time of the disturbance. As Mr. Wicker has so properly noted, hindsight on this affair just will not wash and the fact remains that the Governor refused to come to Attica to meet with the observers' committee and to afford us some additional time in which to bridge the gap to the rebellious inmates.

Mr. Wicker's article appeared in this morning's New York Times and I submit it herewith for inclusion in the Record. I urge that our colleagues—and most especially those on the Judiciary Committee—give it close and careful attention. There can be no question but that the whole Attica tragedy is an item which warrants the Judiciary Committee's most detailed scrutiny during its confirmation hearings in an effort to determine whether Nelson Rockefeller is qualified to serve as Vice President.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 1974]

HINDSIGHT ON ATTICA WON'T WASH

(By Tom Wicker)

Congress ought to explore thoroughly the qualifications and attitudes of any man who is to stand a heartbeat from the Presidency. But last week before the Senate Judiciary Committee, the response of Nelson Rockefeller to a question about the Attica prison rebellion raised serious questions about his memory, his veracity or both; the committee only let the matter drop.

Mr. Rockefeller did concede, tacitly but for the first time, that as Governor of New York, he should not have permitted the armed attack on the prison on Sept. 13. That attack resulted in the deaths of 39 guards and inmates and the wounding of more than 80 other men. Two days later, Mr. Rockefeller said the attackers—the New York State Police—had done a "superb job."

To the Judiciary Committee, he said last week, "The procedure . . . namely to go ahead at the beginning without weapons and which was stopped in the process, which procedure has now been re-established by the State, is the best procedure and . . . if this would happen again I would think that was the proper way to proceed." It may comfort the families of 39 dead men that Mr. Rockefeller now believes it would have been better not to use firearms.

Mr. Rockefeller's other testimony on Attica largely obfuscated or distorted what happened there, including his own role. He said, for example, that Bobby Seale of the Black Panthers and William Kunstler, the attorney, "coincidentally arrived on the scene." Both men, in fact, were asked to come as "observers" by the rebelling inmates, as a part of their demands for a negotiated settlement and the state agreed to their presence.

Again, Mr. Rockefeller told the Senators that "by about the third or fourth day" of the rebellion, his Commissioner of Corrections, Russell G. Oswald, was "fearful of his life" and would not go back into the prison. The fact is that Mr. Oswald did not return to the prison after the second day, not because he was "fearful of his life"—he had gone courageously into the prison yard three

times—but because of a direct inmate threat to take him hostage.

At a crucial point in the negotiations, Mr. Rockefeller said of the observer group that the state had helped to assemble, "One by one they left . . . fearing their lives and the only man who was left who had the courage to stay and to argue with the prisoners was Mr. Clarence Jones of the Amsterdam News. . . ."

Clarence Jones is a brave man who repeatedly proved it at Attica. But on the occasion to which the Governor referred, at least half the observer group remained in the prison yard with him. The other half left only because they thought the entire group was leaving, and because a pledge had been exacted from them by Commissioner Oswald that all would leave together. The group who left included this writer. It included also Representative Herman Badillo of New York, one of the most courageous and effective of the observers, as well as Mr. Kunstler. But when he heard that the Jones group had remained in the prison yard he immediately returned there and made a bold speech that Mr. Oswald later praised and which many of the other observers, including Clarence Jones, thought might have saved them from being taken hostage.

Nelson Rockefeller was at that time and throughout the rebellion and the State Police attack nowhere near the Attica prison yard. When members of the observer committee asked him to come, he told the Judiciary Committee, "I think . . . that they had failed and that therefore, rather than to have to say we have failed in this maybe if somebody else would come, maybe something would happen. . . ."

This is a false and gratuitous slur on the observers' motives. Mr. Jones, Mr. Badillo, State Senator John Dunne of New York and this writer all told Mr. Rockefeller by telephone that if he would come to Attica to talk with the observers (not the inmates), time might be gained in which a negotiated settlement might be arranged, and the Governor's good faith in seeking such a settlement would be demonstrated to the inmates.

Before the Senate committee, Mr. Rockefeller attributed to himself a proposal that he came to Attica after the inmates had given up their hostages. In fact, Russell Oswald made that proposal to Nelson Rockefeller, who turned it down. Mr. Rockefeller also said the deaths of ten guards from State Police gunfire was due mainly to "overfire" from troopers trying to protect one another from inmate attack. The New York Commission on Attica raised serious doubts about this explanation two years ago; and it is simply not true, as Mr. Rockefeller claimed, that "the instructions of the State Police were not to use their weapons unless one of their own had to be defended."

The irrefutable truth is that for six solid minutes, that bloody morning, New York State Police poured indiscriminate buckshot and rifle fire into a milling mass of gas-blinded inmates. The result was that one of every ten persons in the prison yard and a quarter of the hostages were hit. Thirty-nine died, and no hindsight or prevarication will bring them back.

THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIST IN TREATMENT OF MENTAL ILLNESS

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, since World War II there has been a gradual increase in the acceptance of mental illness on the same basis as any other ill-

ness. In view of this fact, there is increasing interest in efforts to provide for equal coverage for emotional or mental illness in all health insurance plans as well as Government programs.

In my view any discussion of proposed national health insurance or other health programs would not be complete unless some thought is given to the role of the private psychiatrist in the delivery of services pertaining to mental health.

Dr. Dwight W. Schuster of Indianapolis went into this subject in a clear, concise statement to a committee of the Indiana General Assembly last April. Although his remarks were directed to a State legislative body, I believe they are applicable to the national level as well in view of the legislation we have passed concerning community mental health centers and the possible action this year or next on some plan for national health insurance. Therefore, I would like to share them with my colleagues.

Certainly the private psychiatrist will continue to stand at the front line in the medical treatment of emotional and mental illnesses. Community mental health centers, HMO's, private group clinics have a role and serve a need particularly in areas where there is a lack of private resources. However, the relationship between these sources and private psychiatric care should be one of mutual support rather than that of adversaries—partners all in a pluralistic system of health care delivery.

The remarks of Dr. Schuster follow herewith:

STATEMENT

Re A complete delivery system for mental health and mental retardation services in the future.

At the outset let me say that my remarks are directed toward mental illness, not mental retardation. Although the survey authorized by the Indiana General Assembly pertains primarily to those mental health services delivered by the State and through the general tax revenues of the State, any discussion would be incomplete without including the role and extent of the services provided on a private fee for service basis. Since World War II there has been a gradual increase in the acceptance of mental illness on the same basis as any other illness. We are still striving for equal coverage for emotional or mental illnesses in all insurance coverage and in all government programs.

There are reasons for the slowness of development of such coverage; the main reason is the difficulty in claims review since emotional illnesses do not lend themselves to computer analysis nearly as easily as surgical conditions for example. However, statistics in significant volume now show that in general, emotional or mental illnesses are not more costly to treat than physical illnesses.

The private care of emotional illnesses has been and probably will continue to be directed primarily to the acute, short term cases. Statistics are not as easily come by in the private sector as in government programs, but I believe that the same treatment programs used in government plus some which are distinctly or predominantly used in the private sector have resulted in impressive results.

One of the results has been a sharp decline in the number of patients who are referred to governmental programs at the three levels: local, State, and Federal. Probably the main reason for the above mentioned result is the availability of excellent psychiatric facilities in general and psychiatric hospitals, and the availability of third party finances, primarily private insurance

plans, to permit more people access to the private sector of care.

I have statistics primarily from Methodist Hospital, here in Indianapolis, which help illustrate the above point. These will be made available tomorrow as further discussion continues.

You are well aware that private psychiatric care encompasses much more than hospital treatment. Some psychiatrists limit their practice to office or out-patient care, but the majority utilize office treatment, day and night care, hospital out-patient treatment as well as twenty-four hour hospital care. In addition to private psychiatrists, it should be kept in mind that there are tremendous numbers of emotionally ill individuals who are cared for by family physicians and other medical practitioners as well as the many ancillary medical groups who contribute tremendously to the care of the emotionally ill. I point out all of these to remind you of the great load if the government at all its levels should undertake the responsibility for all mental illness. It seems apparent that no one segment of the mental health system is or will be able to handle the entire load.

A logical conclusion is that there is need, both from the financial and quality of care standpoints, for pluralistic but cooperative approaches. The private fee for service physician stands at the front line in medical treatment of emotional and mental illnesses. Due to the great variety of these ills, there is need for variety of treatment approaches. Community mental health centers, Health Maintenance Organizations, private group clinics have a role and serve a need particularly in areas where there is a lack of private resources.

However, the relationship with private care should be mutually supportive and not isolation or rejection of each other. Likewise, there is a definite need for state hospitals and longer term care. Even if there is a national push to eliminate the State hospitals, experiences in California and New York have painfully pointed up the fact that community health centers are not the total answer to the State's responsibilities for care of the mentally ill. Careful study of statistics reveal that reduction of patients in State hospitals is not what it might appear. Rather there is a continual shuffling of people back and forth in the system with increased admissions to State hospitals countering their increased dismissals. It is clear that there has been and probably will continue to be a jockeying by the various governmental units to shift the cost of care to one or another. In the final analysis, it is the tax payer who pays regardless of the governmental unit. The patient is the one who suffers through these bureaucratic maneuverings.

Private psychiatrists hope there will be continued effort on the part of all concerned groups to put quality of care first and we stand ready to contribute our efforts to make a comprehensive system work.

Thank you for this opportunity to present these views.

AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1321, HOUSE COMMITTEE REFORM AMENDMENTS OF 1974

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I herewith insert by permission previously granted a listing of the amendments I will offer to House Resolution 1321, the House Committee Reform Amendments of 1974.

AMENDMENT NO. 1. TO LIMIT THE TERM OF THE SPEAKER

Page 75, immediately after line 13, insert the following new section, and redesignate the ensuing sections accordingly:

"SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

"Sec. 401. Rule 1 of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"(8) No Member shall serve as Speaker who shall have been elected as Speaker in the two successive Congresses immediately preceding."

Page 91, immediately after line 24, insert the following new section, and redesignate ensuing sections accordingly:

"(b) Section 401 shall become effective at the beginning of the ninety-fifth Congress."

AMENDMENT NO. 2. TO BALANCE LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION BETWEEN COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT, COMMERCE AND HEALTH, AND MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Page 7, immediately after line 11, insert new sections:

"(8) Disposition of solid wastes; noise control.

"(9) Nonenergy aspects of air quality, including industrial pollution.

"(10) Safety of drinking water."

Page 9, strike out lines 18-21 inclusive, and insert:

"(2) Environmental aspects of production and consumption of fuels and generation of power; land-use planning, and conservation of resources."

Page 9, strike out line 23, and insert: "resources, irrigation, and reclamation."

Page 10, strike out lines 7 and 8.

Page 17, immediately following line 16, insert new sections:

"(7) Wildlife and its protection, including research, refuges, and conservation.

"(8) Ocean dumping and coastal zones.

"(9) Deepwater ports.

"(10) Environmental policy."

AMENDMENT NO. 3. TO ASSIGN DUTIES OF PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE CLASSIFICATION OFFICE TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION

Page 30, line 16, immediately after the letter "(d)", insert the number "(1)".

Page 30, line 20, strike out the number "(1)", insert the letter "(A)", and redesignate the ensuing paragraphs accordingly.

Page 31, immediately after line 16, insert the following new subsection:

"(2) The Committee on House Administration shall develop, supervise, and maintain for the House and its committees and Members a cross-referencing capability based on the authorization statutes, showing committee jurisdiction, appropriation Acts, budget authority, budget outlays, unexpended balances, other relevant systems which or may not be compatible, and the relationships between them.

"In connection therewith, the Committee shall:

"(A) work closely with the House standing committees in all phases of the development of the cross-referencing capability and coordinate with the Congressional Research Service and General Accounting Office, in the development, implementation, and operation of the cross-referencing service.

"(B) advise the House of developments which could improve the operation of the classification service and issue an annual report to the House on the progress in implementation and use of the service, and plans for the coming year.

"(C) make available (as development permits) publications or information in an appropriate format for use of the House committees and Members and provide the capability to answer specific queries on the available information.

"(D) make an annual report to the House on its progress in carrying out the functions specified in Subsections (d) (2) of this sec-

tion, and may make such additional reports, or recommendations, as may appear appropriate.

"(3) The Committee is authorized to appoint and provide for the compensation of such additional staff as may be necessary for the performance of the functions specified in subsection (d)(2) of this section, provided, however, that such staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those specified therein."

Page 78, strike out line 1, and all that follows through page 81, line 2, inclusive, and redesignate ensuing sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 4. TO PROVIDE A PROCEDURE FOR REFERRAL OF BILLS TO COMMITTEES CURRENTLY OR IN SEQUENCE

Page 34, strike out line 24 and all that follows through page 39, line 7 inclusive, and insert:

"6. (a) Any bill, resolution or other matter which relates to a subject under the jurisdiction of more than one standing committee named in Clause 1, may, at the request of a committee chairman seeking referral of the matter to his committee, be referred by the Speaker under the provisions of sections (b) and (c) of this clause.

(b) The Speaker may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more committees for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations in the case of any committee after the first), or divide the matter into two or more parts, reflecting different subjects and jurisdictions) and refer each such part to a different committee, or refer the matter to a special ad hoc committee appointed by the Speaker with the approval of the house (from the members of the committees having legislative jurisdiction) for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the House thereon.

(c) Any referral under the provisions of this clause shall be subject to the approval of the House."

AMENDMENT NO. 5. TO FORMALIZE CURRENT PRACTICE IN THE APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Page 41, line 18, immediately after the word "position", insert a period and strike out all that follows through line A inclusive.

AMENDMENT NO. 6. TO ASSIGN THE DUTIES OF THE PROPOSED HOUSE COMMISSION ON INFORMATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Page 30, line 18, immediately after the letter "(d)", insert the number "(1)".

Page 30, line 20, strike out the number "(1)", insert the letter "(A)", and redesignate the ensuing paragraphs accordingly.

Page 31, line 16, strike out the period, insert a comma and the word "and", and add the following new paragraph:

"(E) conducting a complete study of:
(1) the information problems of the House of Representatives against the background of the existing institutions and services available to the House, and to make such recommendations with respect thereto as may be appropriate, and

(2) the administrative services, facilities, and space requirements of the Members and committees of the House, including staff personnel, administration, accounting, and purchasing procedures, office equipment and communication facilities, record-keeping, space utilization, parking, and the organization, responsibility, and supervision to provide adequate, efficient, and economical services and space utilization.

"(2) The studies conducted by the Committee pursuant to this subsection should include, but need not be limited to:

(A) House resources for information, in-

cluding the Congressional Research Service, the General Accounting Office, and the Office of Technology Assessment, and the organizational framework that makes them effective and ineffective;

(B) information management, collection, and dissemination for the House;

(C) resources outside the Congress for information and their utilization;

(D) methods for setting up and organizing the flow of information from and to the executive;

(E) experimental or pilot approaches to information problems, such as the creation of mechanisms for outside groups, or for pooling of resources; and

(F) the creation of a congressional staff journal or other process for communication.

(G) the staff required to provide the House Legislative Counsel with the capability to fully meet the needs of the Members of the House.

"(3) The Committee shall make an annual report to the House on its progress in carrying out the functions specified in Subsections (1) (E) (i) and (ii), and may make such additional reports, or recommendations, as may appear appropriate.

"(4) The Committee is authorized to appoint and provide for the compensation of such additional staff as may be necessary for the performance of the functions specified in Subsections (1) (E) (i) and (ii) of this section, without regard to the numerical limitations provided in Rule XI, Clause 6, sections (a) (1) and (b) (1), provided, however, that such staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those specified in this subparagraph."

Page 81, strike out line 3 and all that follows through page 84, line 9, inclusive, and redesignate ensuing sections accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 7. TO ESTABLISH THE LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION OF A COMMITTEE ON CRIME AND INTERNAL SECURITY

Page 7, immediately after line 17, insert a new subsection, and redesignate ensuing subsections accordingly:

"(g) Committee on Crime and Internal Security, the legislative jurisdiction of which shall include:

"(1) Crime prevention.

"(2) Internal Security generally.

"(3) Federal law enforcement agencies, and law enforcement assistance.

"(4) Mutiny, espionage, treason, and counterfeiting.

"(5) Protection of public officials.

"(6) Nonjudicial aspects of federal crimes.

"(7) Corrections, and federal penal institutions.

"(8) Internal security aspects of immigration and customs.

"(9) Communist subversion.

"(10) Organized crime.

"(11) Domestic terrorism and paramilitary extremists.

"(12) Security of classified information."

Page 12, strike out lines 24 and 25, and redesignate ensuing subsections accordingly.

Page 14, line 23, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma and the word "and".

Page 14, line 24, immediately after "criminal" insert a period, strike out all that follows through line 25 inclusive, and redesignate ensuing subsections accordingly.

Page 16, strike out line 1, and redesignate the ensuing subsection accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 8. TO ESTABLISH CERTAINTY IN TRANSFER OF SENIORITY

Page 89, line 20, strike out "should" and insert "shall".

Page 90, line 1, strike out "should" and insert "shall".

Page 90, line 4, strike out the comma and

all that follows through the word "in" on line 6 inclusive, and insert "shall determine".

AMENDMENT NO. 9

To assign duties of proposed Office of Law Revision Counsel to Committee on Judiciary

Page 31, immediately following line 16, insert a new section, and redesignate ensuing sections accordingly:

"(e) (1) The Committee on the Judiciary shall have the functions of reviewing, developing, and keeping current an official and positive codification of the laws of the United States. Pursuant thereto, the Committee is authorized to:

(A) Prepare, and submit to the House, one title at a time, a complete compilation, restatement, and revision of the general and permanent laws of the United States which conforms to the understood policy, intent, and purpose of the Congress in the original enactments, with such amendments and corrections as will remove ambiguities, contradictions, and other imperfections both of substance and of form, with a view to the enactment of each title as positive law.

(B) Examine periodically all of the public laws enacted by the Congress and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary recommendations for the repeal of obsolete, superfluous, and superseded provisions contained therein.

(C) Prepare and publish periodically a new edition of the United States Code (including those titles which are not yet enacted into positive law as well as those titles which have been so enacted), with annual cumulative supplements reflecting newly enacted laws.

(D) Classify newly enacted provisions of law to their proper positions in the Code where the titles involved have not yet been enacted into positive law.

(E) Prepare and submit periodically such revisions in the titles of the Code which have been enacted into positive law as may be necessary to keep such titles current.

"(2) The Committee shall make an annual report to the House on its progress in carrying out the functions specified in Subsection (d) (1), and may make such additional reports, or recommendations, as may appear appropriate.

"(3) The Committee is authorized to appoint and provide for the compensation of such additional staff as may be necessary for the performance of the functions specified in Subsection (e) (1), provided however, that such staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those specified therein."

Page 84, strike out line 11 and all that follows through page 87, line 24 inclusive.

AMENDMENT NO. 10. TO PROVIDE FOR ELECTION OF SELECT COMMITTEES BY THE HOUSE AND ELECTION BY A SELECT COMMITTEE OF ITS CHAIRMAN

Page 40, immediately after line 25, insert the following new section, and redesignate ensuing sections accordingly:

"(c) Select committees which the House may order from time to time shall be composed of members elected by the House. The members of each such committee shall elect one of their number as chairman."

Page 41, line 9, immediately after "standing", insert "or select".

Page 41, line 14, strike out "all select and".

AMENDMENT NO. 11. TO TRANSFER COMMERCE PROVISIONS FROM THE JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY TO COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND HEALTH

Page 6, line 20, immediately after "practices" insert a comma, and immediately

thereafter insert "protection against unlawful restraints and monopolies."

Page 15, strike out lines 19 and 20, and redesignate ensuing subsections accordingly.

AMENDMENT NO. 12. TO DELETE HIGHER PAY PROVISION FOR HOUSE OFFICERS AND CERTAIN STAFF

Page 88, strike out line 24 and all that follows through page 89, line 8 inclusive.

AMENDMENT NO. 13. AUTHORIZING A COMMITTEE TO BRING UP A REPORT WITHOUT A RULE FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Page 88, immediately after line 14, insert the following new section, and redesignate ensuing sections accordingly:

AMENDMENT TO RULE XVI

SEC. 408. Rule XVI, clause 9, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "At any time after the reading of the Journal but not before the consideration of motions permitted by the first sentence of this clause, the Speaker may, in his discretion, recognize the chairman of a standing committee or a member of such committee if either is acting in the direction of that committee (such direction having been given by a separate vote on a day following the day the measure was ordered reported from the committee) to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering a bill or resolution reported by the chairman's committee and on the House or Union Calendar subject to the provisions of clause (2) (1) (5) of Rule XI. Such motion shall specify the number of hours, and the division and control of such time for general debate in the Committee of the Whole on the bill or resolution to be considered therein, is not debatable and may not be amended. If such motion is adopted, at the conclusion of consideration in the Committee of the Whole of the bill or resolution specified in the motion, the Committee shall rise and report the bill or resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill or resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions."

AMENDMENT NO. 14. TO TRANSFER JURISDICTION OVER COPYRIGHTS AND TRADEMARKS TO THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND HEALTH, AND JURISDICTION OVER PATENTS TO COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Page 7, immediately after line 11, insert "(8) Copyrights and trademarks."

Page 15, strike line 21, and renumber ensuing sections accordingly.

Page 19, immediately after line 20, insert "(8) Patents."

WE ARE PROUD TO BE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Jan Porter a most perceptive columnist from Tabor, Iowa's Beacon Enterprise has aptly expressed what many of us from farm regions often feel. The amount of pride a farmer puts into his work is more than a vocational drive—it is a way of living that involves a myriad of jobs.

In addition to the tasks we normally

attribute to farmers, they tackle the extraordinary feat of contending with the vagaries of weather, pit their wits against the hazards of business, and have supplied the front-line defense for our environment.

Agriculture's contributions to our economy and America's very way of life surpasses the cursory image most people attach to the profession. I offer Jan's article for those who have not had the opportunity to view farmers from this incisive perspective:

WE ARE PROUD TO BE

(By Jan Porter)

I get an Irish itch when someone replies with a look of shock.

"You are farmers? Well, you certainly don't look like farmers!"

How do farmers look? With flour sack dresses? Minnie Pearl walks? I always wonder. In my neck of the woods, Hee Haw characters are a rarity.

In almost all the farmer's professional magazines the problem of the farmer's image is discussed. We are asked, "Are you a hayseed? Can you always distinguish fellow farmers by the suntan that begins at the eyebrow? Is your farmer husband the Marlboro man driving his Bronco up a steep hill? Or is he a rich dude flying an airplane?"

Even with such harassing questions the farmer is too busy a man to worry about his image let alone dream up just what it is. And, as a rule, he is too darn independent to join forces with others, pool finances, hire some good PR men who will drown the consumers with information about his industry . . . the only industry he wants to work in.

Therefore, International Harvester found that (1) a majority of city people think farmers get much of their income from government payments. (2) Many non-farmers think farmers "do too much belly-aching." (3) Over 60% of the people surveyed want ceilings put on all food prices in the stores. (4) More than 40% of non-farm people feel farmers are using pesticides unwisely and unsafely. (5) Almost half of the people questioned felt food quality is fair to poor . . . and getting worse.

We can't ignore these attitudes. Attitudes spawn actions. The recent beef boycotts prove that. We need rapport with our consumer not hostility. Yes, I shall gulp too, when 10 pounds of sugar reaches \$4.00; but knowledge of the drought extending into the sugar beet crop area and foreign exportation helps me to accept it. When any problem exists, communication helps.

In fact, communication is the big key. For years we've had all sorts of Princesses and Queens elected to tell our products' story. What an enormous job for someone with a smattering of knowledge and a pretty smile. Now is the time for a fellow (and his wife) with ten, twenty, or thirty years of experience to get out and sell the farming profession. We need to invite the local and the city children out for a tour of our farms. Few have Uncles or Grandpas on the farm whom they can visit. We need to tell city acquaintances we meet on planes or in other public places what our way of life is all about. It's one to be proud of. Folks need to understand that a farmer is an educated businessman who runs his operation like any other businessman . . . city or country.

He's an efficiency expert, always trying to cut his costs and increase his slim margin of profit.

He's an investor . . . handling each dollar wisely, but putting it in a business that isn't known for its high rate of return.

He's an environmentalist and a conservationist, treating his resources wisely so his land will still be productive when the next guy is ready for it.

He's a speculator, gambling on the weather, insects and disease. And hoping the law of supply and demand will treat him favorably in the marketplace.

Most of all he's an optimist, knowing next year will be better . . . it has to.

These are a few of the things we farmers are. But the ranks of us will be thinned unless we all do something about it. That something is unification for communication. Find a farm organization you rather like and support it. Right now we're lucky. We can still pick and choose. Maybe you are too busy. Send them ten dollars and help promote your beef, your pork, your corn, your soybeans, your wheat. Alone we can do little, but together we can tell the country that we're the world's most important businessmen. And they'll respect us for it.

GASOLINE SURTAX WOULD BE HARMFUL

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that the country has two serious problems: inflation, and energy. Unfortunately, there are no short-range, immediate solutions for either one. We will enter a fool's paradise indeed if we assume there are.

The two are tied together in some ways—for instance, the sudden jump in the price of imported oil has caused certain inflationary pressures, as well as considerable difficulties in providing the energy needed. I do believe steps are being taken to remedy our energy crisis; much is being done, and more can yet be done. This applies to inflation, as well.

But, again, what seem to be attractive, short-term solutions often carry within them potential for great harm to the economy as a whole, and individual citizens. I refer here to consideration in some quarters to putting a 10 cent or 20 cent tax surcharge on each gallon of gasoline.

In theory, this would cut down the use of gasoline, and also provide money for public service jobs that would ease the unemployment rate. These premises are questionable at best; 78 percent of all Americans drive to work, in their own cars, or, today, in car pools. What is an increase in the price of gasoline going to do to their already over-strained budgets? Will it not put them further and further behind? To be sure, the price increase may cut down pleasure driving, but what percentage of driving in this country is pleasure, and what percentage is absolutely necessary? From information I have seen, pleasure driving has already dropped considerably.

The Federal Government has absolutely no business in placing, upon the necessities of life, an extra financial load that would burden the taxpayer even further. Ideas and options to handle the

inflation and energy crises are certainly welcome, but some of them should be scrapped out of hand.

The possible surtax on gasoline certainly should.

HON. BARBER CONABLE'S REMARKS
AT INFLATION SUMMIT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and thoughtful colleague from New York Mr. CONABLE, attended nearly all the presummit conferences on inflation and all of the summit. His closing remarks at this weekend's summit deserve the careful attention of all who are concerned about our efforts to control inflation. I am proud of his contribution and share his belief:

REMARKS

(By Congressman CONABLE)

Senator Humphrey and I were allowed a total of 20 minutes, and I would say he is a tough act to follow in more ways than one under those circumstances.

We are at the end of a very interesting and encouraging experiment in representative government.

As a member of the Steering Committee for this conference, I have been to six of these meetings, and I can attest that a wide range of interests and aspirations have been represented in the pre-summits as in this room. It should be apparent that the process has not been rigged because so many people have been permitted to charge it was.

Here the American people have been able to watch representatives engage in open dialogue with the President and Members of Congress about the gravity of a problem that concerns us all.

I hope others are as proud as I am that such a process is possible. Such openness will help renew our confidence.

The President's patience and unflinching good nature in presiding here so long yesterday and his returning under the circumstances of today to close this conference show the high priority he gives to the battle against inflation.

We know difficult decisions lie ahead, and the inspiration of such leadership is essential if we are to accept those decisions and carry the resulting programs to a successful conclusion.

The Members of Congress present are grateful that the President understands the relevance of Congress to this battle and that he will offer and expect more than politics as usual in our mutual relations no matter how imminent the political season.

Here and at the pre-summits, what we have been seeking is understanding and consensus. As a Republican in Congress, I have none of the pleasure in minority status that Professor Galbraith seems to enjoy. My purpose is to summarize here the majority views of these meetings as I see them. The limitations of time and participation yesterday and today may have made the outline sketchy, but the total record of all the meetings will show, I believe, widespread agreement about the following seven points.

First, fiscal discipline is needed even though the immediate trade-off between

spending cuts and the short-term rate of inflation is not all that impressive.

Our current calamity results in substantial part from the cumulative impact of careless though well-intentioned overstimulus from spending more than we taxed.

Further, undisciplined fiscal behavior at this time by the Government will rob us of our right to lead America out of the economic swamps because the people understand instinctively what the Government has apparently been a long time learning, but we can't continue to spend beyond our means.

Second, monetary discipline is also needed although many believe we have reached the point where serious dislocation will occur if pressure is not taken off interest rates.

Third, to maintain public support for a substantial monetary and fiscal discipline, we in Government must be wisely sensitive to the special problems our troubled economy inflicts on the poor, the potentially unemployed, the elderly, the small businessman and farmer, the housing industry, and the consumer. It is going to require judgment, flexibility, and real leadership to find the right balance between toughness and human concern.

Fourth, there is virtually no support in industry, labor or among rank-and-file congressmen for wage and price controls. Talk about their inevitability, which many of us think is cynically based upon the expectation of short public memories, should be discouraged. Things were bad in August of 1971 but they are worse now after three years of controls.

Fifth, many believe that too many industries have the power to raise prices beyond what a healthier competition would permit. Many also believe that labor should be given incentives rather than coercion to moderate its wage demands even where real wages have eroded by inflation. Perhaps such incentives should be built into any tax adjustment given to lower-income people.

Sixth, great emphasis should be put on conservation of resources and the reduction of waste particularly in the energy field.

Seventh, the world depends upon American prosperity and economic stability.

One of the frightening things one learns as a Congressman is that so often we legislate not just for 210 million people but for the whole world.

The leadership needed from the United States now is not military or political but economic. Cartel-type price-fixing in oil and basic materials can probably be dealt with only if America encourages and leads a collective response from the consuming developed and less-developed nations.

Trade bill completion by the Congress will help as a first step in needed negotiating authority.

Now, the President may see the elements of consensus differently than I do. Since he speaks with one voice while we in Congress speak with many, the advantage in finding consensus and in initiating programs lies with the presidency. In dealing with this problem, complexity is our enemy but strong and decisive leadership can give us faith that the underlying realities are being dealt with. Whether or not we agree about the details, if the program is fair, all Americans will be willing to accept necessary sacrifice even though we as a nation have become quite self-indulgent compared to our grandparents.

But those involved in these summits urge the President and the Congress not to lose the momentum of these meetings as a preliminary to action. We understand it is not going to be easy or quick. It cannot be done with mirrors.

An element of consensus that I have not mentioned before is that the problem is urgent and we all want to get at it—every-

one who has attended these meetings. We don't just want action for the sake of action. Our economic and political freedoms are at stake in some of the nostrums which have been proposed. It will require wise leadership in this voluntary nation of ours to keep our sense of urgency alive and effective as long as it must be kept alive, but those of us in the Congress who know the President so well think both branches of Government now have what it takes.

Thank you.

AMTRAK

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to return to Washington from my congressional district in Indiana this weekend by way of Amtrak. On Sunday afternoon, September 29, 1974, at 5:40 p.m., I boarded the James Whitcomb Riley at its scheduled stop in Peru, Ind. We arrived at Union Station in Washington, D.C. the following afternoon at 12:45 p.m.—on time.

During the 19-hour train ride from Indiana to Washington, I had the opportunity to inspect Amtrak equipment and the quality of service. I found everything to be in good condition. The refurbished cars were clean and modern. Personal service was friendly and cordial. Our schedule was maintained throughout the trip across the country.

I talked with a gentleman passenger who was an efficiency expert for another railroad traveling on Amtrak. He told me that he had conducted a study on the efficiency of rail services. Results indicated that trains were 200 times as efficient, energywise, as a Volkswagen. That figure should impress anyone.

A good passenger rail system is essential in the United States. Other countries have shown us that rail passenger travel is a viable means of transportation when track is kept in good working condition and only the best of equipment is used.

Energy problems are still with us and the American people must be made aware of its potential effects and encouraged to use public transportation whenever possible. It is interesting to note that passenger trains have proven to be the most efficient means of moving people. They consume less energy per person per mile than do automobiles, buses, or airplanes.

Many passengers whom I talked with indicated to me that they were pleased with the service and efficiency of Amtrak. Everyone said that they would make the same trip again by train when the occasion arose.

I firmly believe that the James Whitcomb Riley train should remain on its present schedule and am encouraging Amtrak to maintain this route. On the old route, the train ran anywhere from 2 to 4 hours late. This past weekend, on the new schedule, we were able to be on time for all stops from Indiana to Washington at complete safety to the passengers on board.

It can be concluded from my experiences this past weekend that Amtrak is

working and becoming an even more important part of the national transportation system.

EMMA TOFT

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time a tribute to Miss Emma Toft. She is a resident of Baileys Harbor, in the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin, which I have the honor to represent.

Miss Toft is well known for her dedication to the causes of conservation and the arts and this tribute is a fitting commemoration of her tireless devotion and her hard work. She is a "doer" and we can all profit from the example she has set.

The tribute follows:

EMMA TOFT: QUEEN OF THE PENINSULA

(By George Anastaplo)

... like the hyacinth which the shepherd tramples underfoot on the mountain and which still blooms purple on the ground.—Sappho

I have been asked to say a few words about Emma Toft. I have been asked to do so by the right person, a decade-long friend of Miss Emma's, my teen-aged daughter. I would not otherwise regard myself as at all competent to speak about so feminine a woman.

I do venture to speak, moreover, because this is a way of teaching ourselves something about The Clearing and what it tries to do, something we should remind ourselves of as still another week together here in Door County draws to an end. I trust Miss Emma will put up with my pedagogy at her expense: she has taught me a thing or two, and I must try to pass on to others what I have learned from her. So, I conclude our joint efforts this week and our festivities this evening by welcoming Miss Emma to The Clearing.

Now, this may seem rather strange, to welcome her at the end of an evening's festivities. It may seem strange to welcome her after we have been graced by her presence here all week. It may seem even stranger to welcome someone who was brought up in Door County much more than half a century ago, someone who has visited the Clearing hundreds of times during her long life on this peninsula.

But there are reasons for welcoming her at this time. There is about Miss Emma a natural freshness and an unpredictable shyness which we usually associate with the young, with those among us for the first time. Indeed, we can welcome her because she is so young, by far the youngest among us this week, unencumbered as she is by what the everyday world is burdened with. Her loping stride, both graceful and purposeful, is that of someone who has instinctively preserved her independence of petty concerns and daily vexations.

To welcome Miss Emma, then, is like recognizing nature for what it is. It is like welcoming the lifegiving sun in the spring, the shimmering aspen in a light summer breeze, the peaceful snow of winter. We have spent much of this week studying poetry, the poetry of Sappho, so you will understand if I borrow of the poetic in what I say tonight in talking about the woman of steady eye

and honest hand we have so often met, regally attired, in her soft white hair, her musical voice and her faded blue denim.

I remind you of vignettes revealing the freshness of Miss Emma: the day she invited Mertha Fulkerson and Jens Jensen over to see the arethusa blooming in her front yard—it turned out that the "front yard" was a swamp which ruined Miss Fulkerson's dress-up shoes; the day she brought a baby skunk to The Clearing to lighten Mr. Jensen's deathbed; the days she has gone out on snowshoes from her winter quarters in Bailey's Harbor to feed the deer on her side of the peninsula. (She did become somewhat "disgusted" with those deer last winter when she learned that they were bringing "a lot of their relatives with them" for her food, repaying her hospitality by stripping the greenery off many of the young cedars.)

I remind you also of the places with which Miss Emma has been associated: the wild-life sanctuary of The Ridges; the 300 acres of virgin timber and unspoiled lakeshore at Toft Point, which she has managed to have had preserved for generations yet unborn; and, of course, The Clearing founded by Jens Jensen and Mertha Fulkerson. She has contributed to the perpetuation and enrichment of all these, and to other institutions as well. She is one of those people who sense that the most spiritual of associations, as well as the home and the community, depend on a proper respect for the physical things of this world. Most important has been her contribution through the institution with which she has been associated, and perhaps even more through precept and example, to the formation of character in Door County.

Since we have, under the devoted ministrations of Leo Paul deAlvarez, also been reading the Old Testament this week, it does seem appropriate to say something more on this occasion about the formation of character. One is naturally obliged to wonder, as one thinks about the Bible, what kind of people is likely to be produced by various teachings and by various institutions. Thus, even the skeptic should wonder what the effect is of a belief in certain tales or of an adherence to certain old ways. Indeed, the responsible skeptic may even be able to do something respectful of piety which the pious multitude cannot, in principle, do. That is, he may deliberately choose to encourage that belief and that way which reason determines to be, in his time and circumstances, most salutary for both human beings and citizens.

What has been the influence of Miss Emma, as teacher and institution, upon those whose lives she touches? What should we especially call attention to on this occasion? Miss Emma stands as a constant rebuke to unthinking change. But she is not merely negative. In fact, she is very much a constructive influence in the lives of her family, her friends and her community. This makes even more telling her occasional negative comments on what is happening around us, comments quietly made on behalf of solid, old-fashioned virtues. Her comments include the soft-voiced insistence that everyone should contribute, and should be permitted to contribute, what she or he can to the life of the community—contributions which include that which is represented among us by the simple but overwhelming fact of "a life fitly lived."

It is a tribute to The Clearing that Miss Emma can find it so congenial, and that it can take her to its heart so effortlessly—especially at a time when so much around us, and unfortunately even here in Door County, is suffering from the ravages of unnatural appetites for self-gratification and hence for novelty. It is, as I have said, nature itself which is delightfully exhibited and respectfully reaffirmed in Miss Emma. She is,

as I have also said, a teacher. She once taught, many decades ago, small classes of young children in a country school; she now teaches an entire peninsula of children and adults alike. She reminds the jaded and the fragmented and the harried of what real people are like. We can perceive through her what a sense of wholeness means; we can see what it means to be able to rely upon the sureness and grace which result from such wholeness. In this, as in so many other ways, she is very much like her old friend and fellow teacher, Mertha Fulkerson.

I dare to say all these things about Miss Emma, and in her presence, because she is indeed the most gentle of creatures. I can trust her to scoff at my presumptuousness, to casually correct my errors, and (since she is free of false humility) even to acknowledge what is sound in what I say. When I emphasize her gentleness, I do not mean to overlook in her what is today called a sense of realism. She can be, as the occasion warrants it, tough and shrewd and even calculating.

Thus, I often associate with her what she showed me once at The Ridges about the startling fierceness one can encounter in nature. She coolly sacrificed several desperate ants to my education. Our companions were squeamish, and even horrified, as she conjured up the awesome ferocity displayed by the ant lion, that tiny insect which ruthlessly drags struggling ants into the depths of its conical pit. One has not lived until one has seen, through the unsentimental eyes of someone such as Miss Emma, the many faces in nature of death—that death which can be at the same time an end for some and a beginning for others.

Thus, one should speak of Miss Emma as a remarkable blend, so mixed as to assure long service, of vinegar and honey. She is, in this respect, like the ancient Sappho. She is also like Sappho in her rich friendships with other women of distinction. And, like the schoolteacher she has always been, she constantly tests us: we can measure ourselves and others by gauging how we and they respond to the wholesome wholeness she embodies.

And so I conclude my welcome to Miss Emma—that is to say, I conclude my invitation to us all to recognize and cherish the best in ourselves as human beings in knowing association both with one another and with the natural forces all around and within us.

WANTED: WOMEN FOR THE WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS PROGRAM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the President's Commission on White House Fellows is now accepting applications for 1975-76. The purpose of this program is to draw bright young people to Washington for a closer look at the governmental process. The program was initiated by the late President Lyndon B. Johnson on October 3, 1964, and each year since that time approximately 20 young citizens have been assigned to White House staff members, the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Besides the actual assignment, the fellowship includes an education program—a series of discussions with

prominent representatives from both the public and private sectors. The program also includes exposure to international affairs through the vehicle of a foreign trip. The education program and portions of the selection process are supported by private funds from foundations and companies.

Applications are open to all persons except employees of the executive branch of the Government who will be at least 23 years of age but not over 36 years of age on September 1, 1975. Fellows receive a Government salary of up to \$30,147 for the year depending on previous earnings, education, and experience.

Because of the tremendous opportunity for a look at the workings of Government from the inside and a chance to meet and converse with some of the present leaders of our country, I would urge interested persons to apply and I ask my colleagues to do the same. Women and other disadvantaged groups should be especially encouraged as they have been underrepresented from the start of the program. Last year only 4 of the 18 Fellows were women, yet that was an increase over the year before.

Application forms and other information may be obtained from the President's Commission on White House Fellows, 1900 E. Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20415. All applications must be post-marked by December 1, 1974.

PUNISHMENT CAN SOLVE THE CRIME CRISIS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing factors in the currently rising crime rate across America is the governmental and public apathy concerning it.

Nothing in our Nation is more important, or calls for firmer action. And yet we appear to be doing nothing. News that the rate, which seemed to have been under control a year or so ago, is on the rampage again makes only the inside pages of our newspapers.

What does this mean? It means murder, rape, and robbery. It means unsafe streets in our cities. It means danger to our homes. It means, as the latest FBI statistics show, a march of crime into the suburbs of our country on an unprecedented scale.

There is an answer, of course. And I am glad that two of our top law enforcement officials addressed themselves to it in speaking appearances recently before the International Association of Chiefs of Police in convention here.

The problem rests now, as it has rested since the crime rate began its soar, with

the permissiveness which has become prevalent in our thinking about criminals and with the injection of this idea into the courts and the offices of the criminal prosecutors.

The notion is that, because crime cases are piled up, we should go to any extreme to keep the criminals out of prison. We should slap their wrists and send them on their way. We should parole them at every opportunity. We should let them cop pleas on the slightest pretext.

It is the kind of coddling which claimed the attention of Attorney General William B. Saxbe and FBI Director Clarence M. Kelley in their addresses to the Nation's police chiefs.

Mr. Saxbe said:

Too many dangerous convicted offenders are placed back in society in one way or another and, that simply must stop. With so few dangerous offenders being convicted something has got to be wrong somewhere. Much of the fault, as I see it, must rest with prosecutions and the courts.

Director Kelley blamed "easy bail for hardened criminals" and "unreasonable plea bargaining" and then, according to the New York Times, said something in defense of our law enforcement officers that needed to be said. He declared it "fallacious and unfair" to blame the climbing crime figures on the police and added:

Our profession should not be a whipping boy, we have behaved extremely well.

I agree with Director Kelley's judgment. Most police departments, in my opinion, are composed largely of able and dedicated men whose main hurt is in the fact that they too often are not backed up by the courts in their efforts to combat crime or, indeed, supported by the public.

Some have told me of working hard on a case only to have the offender freed by a court and back on the streets in no time. They resent the willingness of prosecutors to bargain and courts to be tolerant when they know the criminals they arrest are dangerous and unrepentant and that society has a right to be protected from them.

We have been willing in Congress to vote funds to increase the police activity in the country, but we should know that the answer to the crime condition is not in an insufficiency of enforcement forces. It is in a return to the idea that wrongdoing must be punished and that those punished must serve as an example to others.

Until our tolerant times this was the philosophy of criminal justice and it can be noted that, when punishment was the key word, crime was not the gigantic problem it is today and that few Americans were endangered with their neighborhoods the prey of burglars and muggers. We have these conditions now. And they are the result of indulgence in our courts and in some prosecution offices

and I endorse the finding to this effect by Attorney General Saxbe and FBI Director Kelley.

What can be done about it? I commend Attorney General Saxbe and Director Kelley for bringing it to public attention. Others who have an understanding of the matter should do likewise. We in Congress, regardless of other burdens, should recognize the gravity of the again-rising crime rate and speak out in favor of those in the police departments who are trying to check it and against those judges and prosecutors who too often negate the policeman's work. When the people generally are aroused to the point of demanding a return of strict punishment for the hardened criminal, then crime can be contained. This is the only solution and it is time that we who bear a responsibility in the public service do what we can to bring it about.

NEW TUITION FIGURES STARTLING

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

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

EASTERN AND MIDWESTERN VIETNAM VETERANS FACE CONTINUED LOSS OF HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN GI BILL OPPORTUNITIES UNDER PENDING AMENDMENTS

When new statistics are examined showing GI Bill payments by States, they show that veterans in low tuition Western States, with few private colleges are able to make dramatically better use of the GI Bill. For example, Pennsylvania and Texas house 386,000 Vietnam era veterans. The two States' full-time college enrollment of all kinds of students are almost equal. Yet in FY 74 alone, Texas veterans used \$181,360,000 in GI Bill benefits, while Pennsylvania used \$117,680,000 in those unique educational opportunities, a difference of almost \$64,000,000.

Under an Office of Education formula grant program—the Special Educational Opportunity Grant, designed to ensure that States receive a fair share of Federal funds—in fiscal year 1974 Pennsylvania received \$9,400,000 in scholarships, while Texas received \$9,600,000. California veterans using its unique system of low cost two and four year colleges, where tuition is \$165 per year, used almost \$1,100,000,000 more in GI Bill benefits than New Yorkers between fiscal year 1968 and 1974 used \$1,726,620,000, versus \$634,000,000. Under the formula grant program, designed to prevent inequities, New Yorkers received 90% of the benefits of Californians. Yet what program should have fewer inequities than the GI bill, where men from the same platoon from different States have a widely different chance at obtaining the educational opportunities that were equally available to their fathers who served in World War II, no matter what State they were from—and what its structure of post-secondary education?

	GI bill payments, fiscal year 1968-74	Tuition costs	Vietnam veterans population	Junior and 4 yr college GI bill use rate (percent)	Per capita payments, 1968-74
California	\$1,726,090,000	\$165	820,000	41.4	\$2,106
New York	634,000,000	750-900	513,000	23.2	1,236
Pennsylvania	483,600,000	1,012	386,000	17.5	1,253
Texas	656,740,000	266-366	386,000	29.1	1,703
Ohio	432,000,000	750	351,000	18.6	1,199
Michigan	403,000,000	704	286,000	25.2	1,412
Indiana	195,000,000	682	181,000	15.2	1,082

STATE-BY-STATE GI BILL PAYMENTS CONTRASTED WITH HEW'S FORMULA GRANT—SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS (FISCAL YEAR 1974) (RANKED BY VIETNAM VETERAN POPULATION)

	Vietnam veteran population	Percent of California population	GI bill payments fiscal year 1974	State GI bill payments as percent of California payment	State EOG grants as percent of California payment	State EOG grants, fiscal year 1974	Additional GI bill payments if based on EOG formula
California.....	820,000		\$456,620,000			\$23,200,000	
New York.....	513,000	62.6	162,280,000	35.5	72.4	16,800,000	\$168,485,400
Pennsylvania.....	386,000	47.1	117,680,000	25.8	40.9	9,400,000	68,946,600
Texas.....	386,000	47.1	181,360,000	39.7	41.3	9,600,000	8,305,600
Ohio.....	361,000	44.0	112,980,000	24.7	38.3	8,900,000	62,097,600
Illinois.....	346,000	42.2	132,350,000	29.0	44.3	10,300,000	69,859,800
Michigan.....	286,000	34.9	108,750,000	23.8	36.3	8,500,000	57,075,000

Note: EOG is an HEW scholarship program which allocates funds on the ratio that the State's FTE higher education enrollment bears to national FTE higher education enrollment. GI bill dollar data taken from Federal outlays compiled by the Treasury Department. VA data is the other source.

	Junior and 4-yr college GI bill use rate (percent)	Tuition costs	Percent of male students in private colleges
California.....	41.4	\$165	14.4
New York.....	23.2	\$750-\$900	44.2
Pennsylvania.....	17.5	900-1,050	44.7
Texas.....	29.1	266-365	17.2
Ohio.....	18.6	750	27.0
Illinois.....	23.9	472-611	32.3
Michigan.....	25.2	704	15.5

Note: Figures for State University of New York system. CUNY charges no tuition. State GI bill covers tuition but not \$200 in fees.

GI BILL AND EOG INFORMATION, FISCAL YEARS 1968-74

(States ranked by Vietnam veteran population)

	GI bill payments fiscal years 1968-74	State payments as percent of California payment	Veteran population as percent of California veteran population	Vietnam veteran population	Additional payments if used at California rates	EOG grants, fiscal years 1968-74	Junior and 4-yr college GI bill use rates
California.....	\$1,726,620,000			820,000		\$123,170,000	41.4
New York.....	634,280,000	36.7	62.6	513,000	\$446,580,000	111,380,000	23.2
Pennsylvania.....	483,680,000	28.0	47.1	386,000	329,560,000	61,160,000	17.5
Texas.....	657,360,000	38.1	47.1	386,000	155,880,000	63,240,000	29.1
Ohio.....	432,980,000	25.1	44.0	361,000	326,730,000	58,010,000	16.6
Illinois.....	527,350,000	30.5	42.2	346,000	201,280,000	63,390,000	23.9
Michigan.....	403,750,000	23.4	34.9	286,000	198,840,000	55,790,000	25.2
Florida.....	435,860,000	25.2	30.5	250,000	90,760,000	31,170,000	25.4
New Jersey.....	241,680,000	14.0	27.6	226,000	234,870,000	27,780,000	16.4
Massachusetts.....	252,970,000	14.7	24.8	203,000	175,230,000	46,250,000	19.1
Indiana.....	195,820,000	11.3	22.1	181,000	185,760,000	31,630,000	13.8

Notes: EOG is an HEW scholarship program which allocates funds on the ratio that the State's FTE higher educational enrollment bears to national FTE higher education enrollment. GI bill dollar data taken from Federal outlays compiled by the Treasury Department. VA data is the other source.

GI BILL ENROLLMENT IN PRIVATE COLLEGES WORLD WAR II AND TODAY

	1947-48 enrollment			1971-72 enrollment			1947-48 enrollment			1971-72 enrollment			
	Total	Veterans	Percent veterans	Total	Veterans	Percent veterans	Total	Veterans	Percent veterans	Total	Veterans	Percent veterans	
Stanford University.....	15,800	7,011	44	18,000	291	1.6	University of San Francisco.....	2,250	1,496	66	4,728	375	8.0
Notre Dame.....	4,200	3,587	85	6,439	108	1.7	Xavier University.....	3,163	1,715	54	2,918	175	6.0
Holy Cross.....	1,079	939	87	2,379	13	.5	John Carroll.....	2,246	1,488	66	3,210	187	5.8
Harvard.....	5,600	3,326	59	6,073	89	1.5	Swathmore.....	1,068	369	36	1,166	10	.9
Yale.....	5,676	3,365	59	4,739	37	.8	Pepperdine.....	4,431	2,299	52	4,641	639	13.8
Northwestern.....	21,128	9,841	47	9,372	90	1.0	Northeastern.....	3,806	7,176	81	29,000	4,400	15.2
Whittier.....	1,249	507	41	1,815	66	3.6	Dartmouth.....	3,167	1,847	58	3,987	95	2.4
Johns Hopkins.....	1,757	1,083	62	2,020	25	1.2	New York University.....	26,438	14,359	54	10,932	463	4.2
St. Olaf.....	1,660	564	34	2,650	5	.2							

PRESIDENTIAL PENSION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in accord with the provisions of House Rule XXIII, clause 6, I hereby give notice of an amendment which I propose to offer in debate on the consideration of H.R. 16900.

On page 12 of the reported bill, line 24, strike out "\$153,000" and insert "\$98,000" in lieu thereof."

This amendment is intended to eliminate \$55,000 appropriated for a pension to Mr. Nixon by reason of his service as President. It is my belief that such a pension is dependant on the recipient having rendered honorable service. The resignation of the former President with the knowledge that his impeachment and conviction was a certainty, combined with the extension to Mr. Nixon of a Presidential pardon for criminal acts committed by him during his tenure as President and the acceptance thereof by Mr. Nixon constitute clear and convincing proof that the service of Mr. Nixon was not honorable and not deserving of the reward of a pension.

AMENDMENTS TO MARTIN SUBSTITUTE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my remarks made during debate on congressional reform on Tuesday, I insert in the RECORD at this point, the amendments I intend to offer to the Martin substitute, House Resolution 1321. These are to eliminate from the

legislation all increases in staffing and partisanship provisions:

AMENDMENTS TO THE MARTIN SUBSTITUTE (H. RES. 1321) TO BE OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT

Page 69, line 9, strike out "eighteen" and insert "six".

Page 69, line 17, strike out "six" and insert "two".

Page 70, line 10, strike out "or age" and insert "age, or political affiliation".

Page 70, line 24, strike out "twelve" and insert "six".

Page 71, line 5, strike out "or age" and insert "age, or political affiliation".

Page 71, line 14, strike out "four persons" and insert "one person".

Page 73, line 22, strike out "seven or more" and insert "two".

Page 74, line 16, strike out "six" and insert "two".

Page 74, line 17, strike out "four" and insert "two".

Page 67, strike out "entitled" in line 15 and all that follows down through page 68, line 3, and insert "entitled to and shall receive fair consideration in the appointment of committee staff personnel pursuant to each such primary or additional expense resolution."

ELDERLY WANT SOLUTIONS TO INFLATION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker now that the heralded "economic summit" meeting has come and gone, it is now time for this administration to come to grips with the problems of inflation and propose the kinds of solutions which can curb the growth of this dreaded national malaise.

A number of proposals, some worthwhile, some specious were offered during the course of the summit, but at the present time we are conspicuous of an absence of any real direction from this administration.

One of the more constant solutions offered to curb inflation is one which I think holds the real key, namely significantly cutting Government spending, and the achieving of a balanced Federal budget.

The people of this Nation will be anxiously awaiting the actions of the Congress and the administration in the coming weeks and months. The interests of all Americans, particularly the elderly, who are enduring the worst hardship from inflation, must be taken into consideration in any inflation fighting proposals which may be offered.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert an editorial which was printed in the October edition of the American Association of Retired Persons News Bulletin. The points raised in this editorial are worthy of the consideration of all my colleagues.

The text of the editorial entitled "Inflation: A Matter of Survival" follows:

INFLATION: A MATTER OF SURVIVAL

Few Americans argued with President Ford when he defined inflation as the nation's top problem. But arguments abound as he searches for a consensus on how to deal with the problem. Reconciling the arguments and finding an effective policy to control infla-

tions is a matter of urgency for all citizens. For millions of older Americans, it is a matter of survival.

Medical care, food, housing and fuel, for example, are basic necessities on which older citizens spend a proportionately larger share of their income than do younger citizens. Those still in the work force can probably "tighten their belts," spend less on "luxuries" and change their lifestyle in other ways to cope with the problem.

But for millions of older citizens there is no way to fight back. How can they cut down on "luxuries" when all of their fixed income must go for necessities? How can they alter their already basic diets, except by eating less? And how can they avoid the high cost of being sick?

Health care prices have increased 50 percent faster than the economy as a whole since price controls on the health industry were lifted in May. The secretary of Health, Education and Welfare estimates that inflation in health care will increase the nation's cost by \$4 billion this year and \$9 billion in 1975 with "some 70 percent of these higher costs coming—by one route or another—out of the consumer's pocket."

Food prices continue their upward spiral. In July the "economy" food plan used by the Department of Agriculture to determine food stamp allowances actually cost \$2.50 more than low-income people received in stamps.

In housing, rents and taxes are skyrocketing. In one Midwestern state last year more than 8,000 elderly homeowners living on less than \$1,000 a year paid 30 percent of their incomes on property taxes alone.

If fuel prices soar as threatened this winter, consumer columnist Sylvia Porter predicts that households with income less than \$8,000 per year "face financial disaster." She reports that the average cost of heating a home in Maine doubled in one year, the price of No. 2 heating oil in New England rose from 20 to 40 cents per gallon and that coal prices increased as much as fivefold in some areas.

As President Ford prepares for his economic summit conference later this year, our Association has recommended a number of general and specific steps to ease the burden on older citizens living on fixed incomes. A paper submitted by our President at a meeting with President Ford in August noted:

"We believe that monetary policy and fiscal policy must be coordinated if the purchasing power of the dollar is to be stabilized (The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act, which we strongly supported, is an important first step in that direction.)

"Since we are not convinced that restrictive monetary and fiscal policies alone are sufficient to control inflation, we strongly favor the dilution of excessive concentrations of market power and the encouragement of competition. In certain industries such as energy, metals and automobiles, it is apparent that such concentrations of market power are stifling free and competitive enterprise, frustrating the basic economic principles of supply and demand, and fostering inflation. We believe that acute competition is the best restraint on price increases.

"If price stability in certain industries can be promoted by increased competition and/or increased regulations, we would support necessary remedies, including more vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws, enactment of additional anti-trust legislation designed to accelerate the judicial process, more open foreign trade policies to stimulate competition from foreign sources, and even government competition of the TVA-type.

"While we do not favor blanket economic controls, which produce great disruption and misallocation of resources in essentially competitive markets, we would favor the imposition of selective controls as a first step toward restraining inflation in particular areas—such as health care.

"We urge the continued development of a comprehensive food policy to maximize food production and to eliminate where necessary barriers to the importation of foreign farm products."

More specific recommendations to help neutralize the impact of inflation on retirement incomes include:

Use of general tax revenues rather than increases in the payroll tax to finance Social Security cost-of living increases;

Removal of the Social Security earnings limitation test coupled with expansion of government sponsored, socially beneficial employment programs for those older citizens who desire or find it necessary to work;

Enactment of legislation requiring that private pension plans include cost-of-living adjustment features, and encouragement of employers to provide retroactive cost-of-living adjustments to their present pensioners; and

Development of a special Consumer Price Index based on the spending patterns of older citizens to reflect more accurately the impact of inflation on the elderly.

President Ford has said that his consciousness of the plight of older Americans "serves only to strengthen my determination to bring the forces of inflation under control." Through the series of "mini-summits" now under way, he seems determined to seek a truly effective and national consensus on solving the inflation problem. As our Association continues to participate in that effort, we welcome your views on the subject and will devote most of our "Reader Says" column to member suggestions in the next few issues.

NEW LIONS DIRECTOR LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent as one of my constituents a new director of Lions International, Don Buckalew of Conroe, Tex.

Lions International is the largest humanitarian service club organization in the world. It is a nonpolitical, nonsectarian association with over 1 million members in 146 nations and geographic areas. Don's election by Lions from all over the world to the directorship is testimony to his years of community service.

As a member of the Conroe Noon Lions Club, Don received the Outstanding Lion Award for 1970-71. He had earlier served as district governor of Lions International District 2-S2, and because of his accomplishments in that office was honored with the 100 percent District Governor's Award and the Lions International Extension Award.

His concern for Texas' youth was illustrated in his past service as director of the Texas Lions League for Crippled Children and his current chairmanship of the Camp Improvements Committee.

In 1969, his efforts on behalf of all citizens were recognized by the Lions International president, who named the Conroe Lion recipient of the Ambassador of Goodwill Award.

Don has also served the community in many capacities outside the Lions Club: he is past president of the Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce Embassy Club; past president of

the Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce; past president of the Montgomery County Hospital Board of Managers.

This portrait of an unselfish, public-spirited citizen would not be complete without adding that his wife, Dale, and their children, Debbie, Don, Jr., Denny, and Deann, have been a constant source of encouragement and motivation for Don.

As he begins his role as a Lions international director, Don can look back with pride on his accomplishments. But those achievements show that he is a man who does not look back, so I am betting that Don will assume the directorship with his sights trained on the future. His skills and generosity will help make the future a better one.

PROJECT INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents in the Fabulous Fifth Congressional District, Jeffrey Ellis Aronin, AIA, FRIBA, recently appeared, on August 20, at a public hearing on Project Independence. This statement, coming from one on the firing line as an architect, had some sensible suggestions to make, and I would like to share them with my colleagues.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY JEFFREY ELLIS ARONIN AT PROJECT INDEPENDENCE PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Kleinfeld, Members of the Panel, Ladies and Gentlemen: My name is Jeffrey Ellis Aronin, Architect, based in Woodmere, New York, with offices also in several countries around the world.

What I am concerned with as an architect is common old-fashioned horse sense, the sort of thing which our forefathers possessed and native civilizations have used for centuries in the design and orientation of buildings and cities.

I have been involved in saving energy all my professional life, even as a student in university. And back in 1946—28 years ago—I persuaded my professor to let me go on a 54-man, 3-month army expedition to Canada's far north. It was an eye-opener; it was there that not only could I see how the Eskimo mastered the climate but I learnt my first lesson in how to keep warm in an igloo. One night when it was -58 degrees Fahrenheit outside, the inside temperature was 29 degrees above—a difference of over 87 degrees, and the only heat generator was the warmth of our bodies which was captured inside. I won't tell you who was there.

My life-long work in this field led to my graduate research at McGill University and the writing of my book, "Climate and Architecture," published in 1953, 21 years ago, in which the fundamentals of moulding our communities to the climate were discussed. And I am pleased to say that it has now been translated into several languages and has been published in toto by the Russians, who conveniently ignored paying their royalty fees. In that year I also said, and I am on record for that in many newspapers of 1953 and 1954, that there would be a shortage of fossil fuels by 1975 and that architecturally we must do something about it.

Now I mention this because I am not going into specifics regarding the multitude of

solutions which are within our capabilities technologically, using solar energy, the wind, temperature differences, precipitation, geothermal energy, the tides, and other factors of the climate.

Suffice it to say, however, that significant energy savings can be effected if:

1. Communities are laid out with respect to climate. Zoning plans should take this into account. In England, long-term growth patterns, land-use designs, etc. prepared by the government, have recognized this.

2. If the building site is properly selected vis-a-vis the microclimate and topography.

3. If the mass of the building is designed to receive those elements of the climate considered desirable and reject those considered undesirable. It is ridiculous that buildings are symmetrical. On a skyscraper here in New York the forces exerted on a north and south wall in winter are in the ratio of 1:100. Annually they are in the ratio of 1:70. It is like the walls being thousands of miles rather than yards apart.

4. If the features of the building and the skin are designed similarly to admit desirable elements and reject undesirable ones. The skin should be a dynamic element, breathing perhaps as does our own skin, responding to different light radiations, temperatures and so forth. It should move as a whole unit with the entire organism. A building envelope designed to receive the impact of the environment and reflecting, admitting, or controlling its flow into the main body of the building would increase efficiency, economy and comfort and also open up many new aesthetic options. Yesterday I heard one speaker say that you should be able to open windows. Certainly you should, but our buildings of tomorrow should not look like the ones he has built over the past, and which Frank Lloyd Wright described as sanitary slums.

Our technology is quite capable of doing all this, but how can the government and business help the design professions towards Project Independence?

1. Building codes and regulations should not require traditional or specific air conditioning or heating systems if others can perform the same function, the same way or better.

2. Energy regulations should not be restrictive.

3. Mortgage bankers should not prejudice a loan for unconventional designs that accommodate the climate and reduce the use of fossil fuels.

4. A life-cycle energy cost analysis should be made for every projected building, to be approved by appropriate authorities.

5. Government should subsidize manufacturers until cost of solar-heating equipment, wind generators, etc. are reduced to acceptable levels. These can be direct subsidies or in the form of tax reductions.

6. Buildings should be designed for 24-hour use rather than 8-hours as is often the case for educational facilities, offices, industries, etc. Some structures can have more than one use.

7. The Government should sponsor adequate building research activities, with its own experimental facilities, as do so many other countries of the world, so well.

8. Layouts of communities should be such as to reduce transportation between home and work.

9. Structural elements should be fabricated in new sizes to conserve materials, conserve weights, conserve transportation fuel, conserve fuel used in the fabricating or refining processes.

10. The science of geotecture, or underground buildings, should be advanced where necessary.

11. Old communities should be rehabilitated. Grass should be grown on the roofs of our cities, to reduce heat buildup in summer and prevent, through insulation, heat loss in winter. It would also provide recreational space for countless millions.

12. The design professions, (and the American Institute of Architects Board has adopted a policy which includes this among other things) have an ethical responsibility to see that buildings are designed to conserve energy.

I could go on and on, I like to think that our profession has a perspective which will be useful in contributing something to the worthy goals of Project Independence and I hope that we may be privileged to do our part.

Thank you.

GI BILL EXPANSION URGENTLY NEEDED

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as the House and Senate conferees again meet to discuss the veterans' education bill, I thought the enclosed recent editorial from the San Jose Mercury to be worth noting. I could not agree more with this editorial that Congress has delayed too long in fulfilling its responsibility to our Vietnam veterans.

I would strongly urge my colleagues on the conference committee to work for a substantial increase in monthly educational benefits, for an extension of eligibility from 36 to 45 months and for a reasonable educational loan program. I would further urge my colleagues in the House to act favorably on the conference report and to extend these vital benefits to our veterans as soon as possible.

The editorial follows:

[From the San Jose Mercury, Sept. 24, 1974]

GI BILL EXPANSION URGENTLY NEEDED

Congress has produced considerable rhetoric on the undue neglect of Vietnam veterans. Unfortunately, it has failed to take the positive actions required to remedy matters, including approval of a bill to increase GI educational benefits.

Such legislation has been under study and in and out of conference committees for several months. Meanwhile, veterans have returned to classes. The report is unanimous. The vets find it increasingly difficult to meet living and educational expenses on benefit checks that have not been increased in the past two years despite a nearly 20 per cent increase in the cost of living during the same period.

Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) has told veterans' representatives that he expects Congress to approve a compromise GI benefits bill within a week. This timetable may be overly optimistic, but it should not be far off the mark. Congress must not dally longer in providing fair treatment for Vietnam and post-Korean veterans.

Having stripped the bill of a proposal to revive a post-World War II tuition-payment plan, a House-Senate conference committee approved a 23 per cent increase in basic monthly payments and authorized a program of student loans to veterans. This compromise was rejected by the House.

Men and women who served their country can be excused if they feel they are getting a raw deal, particularly with so much concern expressed over amnesty for persons who avoided service.

Veterans' educational benefits should be increased to reflect higher living costs. Also in order are an extension of schooling eligibility for an additional nine months and the authorization of a properly funded student loan program for veterans.

Improved benefits are needed to enable many Vietnam veterans to continue their schooling, and to provide them with benefits that are more on a par with those provided in the post-World War II period.

CRISIS FACING PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, 1974, I called to the attention of my colleagues the crisis facing Pan American World Airways, and inserted some material detailing steps that can be taken to alleviate the problem.

Since then, I have requested President Ford to meet with me and the heads of our principal international airlines to discuss the unfair mail transportation rates for U.S. air carriers versus foreign air carriers.

The following editorial from the Washington Post of September 28, 1974, summarizes the issue very neatly:

PAN AM AND UNFAIRNESS

One of the most effective advertisements we have seen recently is that published in this newspaper and elsewhere by the employees of Pan American World Airways. It contended that Pan Am is on the verge of financial disaster because the government of the United States has treated it unfairly over the years. By focusing on this simple issue of fairness, and by documenting it to some extent, this ad has attracted more interest on Capitol Hill than had all the entreaties of Pan Am's executives.

As evidence of unfairness, the employees cited the higher rates foreign airlines get for carrying international mail, the lower interest rates at which foreign airlines can finance airplane purchases, the high landing fees charged to American airplanes at some foreign airports and the consistent refusal of the Civil Aeronautics Board to give Pan Am any domestic air routes.

There is considerable truth to these claims, even though they do not tell the whole story of Pan Am's decline from its once dominant position in commercial aviation. If the Post Office paid American airlines at the same rate for hauling mail that foreign airlines are paid by other governments, for example, Pan Am would get around \$35 million a year more than it now does. If Pan Am could have borrowed money for its airplane purchases through the Ex-Im Bank, as most foreign airlines have, its debt charges would be millions of dollars less than they now are. If landing fees at foreign airports were the same as they are at American airports, Pan Am would spend substantially less money each year. If the CAB had given Pan Am domestic routes, it would not be in the critical financial position it is in today; its position would only be serious—as is that of the other major American international airline, Trans World.

While we think the government ought to move to alter some of these conditions (and it has already begun to consider the mail rate question), none of them gets to the real heart of the troubles in the international air business. Those troubles are enormously complex and derive from a mixture of foreign policy considerations, national pride, international trade policy, incorrect business judgments and the idea of competition between privately-owned companies, like Pan

Am, and government-owned companies, like a majority of its competitors.

It makes little economic sense, for example, to have more than a hundred international airlines. There is Pan Am, flying to 124 cities in 78 countries, and there is Air Siam, flying to four cities in four countries with, apparently, two airplanes. Nor does it make much sense to have 24 airlines competing for passengers across the North Atlantic, particularly when their estimated losses this year on these routes come to a total of around \$300 million.

These costly oddities exist because each country wants to have its own airlines, first for domestic flights and ultimately for international flights. And once established the international flight becomes a matter of pride, regardless of the cost, which is often subsidized by the airline's government.

Perhaps Pan Am's predicament will provide the incentive needed to start an overhaul of the whole international air business and of the American government's policy toward it. It seems clear that most other international airlines are also in financial trouble. KLM, for instance, recently estimated its losses in the current fiscal year at \$30 to \$40 million. As deficits of this size mount, other governments may be more inclined to set national pride aside and begin to consider the economic facts.

In any event, for the Ford administration, which wisely turned down Pan Am's request for an emergency subsidy, the goal ought to be the rationalization of the situation, not the salvation of Pan Am. If the American national interest—primarily the maintenance of a complete international air network—requires only one major airline, a Pan Am-TWA merger would make sense. If that interest requires two major carriers, Pan Am will need other kinds of help, including, perhaps, a merger with a domestic airline. The important thing is for the administration to do more than just provide Pan Am with a quick shot in the arm or with an elimination of the unfairness now existing. It needs to aim at the larger goal of making sense out of an industry that is spending itself into bankruptcy.

CONGRESSMAN CLIFFORD MCINTIRE—LONG CAREER OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, Maine people were deeply grieved this week at the death of former Congressman Clifford McIntire, and it was an occasion of special sadness to me, since I have known him well throughout much of his long career in public service.

First elected to the 82d Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Frank Fellows, he was reelected to the 83d and to the five succeeding Congresses. His years of distinguished achievement in the Congress therefore ran from October 1951 to January 1965.

Born in Perham, Aroostock County, Maine, May 4, 1908, he attended the public schools there and Washburn, Maine, High School. He was graduated from the University of Maine College of Agriculture in 1930, and then engaged in farming in his hometown of Perham.

Later he became an appraiser, supervisor, and regional manager for Farm Credit Administration's Springfield of-

fice, and was named general manager of the Maine Potato Growers, Inc., at Presque Isle prior to his election to Congress.

After trying unsuccessfully for the U.S. Senate, he became director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, a member of the task force on rural development, and a member of the Advisory Council of the Public Land Law Review Commission. Recently President Ford nominated him to serve as a director of the Federal agency charged with helping to restructure the bankrupt rail lines in the Northeast.

Throughout his 66 years, and his many years of service, Clifford McIntire justly earned the respect of the citizens of the State of Maine. His work on Capitol Hill was well known and will be greatly missed.

He was a man who worked hard and with great dignity all his life; who loved the outdoors; and who especially loved the people and the State of Maine.

All of us who knew "Cliff" McIntire are deeply saddened by his death.

OCTOBERFEST FEATURES

ED McMAHON

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend Lowell, Mass., will have the third regatta festival which will celebrate the increased use of the Merrimack River for boating and also the ethnic diversity which came to this area to man the mills along the Merrimack River. The feature of this Octoberfest will be Ed McMahon, costar of "The Tonight Show" with Johnny Carson. Although Ed was born on March 6, 1923 in Detroit, Mich., he was raised in the Fifth District of Massachusetts—in Lowell. Ed was educated in Lowell public schools and was a member of the class of 1940 of Lowell High School. His high school graduation exercises were held in Lowell Memorial Auditorium, which his father used to run and where Ed will do a show this Saturday night. Before World War II he attended Boston College, and then completed his B.A. degree in speech and drama after the war at Catholic University. During the war Ed was a Marine Corps pilot as well as a flight instructor; he is still a member of the reserves. During the Korean war he reentered the Marine Corps as a fighter pilot.

Ed began his radio and television career in Lowell with a job on WLH radio station. His career was interrupted by World War II and his educational pursuits, but after completion of his degree, in Philadelphia he began his television career. Another interruption came about as the result of the Korean war.

Ed is probably best known for his television appearances, but he has also done many night club acts and has appeared on Broadway in "The Impossible Years" and in a leading role in the movie "The Incident." Ed McMahon and Johnny Carson began their partnership in 1954 for the program "Who Do You Trust?"

He continued his sidekick role when "The Tonight Show" began in October 1962. In addition to his well-known role on "The Tonight Show," he has hosted three daytime series and has starred in many NBC-TV specials.

Ed has participated in many civic and community events throughout his career. In recognition of his service to his fellow man, Lowell Technical Institute is awarding him an honorary degree as well as making him a member of the alumni association. In addition, the class of 1975 salutes him as an honorary member.

This Octoberfest is the third of what is becoming a series of events that bring people back to their cultural heritage at the site where the industrial revolution in this country came of age—the site which will soon be incorporated into an urban cultural park. Mr. Speaker, I welcome home this weekend, Ed McMahon, native of Lowell, to be honored by his friends and admirers.

THE VOTER

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Washington Report of October 2, 1974, entitled "The Voter":

THE VOTER

As I walked down the street in a small Indiana town, one man said to me, "I vote for every candidate of my party—a straight ticket—and I always have. It's the only way." About 20 paces down the street I encountered a second person, who said, "I split my ballot, and vote for the candidate, not the party. That is the only way to assure we get the best qualified candidate."

In the mysterious workings of American democracy neither of these persons is wrong and both may be right. A good argument can be made to support either view.

The straight ticket voter reasons something like this: (with appreciation to Clinton Rossiter for a few borrowed phrases) There is no America without democracy; there is no democracy without politics; there is no politics without political parties; and there are no political parties unless some people are loyal to the party and faithfully support it with time, talent, and treasure.

Generally, such a voter sees the political party playing a central role in the functioning of a democratic society because it controls, directs and brings into the open the struggle for power, serves as an immense personal agent to put forward candidates for office, helps make public policy, and educates the American public on issues. He sees the vitality and strength of a political party as an essential aspect of American political life, and he can "vote it straight" with a clear conscience and sound conviction.

But so can the independent voter. Today, relatively few Americans vote for only one party. Most Americans value their independence, and they often change their minds about candidates, cross party lines, and split their tickets. Every politician knows that the habit of independence among voters is growing, that party lines are becoming blurred, and that party affiliations count much less than they once did. The independent voter reasons simply that the way to get good government is to have good office holders, and the best way to get good office holders is to elect the best candidate to the office, without regard to party label.

CXX—2123—Part 25

The straight ticket voter must make a special effort to be fair and openminded, and the independent voter must make a special effort to decide how to vote. But neither need apologize for his manner of voting.

What follows are a few suggestions for the independent voter on questions he might ask in determining how he will vote.

(1) Is the candidate a person of integrity and character? The founding fathers of this nation saw an essential connection between good government and good character. They knew something more was needed to preserve ordered liberty than a perfect plan of government. They knew the people and their representatives needed moral principles in order to keep the government they had constructed working. Perhaps more than in previous elections, voters in 1974 are seeking candidates with character and honesty.

(2) Does the candidate understand the issues? One survey of voter attitudes found that the single most important factor in determining how voters select a candidate is whether or not they feel the candidate understands the issues. The beginning of wisdom in politics today is to realize the complexity of the problems before the nation. Some candidates want to ignore them, or propose simple solutions to them when there are none, or merely recite them, as if that were enough. It is heartening to see voters recognizing that politicians deal with an enormous variety of complex and tough problems, and requiring of them, not expertise in each field, but sufficient understanding of the essentials of each problem that they can usually make sound judgments.

(3) Does the candidate try to deal seriously and constructively with the issues? Anyone can be against or toss around easy slogans. But people today, as they look at the qualifications of a candidate, want to know if the candidate is a problem-solver or merely a part of the problem.

(4) Does the candidate have the commitment and the ability to get things done? Obviously, it doesn't help much if a candidate of good character understands the issues and is willing to deal with them constructively but doesn't have the ability to get things done in the decisionmaking processes of the country.

(5) Do I agree with the candidate on most issues? The voter may be conservative or liberal, isolationist or internationalist, left wing or right wing, anti-government or pro-government, or he may be a one issue voter. Under our system each voter has the right to select and vote for the candidate whose views most nearly correspond with his own. With the wide range of issues today, a voter cannot reasonably expect to agree with a candidate on every issue, but he can expect to find a candidate who generally fits his approach to the issues.

American democracy allows the voter to choose whether he will be a party-line or independent voter, and, if the latter, how he will choose his candidate. These decisions make the system work, and it is part of the genius of this system that it permits either approach.

BIG THICKET

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, the vote to approve the House-Senate amendments on the Big Thicket National Preserve fulfills the dreams of many Texans and environmentalists nationwide.

And, although this legislation does not

represent all of the provisions many of us fought for so long, it does preserve 84,550 acres of an area only 100 years ago that was over 30 times this size and is referred to by scientists as the "biological crossroads of North America."

This is a tribute to many people and certainly one of the leaders is the former Senator from Texas, Ralph Yarborough. Senator Yarborough fought long and hard in the other body to protect this area. Thanks to the Big Thicket Coordinating Committee and many individual environmental groups the Big Thicket will now be preserved and signal a new era in the National Parks Service system.

Known as a preserve, the Big Thicket will not only be available for outdoor recreation but will serve as a scientific and educational living laboratory so students of various disciplines can observe this area unique to the United States—a mixture of zoological and botanical life both temperate and tropical, western and eastern.

Mr. Speaker, many of us feel very firmly that the legislative taking provision in the House bill was best since it would save money in the long run, be most fair to landowners, and immediately save an area being decimated at an estimated rate of 30 to 50 acres a day. However, the intransigence on this point by the Senate led most Texans and the House Interior Committee to the conclusion that our primary goal of preservation must be realized this Congress and legislative taking would have to be given up for now. Therefore, I am happy to see at least a provision calling for the Secretary of Interior to draw up a plan within 1 year, detailing an acquisition schedule to be completed 5 years thereafter. Of course, this can also be supplemented by the Secretary filing a declaration of taking on any area under immediate danger and I plan to review carefully any possible deterioration of the units designated in this legislation and ask the Secretary to move expeditiously to insure the integrity of this preserve as described in H.R. 11546.

Mr. Speaker, this body is to be commended for passing strong and unique environmental legislation, the Big Thicket National Preserve. But most importantly, I believe we should salute hundreds of environmentalists, most from Texas, but many from throughout the United States, who spent thousands of hours of their own time and thousands of dollars of their own money in the realization of this dream. It is as a result of their painstaking work and substantial sacrifice exploring, studying, protecting, and publicizing the Big Thicket that this new environmental concept came into being.

A LETTER RECEIVED FROM
MR. U SAM OEUR

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from Mr. U Sam

Oeur, the delegate of the Khmer Republic to the General Assembly of the United Nations, informing me that the Republic is facing great difficulty in retaining its seat in the General Assembly of the United Nations, because of the pressure and threats of the Communists within and without that organization. In response to Mr. U Sam Oeur's letter, I addressed a letter to Mr. John Scali, the Representative of the United States to the United Nations, asking him to do everything in his power to protect the seat of the Khmer Republic in the United Nations and the freedom and independence of the Republic as well. I have received the assurances of Mr. Scali that he will do everything in his power to support the Khmer Republic.

But Mr. Scali's efforts are not enough. I believe that the Members of Congress ought to know the urgency of the situation of the Khmer Republic, which is now the frontline in the battle against the Communist imperialism in Southeast Asia. Not only do these people face the Communist diplomatic threat in the United Nations, they also face the Communist military threat in their own country. As Members of the Congress of the United States we ought to appreciate the valiant struggle against communism that is being waged by the people of Cambodia and do what we can to protect not only their seat in the United Nations, but also their independence from the Communist Empire.

Let us all respond to the request for help from the Khmer Republic and use the vast moral, diplomatic, and political power of the United States to insure the survival of freedom in Southeast Asia and particularly in the Khmer Republic.

VIRGIN ISLANDS EDUCATOR
HONORED

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to insert in the RECORD two newspaper accounts of a testimonial banquet honoring Mrs. Juanita Gardine, an outstanding Virgin Islands educator, and a distinguished civic leader. Mrs. Gardine's motto is "Always remember: Strive for perfection in all things," and her career is the proof that she has done just that. The women of the Virgin Islands have made exceptional contributions to our development and well-being as Mrs. Gardine's service to her community so dramatically illustrates. Her life is an inspiration for all and the recent fete in her honor is a measure of our gratitude and the esteem in which we hold her. The articles follow:

[From the Daily News, Sept. 25, 1974]

EDUCATOR HONORED AT ST. CROIX FETE

CHRISTIANSTED.—Her motto is "Always remember: Strive for perfection in all things."

And according to those who gathered recently to honor her, Juanita Constantia Forbes Gardine has taken that motto to heart in her years of service to the Virgin Islands.

A native of Christiansted, Mrs. Gardine has

long been active in St. Croix in the fields of education, civic activities and church work.

Mrs. Gardine was educated at the Christiansted Public Grammar School and attended most of the seventh grade at the junior high school before moving to New York.

She stayed in New York until 1934, earning a bachelor's degree from Hunter College.

When she returned to St. Croix, she began her long climb up the educational ladder, starting as a fifth grade teacher at the Christiansted Public Grammar School.

Mrs. Gardine later served as assistant principal and principal of Christiansted High School, principal of Frederiksted Junior High School, assistant superintendent of education, dean of community colleges, and supervisor of statistics.

In the midst of this work, she spent four summers—from 1937 to 1940—studying at Columbia University's Teacher's College for her master's degree in teaching mathematics.

Her most recent position in the Department of Education was as principal of Christiansted Public Grammar School, a job she held from 1963 until August of this year.

Despite her heavy working schedule, Mrs. Gardine has found the time to take an active role in St. Croix community affairs.

Currently she is president of the Christiansted Business and Professional Women's Club, chairman of the Supervisory Committee of the Credit Union, a member of Episcopal Church Women and a member of Women of St. John's Church.

She was once president of the Teachers' Association, president of the Municipal Employees' Association, president of the Mental Health Association, secretary of the American Red Cross Board of Directors, president of the Women of St. John's Church, board member of Episcopal Church Women, secretary of the School Health Committee, and secretary of the State Federation of BPW Clubs.

The testimonial dinner for Mrs. Gardine, held recently at the Beach Hotel, drew a star-studded list of speakers, including Gov. Melvin H. Evans and Commissioner of Education Harold C. Halzlip.

[From the Virgin Islands Post, Sept. 29, 1974]

JUANITA GARDINE HONORED IN CEREMONY

Juanita Constantia Forbes Gardine, a native of Christiansted, St. Croix, attended Christiansted Public Grammar School and the seventh grade of the Junior High School. She went to New York in 1925 and attended Harriet Beecher Stowe Junior High School, Wadleigh High School and Hunter College earning the B.A. She returned home in November 1934 and in December 1934 started to teach for a teacher, who became ill, in the fifth grade of Christiansted Public Grammar School. Since there was a great need for a mathematics teacher she was transferred to Christiansted High School in the Junior Division. She later taught in the Senior division.

During the summers of 1937, 1938, 1939 and 1940 she studied at Columbia University in Teachers College and earned the M.A. in the teaching of mathematics in 1940.

She remained at Christiansted High School until June 1941. Before leaving she acted as Assistant Principal for the last half year since the Principal had resigned and the Assistant Principal had gone away. The Superintendent was Acting Principal but was not at the school very long so she was practically in charge.

In September 1941 she was made Principal of Frederiksted Junior High School teaching Mathematics and Geography where she remained until 1947. In September of 1947 she went to live in New Jersey but returned home in February 1948, but did not return to the Education Department in St. Croix until September 1948. In New Jersey she was a substi-

tute teacher of Mathematics, Physics and English.

In St. Croix, she returned to teach at Christiansted High School being the homeroom teacher of the 12th grade teaching English and Mathematics to that and other classes.

In January of 1949 she was appointed Assistant Superintendent of Education. However, since no replacement could be found for the High School she remained there until March doing both jobs. She continued as Assistant Superintendent with duties of Supervisor of School Lunch and Elementary Schools until 1955 when the two municipalities were made one with one Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner. She was then made Dean of Community Colleges which title was held for two years but funds ran out and she actually went back to supervising elementary schools.

In 1957 she was asked to become Principal of Christiansted High School which position she held for a year. She taught evening classes in Mathematics for Catholic University of Puerto Rico Extension in St. Croix.

In 1958 she was asked to organize the Statistics Department for which a Federal Grant was available. This position was first Supervisor of Testing and Statistics and later Supervisor of Statistics only. Part of each month was spent in St. Thomas since this was necessary to do the work for all three islands.

There was some disagreement with Dr. Sanchez, the Commissioner of Education, and she resigned from the Department in 1961 and a few months later became a Social Worker in the Department of Social Welfare.

In 1963 (September) she went back to the Christiansted High School as a remedial teacher but was asked by Dr. Richards, who was then Commissioner, to take over the Principalship of the Christiansted Public Grammar School. That position she held until August 20, 1974.

In 1960 she went to New York University and was matriculated for 6th year degree. Courses were taken here under the New York University Program. Thirty-three credits were earned from New York University. Three credits were earned by correspondence from the University of Chicago and six credits in Special Education under two professors from Cheyney College during the summer of 1967 in St. Thomas.

At present she is a member of the American Statistical Association and National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Federation of BPW Clubs, Inc. and State Federation of BPW Clubs.

Locally she is President of Christiansted BPW Club, Chairman, Supervisory Committee of the Credit Union, Member of Episcopal Church Women and Women of St. John's Church.

She was once President of the Teachers Association, President of the Municipal Employees Association, President of the Mental Health Association, Secretary of the American Red Cross Board of Directors, President of the Women of St. John's Church, Board Member of Episcopal Church Women, Secretary of the School Health Committee and Secretary of the State Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

She hopes to work part time at the College of the Virgin Islands and do some traveling when possible. Her interest will always be in the education of the children of the Virgin Islands. But to date only few * * * have been thrown in honor of one who has done outstanding work among the children of these islands.

Last weekend's testimonial banquet organized for veteran St. Croix educator Mrs. Juanita Constantia Forbes Gardine, at the Beach Hotel on St. Croix was one of those few.

Despite intermittent rains, hundreds of friends, co-workers and students of Mrs. Gardine turned up to honor this grand old

lady of V.I. Education, returning some of the friendship she had given over her 40 years working in the Education system of this island.

Heading the impressive list of speakers was Governor Melvin H. Evans, who told Mrs. Gardine "if there were many more like you today, the world will be different." Also addressing the gathering were Education Commissioner Dr. Harold Halzlip, St. Croix' acting Administrative Assistant, Rudolph Shulterbrandt; Mrs. Elena L. Christian and special guest speaker Dr. Elam Hertzler, Special Assistant to the U.S. Commissioner of Education in Washington, D.C.

The speeches refreshed the minds of many as to the type of teacher Mrs. Gardine was, devoted and dedicated, never giving up in spite of the constant struggle which began way back when it was work without pay and funds running out.

The guest of honor received very many gifts but one of the most remarkable and most lasting was the naming of Christiansted Grammar School in her honor.

In her remarks to her guests, Mrs. Gardine said, "I did it all through these years, because I wanted to." She explained that was the reason why she kept on coming back although there were so many hardships, and yet today she emphasizes "I have no regrets."

She said she hoped to work a little at the College of the Virgin Islands because her interest will always be in the education of the children of the Virgin Islands.

Mrs. Gardine has four children, three of which are presently working in the mainland and the other is a teacher at the school.

DUBIOUS ACHIEVEMENT

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, a spending and inflation index has recently been compiled by a group called the Connecticut State Taxpayers Association. They are checking the votes of the U.S. Senators and Representatives. It might be of interest to my colleagues, this group notes those who do not just talk about fiscal economy but actually vote for it. I wish to insert the following Wall Street Journal article:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 2, 1974]

DUBIOUS ACHIEVEMENT

A group calling itself the Connecticut State Taxpayers Association is on to something, judging from its press release that crossed our desk recently. Instead of limiting its concern to state issues, as in the past, the nonpartisan organization has compiled a unique Spending and Inflation Index.

The way it works, the association analyzed 15 votes in the U.S. Senate and 15 in the House of Representatives, encompassing such things as public works, foreign aid and mass transit subsidies. According to the association's calculations, the 123 Congressmen who voted for every measure voted in effect to spend more than \$10 billion, a figure representing about two-thirds of this year's federal deficit. They, along with 36 Senators, were given the association's "Most Inflationary Politician of 1974 Award."

Obviously, votes on issues are not really as cut-and-dried as all that. It's possible to fashion good arguments for most of the 30 proposals in question. Still, the politicians who qualify for the association's award are the most part precisely those any reasonably informed follower of public affairs would expect. Moreover, we see no good reason why

the Connecticut group shouldn't rate Congress by its own fiscal yardstick when the ADA, ACA, AMA, NEA, COPE, and others rate Congressmen according to how closely they adhere to organizational policy lines.

But there is a more important reason why a "Spending and Inflation Index" strikes us as potentially useful. Political democracy is so constituted that the legislators who are most often forced onto the defensive are those who oppose excessive spending and who favor balanced budgets—that is, those who don't just talk about fiscal economy but actually vote for it.

There are exceptions, to be sure. Certain congressional districts, even an occasional state, will send a fiscally conservative delegation to Washington. And there are signs the public no longer looks with quite the same favor upon big spenders. But by and large, constituencies are built and maintained by voting to spend more and more on bigger and bigger programs. Few politicians ever lost votes by dipping their fist into the congressional pork barrel.

In short, a big spender, who claimed to be motivated by "compassion" could usually prevail over a skinflint opponent who put "budgetary concerns above social needs." But political compassion would probably take on a far different light if it came equipped with some sort of reliable price tag.

FLORIDA PROFESSOR HELPS OTHERS TO HELP THEMSELVES

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Bennett family of Florida is a proud family. Diligence and integrity have been watchwords for those who know the family and so it is no surprise that a current generation of brothers carry on a proud tradition.

All of my colleagues know of the service which has been rendered by our friend and colleague, CHARLES E. BENNETT, in the U.S. House of Representatives. No man is more highly respected.

What I want to do here is to pay tribute to another Bennett, his brother, who has carved out a distinguished record of service in the academic world and in service to his fellow man.

Dr. Robert E. Bennett teaches chemical engineering at the University of Florida in Gainesville, Fla. I am proud to represent that institution in the Congress, and I am particularly proud to pay tribute to a gentleman who has made such lasting contributions as Dr. Bennett.

I think a recent article in the Gainesville Sun, written by student journalist Randy Bellows, says what should be said.

Needless to say I am proud of Dr. Bennett and doubly proud that I have been privileged to serve for 12 years with his brother here in the House. As I said at the outset, this is a tremendous family and mankind is richer because of their unselfishness:

PROFESSOR AT UF HELPS OTHERS HELP THEMSELVES

(By Randy Bellows)

Belohorizonte, Brazil, may never know it but Northeast Gainesville is in its debt.

Ask Robert Bennett about it. He'll only be too happy to explain.

It was 14 years ago when Bennett first stepped on Brazilian soil. The University of Florida professor of engineering had been invited to organize and begin a chemical engineering department at one of the nation's universities.

"I had read a great deal about Brazilian poverty in North American newspapers and was anxious to see what it was like in Belohorizonte where the school would be," says Bennett.

What he found was a community gently protected by almost "perfect" weather which was its own shelter.

"I got back to Gainesville in 1962, looked around and immediately noticed the difference," Bennett, who at 64 proudly proclaims that he still takes the steps "two at a time," continued.

"Gainesville didn't have Brazil's weather and because of it many parts of the city has housing worse off than in Brazil itself. I decided that since I couldn't help my good friends in Brazil, I'd spend my time working in Gainesville."

And thus began, precisely a dozen years ago, a neighborly love affair between Dr. Robert B. Bennett—chemical engineer, handyman, bricklayer, banker and entrepreneur—and a tidy piece of turf called Northeast Gainesville.

The clippings lay on his desk in an uneven, jagged pile but it takes nary a moment for Bennett to zero in on the right one.

"Here it is," he proclaims. "Look at this."

His target is a fading photocopy of Look Magazine's article announcing Gainesville's selection as an All-America city. But his particular target is the lead picture—that of Dr. Robert Bennett before an aging Gainesville resident, with the caption: "A College Town Where Everybody Gets Involved."

And for Bennett, that's what it's all about.

For the past 10 years—on weekends, after class, late at night—Bennett has become both the father and son of an "adopted" community, the area in and around the Northeast's Bartley Temple, 1936 NE 8th Ave.

For one day, almost every week, he sheds the garb of a university professor, dons workman's clothes, and goes to work helping Northeast Gainesville to build—and rebuild—itsself.

He has torn down houses, patched up bathroom floors, laid concrete porches and dug fences. He's gone to bat for family services, found medical care for the community's residents and become a won't-be-denied citizen advocate when needed services were not forthcoming.

And so when sewer hookups became a Gainesville reality, it was not completely surprising that he poured \$2,000 of his own money into an informal network of long-term, no-interest loans. Loans made on trust; loans paid on trust.

His is a unique situation, a fact he bemoans. But he quickly adds that his work is not charity, but the opportunity for a community to gain a sense of confidence all its own.

"I will never take on a project unless the family agrees to work with me," he says. "They may only mix the mortar or hand me the tools but they have to be part of it."

"And soon they can do the work on their own. They know how to use the tools but more importantly they have the confidence to know they can make something work."

"And the loans—not only does it give them a chance to buy things they otherwise might not be able to get, but they learn to manage their own affairs," he said.

But "helping them to help themselves"—a phrase Bennett also has adopted—takes time and takes trust and takes money and that is what Bennett bemoans: that more individuals have not done it.

"Every now and then I'll get a group of students or some other people to come out on a project with me. They'll come out one

day and never come back. They say they've done their part.

"But have they?"

Bennett had really no idea what he was getting into 10 years ago when he first joined the Coordinated Council of Concerned Citizens—a group of Gainesville residents.

"I didn't really do much in the group itself. Not as much as the others. But I met people there who said, 'Hey, you're an engineer, do you think you can help with our houses?'"

Bennett, although lamenting that he was just an amateur, agreed to try. Laughing today, he tells of the very first job:

"This family had a rotten bathroom beam. I had to get an 8-ton jack to prop up the house and put in a new beam. It's still the toughest job I've had to do."

But the others have been none too easy either.

"I got a request one time to see if I could get some concrete blocks for a Newberry church. I found two abandoned houses and the owner agreed to let me take it apart and use the materials.

"At first I just wanted the blocks. But soon there were people all over, wanting to help me take down the houses, and use the materials.

"I went home and got every tool I had and gave it out mostly to kids and teen-agers who wanted to help. We ended up using the metal roof to patch up one house, the lumber on another and the concrete bricks to build porches, steps and to put under other houses.

"Oh, the church decided it didn't want the bricks after all. They wanted to do it alone."

And so it goes. But by far his most ambitious effort has been in financial aid to the community's residents.

Beginning simply as an informal way to help a dozen people pay for their sewer hookups, Bennett estimates that he has now loaned out some \$4,000 since late 1969.

And it hasn't all gone for sewers either: Refrigerators, second-hand trucks, tools, bathroom installations, fencing material—"I could go on all day," he says. All have been paid with Bennett's financing.

Often the money does not come back very quickly. Rather, it is usually tortuously slow in returning to Bennett's wallet—\$5 a week for some, \$15 a year for others.

"But in the end I've gotten it all back," he says. "I haven't lost a dime. And you know why? It's because of trust. When these people find they can trust you, you find you can trust them.

"And once you get to know these people, you could never find a better friend."

That's part of the reason Bennett does it. But there is more. There is something else.

"People need to see results from what they do," he explains. "A man publishes a book—it takes a long time before the letters and reviews start coming in.

"But this work is different. It is so gratifying to see the immediately good results that come from this. To feel that you've really helped someone, even to only help repair the door."

And that's why—although Bennett sits on any number of community service committees—his biggest joy comes from "seeing things done, from getting out there and working with the people."

And although he's going on 65, he is not yet ready to stop.

Spritely and agile with thin, wire rimmed glasses (the original kind), he explained: "The longer I do it, the longer I'll be able to do it. I expect to keep it going as long as I'm here and am physically able to do the work.

"For you see, it's the human reaction that counts, that's most important. The chemical reaction and physical reaction are nice. But it's the human being that is the most puzzling. And the most satisfying."

And with those words the University of Florida professor of chemical engineering turned back to his work; ordering some equipment for the chemistry lab.

BUREAUCRATIC CASE FOR ZOOS?

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, a recent column by John Chamberlain has generated much interest in legislation pending before Congress which would have an impact on the Nation's zoological parks. I understand that the column appeared in more than 100 newspapers throughout the country.

In his column, Mr. Chamberlain quotes at length from observations made by Mr. John Mehrrens, director of our very fine Columbia Zoological Park which is in my congressional district. Mr. Mehrrens is widely known and highly regarded in zoological circles throughout the Nation and his views merit careful consideration. They will also be of great interest and I would like to share them with my colleagues. I am therefore happy to include as a part of my remarks the article by Mr. Chamberlain which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of Tuesday, September 17, 1974. The article follows:

BUREAUCRATIC CASE FOR ZOOS?

(By John Chamberlain)

There is a move on in Congress to federalize the zoos. Now, really!

The idea, of course, is well meant. But if the wild animals of North America could be interviewed on the subject of the federal government as nursemaid, one would surely be deafened by a hideous concatenation of yelps, screeches, yowls, and barkings, all sounding their objections.

The noble Department of the Interior, is supposed to be the keeper of wildlife on public lands. But not so long ago it was planting something called "1080" in explosive cartridges. Topped off with bait, or an appealing scent, the cartridge would be nibbled at by a coyote. The explosive would drive the "1080" down the coyote's throat and he would die in agony.

Livestock owners can make a good case that the coyotes are vermin, but the trouble with "1080" is that it also appealed to kit foxes, bobcats, pumas, and even domesticated dogs. Hoping to find a less indiscriminate killer, Interior has substituted sodium cyanide for "1080." But the kit foxes and pumas are, according to disinterested reports, still dying along with the coyotes.

The Golden Eagle supposedly counts on our Washington nursemaids for survival. But if a rancher shoots a Golden Eagle over his own acres from an airplane on the theory that his calves are endangered, nothing is done about it.

The reason for protecting sheep and cattle from wild predators is economic and is not to be condemned out of hand in a world that is short of protein. But what the history of federal coyote control proves is that Washington is always subject to pressure groups. Only a dictatorship could change that, and who wants a dictatorship? If the zoos of the nation were to be federalized, the humane societies would surely dominate the pressure on whatever zoo bureaucracy happened to be set up by the White House.

Well, what would be wrong about that? Let John Mehrrens, who runs the very success-

ful Columbia Zoological Gardens in Columbia, S.C., tell you what is wrong.

The average save-the-animals American, he says, is a biological illiterate, and his reaction is always emotional. This illiterate deplores it when a cheetah is taken from its native habitat in South Africa, or when an Indian tiger is wrenched from his home in the Indian jungle. But the truth is that, in the not so distant future, the cheetahs and Indian tigers may very well owe their existence to protected zoo breeding banks.

"Habitat destruction," says Mehrrens, "is remorseless everywhere, and in South Africa the cheetah is regarded as vermin to be exterminated."

The Mehrrens' statistics are ominous. A few years ago there were 40,000 tigers in India; today the number has dwindled to 1,800. There are more registered Siberian tigers in zoos than in the whole of Siberia. The last wild Balinese tiger was recently shot by a poacher. So the Balinese tiger is now extinct simply because nobody had taken a pair out of their native habitat for a Western zoo. One of three orangutans are now born in captivity, as are two of every four gorillas. As for the African lion, 50 years hence he will be lucky to be living a game park.

Mehrrens' point is that zoos are merciful as well as useful, provided, of course, they are well run. In a period of inflation, Congress, tho it would surely be responsive to the emotional pressures of the humane societies, would hardly be willing to provide money to make the zoos better or to build up their breeding banks of endangered species.

Rather than have a timorous and poorly funded Washington bureaucracy running our zoos for the 103 million people who visit them in a year, and doing the usual sloppy federal job of it, Mehrrens would have the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums take the responsibility for the animal show much as the doctors and the lawyers provide professional competence for their own ranks.

Washington has run the U.S. currency into the ground, devastating thousands of human beings. Why, then, should it be trusted to keep the animals happy?

GILMAN SEEKS FREEDOM FOR UKRAINIANS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of expressing our Nation's humanitarian concern, I am today joining several of my colleagues in cosponsoring a concurrent resolution with the Senate seeking the freedom of two imprisoned Ukrainians, Valentyn Moroz, a 38-year-old historian, and Leonid Plyushch, a 34-year-old mathematician.

These two prominent Ukrainian intellectuals who are incarcerated in a prison near Moscow, are reported to be subjected to extreme physical harm because of their protests against the inhumane and illegal conditions of their confinement and for their continued pleas for constitutional rights of national identity, national language and freer cultural expression. Valentyn Moroz began a hunger strike in protest against solitary confinement on July 1 and his condition is reported to be deteriorating rapidly.

I am appealing to my colleagues to join in supporting this resolution of con-

gressional concern to bring international cognizance that by these transgressions the Soviet Government and the Ukrainian SSR are in flagrant violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which they are signatory parties.

This resolution, expressing our desire to apply the standards of human justice and human rights so common to all of us, urges the President to use appropriate means to request the Soviet Government to release Mr. Moroz and Mr. Plyushch, permitting them and their immediate families to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the country of their choice.

Our Nation must continue, with relentless resolve, to safeguard basic human rights for the suffering and for the persecuted, wherever they may be found.

TAX REFORM VIA FOOLPROOF MINIMUM INCOME TAX

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an appointment by you, which I greatly appreciate, I attended last week a couple of the warm-up sessions preceding President Ford's economic "summit" conference. I would like to report back to Members of the House an important point I raised there, because I believe it is one that has not been given in this Chamber the attention it deserves.

I sat through a briefing by officials of the Office of Management and Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers who, unfortunately, appear to feel that the main road out of the economic mess we find ourselves in is through cuts in the Federal budget—no matter what the human cost.

These officials did not seem at all concerned with the fact that budget cutting would have the effect of curtailing existing domestic programs, such as in the areas of health and pollution, and precluding the promulgation of much-needed new programs in these areas.

If fiscal stability is one answer to our economic problems, then, I submit, there is another way to achieve this goal. An alternative to cutting Government spending is to increase Government revenues, and this we can accomplish through meaningful and effective tax reform.

Whenever we try to achieve tax reform in this Congress, we find ourselves bogged down at every loophole, battling special interests tooth and nail at every comma and semicolon. I submit, Mr. Speaker, we can avoid much of this strife and find a shortcut to tax reform by making an end run around the loopholes.

The way to do this, it seems to me, is to enact a foolproof minimum income tax with no escape hatch for wealthy individuals who manipulate their investments in such a way that they are left with tax-free incomes.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, as our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Brock Adams has already pointed out to us, 402 Americans with incomes of \$100,000 a year or more paid no income taxes at all. Because of situations like this, we enacted a so-called minimum tax in 1969, before I became a member of this body. The idea was to make sure that everyone would pay his fair share of the cost of the Government. But it turns out now that even the 1969 provision in the code is full of loopholes. We have had enough time to close them, and there is no excuse for us to wait any longer. We ought to have action on H.R. 968, the Tax Reform Act of 1973, which so far has got nowhere. Introduced by our learned colleague, the Honorable HENRY REUSS, this bill numbers me as one of its many cosponsors. It contains a title VIII which concerns itself with the minimum tax.

I realize that our Ways and Means Committee has been holding hearings on this very important topic, and I urge its members to follow through with some concrete legislative proposals. This could be a very worthwhile undertaking because I have seen estimates which hold that we could pick up as much as \$4 billion in additional revenues annually by restructuring the minimum tax.

This would not only be profitable; it would be fair.

To encourage discussion of this issue, I append here, as an example of what could be done, an excerpt from the testimony of tax authority Kenneth A. Goldman, who appeared recently before the Ways and Means Committee. I recommend to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that they closely peruse the portion of the testimony which follows:

EXCERPT FROM THE TESTIMONY OF KENNETH A. GOLDMAN

III. THE MINIMUM TAX

A. Rationale underlying the minimum tax

The "minimum tax for tax preferences" was enacted in 1969 as one response to the disclosure that 154 taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes in excess of \$200,000 has paid no tax. Its objective was to bring within the tax base the principal items of income (direct or indirect) not taxed under the "regular" tax base. In particular, it was an attempt to achieve to some degree the following goals:

(1) Assurance that each person or corporation above a minimum income level contribute meaningfully to the costs of Government;

(2) Imposition of a significant tax on persons otherwise paying a relatively smaller share of taxes than those similarly situated;

(3) Reduction of the disparity of tax burdens among persons having similar economic incomes;

(4) Imposition of a meaningful tax upon those who accumulate so many tax preferences that they pay little or no regular tax;

(5) Increased revenue; and

(6) Reduction of the attractiveness of "tax shelter deals".

It is painfully self-evident that the minimum tax, as enacted, has accomplished virtually none of these goals. Let me emphasize however, that the failure is not due to the concept or structure of the minimum tax, but rather to some very specific inadequacies that are readily identifiable and easily corrected. As presently enacted, the minimum tax does not produce a meaningful tax contribution from those affected by Sections 56-58 of the Code. Consider, for example, a

married individual whose income consists only of \$300,000 of capital gains. His "regular" tax on this \$300,000 would be \$76,980 (an effective rate of 25.66%) and his minimum tax would amount to \$4,302 (an effective rate of 1.43%). The minimum tax has resulted in less than 1½% tax burden! It is also interesting to note that the combined effective tax rate on this \$300,000 is 27.09%; and a wage earner reaches a marginal rate of 28% at only \$16,000 of taxable income and an effective rate of 27% at only about \$32,000. In other words, the wage earner with \$32,000 of salary pays taxes at about the same effective rate as an individual with \$300,000 of capital gains income, even including the minimum tax as now imposed. (This, of course, does not even deal with an individual earning tax-exempt income who pays no taxes whatsoever, since "tax preferences" do not include tax-exempt interest income.)

The examples appended to this statement demonstrate that even with the minimum tax, there is no equality of tax treatment for taxpayers similarly situated. Five individuals, each with a real income of \$300,000, pay taxes at effective rates ranking from 0% to 60%. And for the three individuals who have income not included in the tax base, the minimum tax as now structured imposes tax at effective rates of 0%, 9% and 1.43%.

The minimum tax has had little effect on either the structuring or marketability of tax shelter deals. The volume of tax shelter syndications would appear to have markedly increased since 1969; and the effect of the minimum tax is typically discussed only briefly in a paragraph tucked in the back of a prospectus. One of the reasons for the lack of impact is the fact that few taxpayers are affected by the minimum tax. For example, a taxpayer having \$100,000 of taxable income will not have to pay any minimum tax until he has more than \$75,000 of stock option spread or realized more than \$425,000 of capital gain.

It is thus evident that the minimum tax as presently imposed has not achieved the goals originally set. It is equally clear, however, that most of these goals can be achieved—or nearly achieved—in the framework of retaining those tax subsidies desired by Congress by making three specific changes.

B. The Minimum tax base

The basic theory underlying the minimum tax is to bring into an additional tax base those items of tax preference which Congress had intentionally decided should remain as subsidies in the "regular" tax system. It is not at all inconsistent to take the position that while certain tax subsidies are desirable, a taxpayer who takes advantage of such subsidies in an excessive amount or who reduces his tax contribution to a less than relatively meaningful amount should be required to include such excess in a tax base. The purpose is not to reduce the amount of the tax subsidy, except in those cases in which taxpayers take undue advantage of such subsidies through excessive accumulation.

To achieve a meaningful minimum tax the items of tax preference must be expanded to include all major tax subsidies. Only then can Congress assure the average taxpayer that no person or entity is reducing or eliminating his tax by excessive accumulation of such subsidies, and that persons with similar "real" economic incomes are bearing similar tax burdens. Out of the numerous subsidies granted through the Internal Revenue Code, only 9 items are included in the minimum tax base; and of these 9 items, only five⁶ have general application. The other 4 items are important tax preferences, and must be recognized as such, but basically affect only specific businesses.⁷

To actually achieve what the average tax-

⁶Footnotes at end of article.

payer thinks is achieved by "the minimum tax", the tax preference base must be expanded to include the following:

(1) *Tax-exempt interest income.*—To the extent that Congress subsidizes those persons who invest in municipal bonds, this is the clearest item of preference that should be included in the minimum tax base. As seen in the appended examples, the individual or corporation receiving \$300,000 of real income from this source pays a tax of 0%, while his counterpart wage earner pays tax at an effective rate of 47.35% and marginal rate of 50%.⁸ Even if the federal subsidy is reduced, as advocated in prior panel discussions, whatever subsidy remains should be included as a tax preference, unless the exemption is eliminated altogether.

(2) *Intangible drilling and development costs.*—The ability to expense that which investors in other businesses must capitalize is a clear and intentional tax subsidy. There can be no mistake that the advantages of both tax deferral and conversion of ordinary deductions to capital gain are tax preferences provided by the ability to expense intangible drilling costs. This preference is perhaps the single biggest factor relied upon by the numerous oil exploration tax syndications, and yet it is not included as an item of tax preference.

(3) *Foreign tax credit.*—Companies paying taxes to foreign governments are given a dollar-for-dollar credit against their U.S. income taxes;⁹ whereas, taxpayers in the U.S. are given only tax deductions for taxes paid to state and local governments. This difference in treatment—and consequent tax subsidy—should be a tax preference.

(4) *Farm losses.*—As with expensing intangible drilling costs and the ability to use accelerated depreciation, current deductibility of most agricultural costs enable a taxpayer significantly to defer his tax. As is discussed later, the provisions in the regulations allowing current deductibility were originally promulgated to help small farmers avoid accounting problems. They have resulted, however, in the proliferation of giant farming syndications. Section 1251 was enacted in an attempt to correct this abuse. However, the provisions of Section 1251 do not deal with deferral, but only with conversion of ordinary income to capital gain. As in other areas, deferral here is clearly a tax subsidy and should be treated as an item of tax preference.

(5) *Appreciation on property donated to charity.*—By donating appreciated property to charity, a taxpayer is entitled to deduct from his income property and gain on which he paid no tax. The taxpayer has disposed of the property in an event which should trigger recognition of gain, particularly since the disposition gives rise to a deduction which includes the amount of the appreciation. This is unlike other taxpayers who dispose of appreciated property and pay tax on the appreciation. The failure to include this appreciation in the tax base, while still recognizing the appreciation for calculating the charitable deduction, is a direct tax subsidy.

(6) *Life insurance proceeds.*—Sizable amounts of "real income" are excluded from the tax base when received as life insurance proceeds. In many cases, these amounts are modest and in such event, would fall within the \$30,000 floor; but in some cases, these proceeds can be quite significant, do represent untaxed income, and should be included as a tax preference.

(7) *Prepaid expenses not required for valid business purposes.*—As noted above, prepayments or accelerated deductions constitute a direct tax subsidy by providing a deferral of taxes. In some cases, prepayment of expenses is required by business conditions; and in such instances no federal subsidy is received. However, taxpayers often attempt to defer taxes by prepayment of expenses that ordinarily would not be paid until a subsequent

year. The Internal Revenue Service has successfully attacked such attempts in some cases, but has ignored, permitted or been unsuccessful in others. For example, in numerous real estate tax shelter syndications, one year's interest is prepaid in reliance upon the leeway provided in Revenue Ruling 68-643. Typically, this is not a requirement of the lender. If a prepayment is permitted, and a tax deferral thus attained, the amount of the prepayment (where not required by business conditions) ought to be subject to the minimum tax.

(8) *Research and development costs.*—As with intangible drilling costs, the Code specifically permits research and development costs, which would ordinarily be capitalized for accounting purposes, to be currently deducted. This is a specific tax subsidy, grants a tax deferral to the taxpayer, and should be an item of tax preference. In this instance, it may be that the taxpayer has no income and therefore has a net operating loss; if so, the existing structure of the minimum tax would enable the minimum tax to be deferred until income is achieved or at least until the losses produced are able to be used against such income.

C. The rate of the minimum tax

The minimum tax is intended to impose a meaningful tax burden on items of income not otherwise included in the tax base. Its goal, accordingly, is to attempt to equalize the tax burden of similarly situated persons and to require most taxpayers to contribute meaningfully to the costs of Government. The lowest tax rate under the "regular" tax is 14%, and this rate applies to taxable income from \$1.00 to \$1,000. On the other hand, a person could have, for example, \$300,000 of tax preference items and his tax rate on those preferences is only 10%.¹⁰

The existence of such a low rate of tax violates at least two principles and goals: First, it ignores the concept of a progressive income tax system. Second, rarely, if ever, does it impose a significant or meaningful relative tax burden. As seen in the appended example of \$300,000 of capital gains, the minimum tax by itself results in a tax payment of only \$4,302, or 1.43% of the \$300,000 capital gains.¹¹ This is particularly egregious when one considers that the taxpayer who has been the recipient of a very significant subsidy from the government is making such a relatively small contribution toward its costs.

Accordingly, Congress should incorporate a sliding scale, progressive rate of tax into the minimum tax system. It would seem appropriate at least that rates equal to not less than one-half of the rates in the "regular" tax system be used; that is, from 7% to 35%. Only then can the average taxpayer believe that all persons are paying a meaningful amount of tax. If this suggested rate structure is effected, the \$30,000 floor could be left intact so that the minimum tax would reach only those who accumulate a large amount of federal tax subsidies. Even then, I might point out, the tax subsidies intended and enacted by Congress would remain quite effective even for those who accumulated preferences in excess of \$30,000 each year.

D. Deduction for taxes paid

Perhaps the most illogical and self-defeating part of the present minimum tax structure is the deduction allowable for "regular" taxes paid. The reason a minimum tax is needed is that the taxpayer has amassed certain items of income which he has not included in the regular tax base. These excluded items stand apart from, and in addition to, the items normally taxed. The reason the taxpayer is subject to the minimum tax is that his "regular" tax is too low in relation to his real income because of the tax preferences; to give him credit for this relatively low tax burden makes little sense.

The tax on included income is simply unrelated to the tax on excluded items of tax preference.

It should be noted that at least one state—California—has enacted a minimum tax without the deduction for "regular" taxes paid. Even though the California minimum tax rate is only 2½% compared to the federal minimum tax rate of 10%, in a great many cases the California minimum tax liability is greater than the same taxpayer's federal minimum tax burden. This result is because of California's refusal to include the illogical deduction for regular taxes paid.

E. The \$30,000 floor

Assuming that the changes advocated above are wholly or partially adopted, the \$30,000 preference floor ought to be maintained at the same level. While there is no magic in that number, an individual accumulating less than that amount of tax preferences (particularly with an expanded base of tax preferences) has not abused the system of tax subsidies which presumably the Congress intends. The purpose of the floor is to exclude from the minimum tax the vast majority of taxpayers who have utilized only a relative small dollar amount of tax preferences. For example, an individual earning taxable income of \$110,000 who has tax preference items of \$10,000 still pays tax at an effective rate of 38.24% while the comparable \$110,000 wage earner with no preferences pays an effective rate of 42.78%. Clearly, the minimum tax is intended to reach those who are paying taxes at a disproportionately low effective rate as compared with others similarly situated (as in the examples appended).

F. Stock options

The inclusion as a tax preference of the "spread" in stock options between the fair market value at the time of exercise and the exercise price is appropriate. However, the timing of the payment of the tax produces harsh results. This is the only tax preference item in which there is no item of realized income (or deduction from other realized income). Instead, the taxpayer must pay a tax on income he has yet to receive; and he may even be in a position whereby, under the Securities laws, he cannot dispose of the stock to pay the tax.

It would seem appropriate that the following correction be made: While the tax should be measured at the time the option is exercised, it should not be imposed until the stock is sold, exchanged or hypothecated. The price at which the stock is later sold, exchanged or hypothecated would be irrelevant. This structure for stock options would be similar to that now in effect for tax preferences incurred by a taxpayer in a year in which he has an operating loss; in such cases, the minimum tax is payable in any later year when the taxpayer has taxable income.

G. Effect on the maximum tax

Under Section 1348, the amount of earned income qualifying for the preferential 50% maximum tax is reduced by the amount of tax preferences in excess of \$30,000. This interrelationship is important, and should be retained. The maximum tax is a preference itself, and its benefits should be reduced to the extent the taxpayer benefits from tax preferences within the regular tax system. Although it could be said that the minimum tax is thus having a double effect this would not be a logical conclusion. The tax preference will still reduce the amount of tax due under the regular tax system—although not to the same extent if the maximum tax had been available—and should accordingly be retained in the minimum tax base, as is the case under the present structure. The interrelationship of Sections 56 and 1348 should therefore be left unchanged.

FOOTNOTES

⁸ This assumes, for purposes of comparison, that the two taxpayers have no deduc-

tions or exemptions from gross income other than the capital gains deduction.

⁶ These are accelerated depreciation on real property, accelerated depreciation on net leased personal property, stock options, depletion and capital gains.

⁷ These are special amortization of pollution control facilities, special amortization of railroad rolling stock, bad debt reserves for banks, and special amortization of job training and child care facilities.

⁸ These rates assume the applicability of the maximum tax on earned income and would increase to 60% and 70%, respectively, if the maximum tax were not applicable.

⁹ Within the limitations imposed under Section 904.

¹⁰ Actually, the rate is less than 10% because it applies only to tax preferences above the \$30,000 floor. Thus, for example, the minimum tax on \$300,000 of total tax preferences equals only \$27,000, or 9%.

¹¹ This is due principally to the offset for "regular" taxes paid, the \$30,000 floor, and the 10% rate.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS ACT

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, last month's agreement through which the GSA acknowledged former President Nixon's ownership of all his Presidential papers has generated criticism from Congress, academia, and the media. Along with some of my colleagues in the House and thousands of fellow citizens throughout the Nation, I emphatically disagree with this decision and believe it must not be allowed to happen again.

As the Hartford Courant noted in a recent editorial, Presidential papers "belong to the public insofar as they relate to the public's business; the exceptions would include letters of personal nature, written or received by the President or members of his family." To grant exclusive control over the papers of any former President to that individual is contrary to the public interest.

A great deal has been written in recent months about the right of former Presidents to their public papers. In the past, these papers were removed at the conclusion of a President's term, and either destroyed, stored, or donated. Over the past 185 years, the precedent of George Washington has become tradition. Yet, as Prof. Arthur S. Miller, of George Washington University, has pointed out:

There is no Supreme Court decision on this point. Nor is there any statute that expressly states that Presidents have legal title to White House documents. . . . The question of title to White House documents has never been examined by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in light of recent developments, it is imperative that the Congress deal with this situation. Congressional scrutiny, however, should not be limited to Presidential, or even Vice Presidential, papers. It must encompass the public papers of all publicly elected Federal officials—the Members of the House and of the other body inclusive.

Our papers are valuable to the people of this Nation, because of the nature of our office. As public servants, we conduct

the public's business. Our papers have been prepared by people on the payroll and should ultimately become the property of the public. Article IV of the Constitution gives Congress the power to "make all needful rules and regulations respecting the—property belonging to the United States." In my estimation, the public papers, documents, files, et cetera of elected Federal officials are property of the United States and should be treated as such.

Consequently, I am introducing the Public Documents Act of 1974. The bill stipulates that the correspondence, films, and other material of an elected officer of the United States shall be transferred to the Administrator of General Services within 180 days of that official's leaving office. A President, Vice President, Senator, or Member of the House, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner would relinquish personal control of those documents which were prepared in connection with his or her office and which would not have been prepared had that person not held elective office. Failure to comply with the law would constitute a violation of the Criminal Code. In the past many officials have deeded or transferred their papers to universities, or to State or private libraries, and my bill would allow this practice to continue.

In speaking of former President Nixon's papers, the Hartford Courant stated:

The public also has the right to the clear record of the Presidency, whether that record be inspiring or depressing, whether it is an example to be followed or avoided by future Presidents.

That record is the ultimate transcription, most important record of the highest and, hopefully, the most respected office in the nation. It must be preserved: the public has the right to know the news of the present administration, and the historic record of past administrations, however they served the people.

This sentiment is held by many of my constituents and, undoubtedly, by millions of other Americans throughout our great country.

A public office is indeed a public trust. The documents associated with our work with the Congress and the documents of a President and Vice President should ultimately be made available to scholars, historians, archivists, and other interested citizens. These papers and films are part of the public record and history of our Nation and should be preserved for posterity. Present law does not assure the preservation of Presidential papers and present law fails to cover other elected officials.

To rectify this situation, Congress must pass the Public Documents Act which I introduced today.

CONTINUING PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWS

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the Congress

the plight of Mr. Joseph Pikarsky of Tiblisi, Georgia, U.S.S.R.

Joseph Pilkarsky applied for an exit visa to emigrate to Israel in 1973. His wife and child were permitted to leave, but he was denied permission, and they are now in Israel awaiting his arrival.

Mr. Pilkarsky was denied his visa because of his alleged "knowledge of Soviet secrets." This claim was apparently based upon the fact that he had, until 1968, served in the Army, where he worked in a canteen.

I understand that on September 29 Mr. Pilkarsky commenced an indefinite hunger strike to bring attention to his case.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently written to Soviet officials requesting their aid and consideration in helping Mr. Pilkarsky obtain his visa to allow him to emigrate to Israel. I urge my colleagues who are concerned about the plight for universal justice and freedom, and thus the plight of the Soviet Jews, to join me and do likewise in an attempt to rectify this deplorable situation.

THE POLITICS OF IMPEACHMENT: WHAT SYSTEM IS IT THAT HAS WORKED?

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of Richard Nixon's resignation, the Congress received congratulations and unending praise for having restored public confidence in Government. The ponderous procedures of the Constitution ground on, slowly but inexorably, to protect the people's rights and liberties from a cabal of men who violated the accepted mores of American politics.

Such an analysis may confuse the specific offenses of the Nixon administration with the more basic defects of the political system of which Nixon and his cohorts sought to take advantage. To more fully appreciate the limits of our accomplishment, I commend to my colleagues' careful attention an article by Prof. Sheldon Wolin in "The New York Review of Books" of September 19, 1974. Professor Wolin, author of "Politics and Vision," is a distinguished political scientist on the faculty of Princeton University.

The article follows:

FROM JAMESTOWN TO SAN CLEMENTE

[Excerpted from a book review written by Sheldon S. Wolin for the New York Review of Books, Sept. 19, 1974, at pp. 3-8.]

(By Sheldon S. Wolin)

The special service which mystification renders to pseudo politics is to deprive us of the resources of political memory when they are most needed. Our present crisis is, in the most fundamental sense, political: it concerns constitutional power, the political virtues of citizens. By blanking out our political past, we invite solutions that are dangerous because ignorant of all but the market-place understanding of politics.

The original question of the member of the House Judiciary Committee ["How in the

world did we get from the *Federalist Papers* to the edited transcripts?"] is likely to be forgotten quickly, overborne by the universal relief following Nixon's resignation and by the new myth which is beginning to take hold already. The new myth turns relief into national self-congratulation, old fears and outrage into childish fantasies; it tells us that the near-impeachment of Nixon proves that "the system works" and that, therefore, it is time to return to the real business of government. The courts have upheld the rule of law; Congress has discharged its constitutional duties in exposing the misdeeds of the President; a new president has been installed; and we may even expect that, in 1976, the opposition party will peacefully regain the presidency.

Before we are wholly numbed by the refrain "the system has worked," we may want to raise a few questions: What is the sense in which the system has worked? What system is it that has worked? What system is it that is working when, for the first time, we now have a president who, in no sense, has been elected; who is the hand-picked appointee of the man who was nearly impeached; and who has now presented us with our second unelected vice president in less than a year?

The most common answer to the first question is that Nixon was almost impeached by the system prescribed in the law and the Constitution and carried out in various ways by the courts, House and Senate committees, and special prosecutors. The common answer, however, has an uncommon side that is likely to be expressed by professional politicians, lawyers, and political scientists when they try to explain the sense in which the system has worked. The system was successful because it kept the issue of Nixon's removal within the narrowest possible legal bounds. Beginning with the investigations of the Ervin committee, continuing through the House committee's debates on the articles of impeachment, and persisting in the present efforts to protect Nixon from prosecution, there has been an unrelenting pressure to confine the issues to legal categories, the hearings to courtroom norms, and the abuses to the standard of the criminal law. The pressures came not only from the President's lawyers but from congressmen and senators as well. They worked to prevent a broad political debate about our recent past and the continuing crisis in our national life.

The surface signs of the crisis were first evident in 1968 at the turbulent convention of the Democratic party when two things became visible: the emergence of the presidency as an immense apparatus of power and the Vietnam war as the measure of its uncontrollability. The special significance of the convention was that, a few months earlier, Johnson had been forced to resign at the end of his first full term. His acknowledgment that he could not run again signified something new in American politics, something that we have been encouraged to forget. Johnson's resignation was not the result of congressional or party pressures, but of the political climate created mainly by the extralegal and unofficial politics which flourished during the Sixties, the politics of the campuses, ghettos, streets, and suburbs. Although the economic demands of minority groups were an important element in the ferment, the peculiar quality of that politics was that it was significantly political and cultural.

The official system was unaccustomed to noneconomic politics in which bargains and trade-offs were not second nature. And so, with the help of psychiatrists and social scientists, the political renewal that took place was diagnosed either as a "generational" revolt (although that analysis was forgotten when all of the young Nixon men went before the bar) or as confusion on the part of the middle class about the

proper relationship between revolution and deprivation. Nonetheless, the political culture of the Sixties persisted, penetrating the movies, the press and television, schools, and everyday life, and preparing the American consciousness for the unthinkable the indictment of its highest official and symbol of national unity.

Without that preparation, it is doubtful that Nixon would have ever resigned. From the outset Congress did not want either resignation or impeachment; it accepted the latter course not simply because Nixon forced it or because the evidence was overwhelming, but because impeachment afforded a better chance of limiting the scope of the problem. At the same time that Congress was instinctively trying to prevent new political forms and values from entering the official system, it was also defending a political system significantly different from the one prescribed by the Constitution. The system that "worked" is the one familiar to political and social scientists, the system that mutes issues and screens out popular dissidence; a system which is affiliated to the idea of democracy only by rhetoric and whose highest art is to encourage democratic illusions without arousing democratic expectations. This system has a constitution but it is not confined to the Constitution. It stretches beyond the president, Congress, the civilian and military bureaucracies, the major political parties, to include the corporate structures of business, agribusiness, and finance, big science and education, trade unions, and the press and television.

It would be foolish to contend that this system has stage-managed the recent spectacle of Watergate; but it is correct to say that it succeeded in establishing limits to the controversy and controlling its effects. It will give us the phony issue of campaign expenditures, knowing full well that no one is going to legislate big money out of politics unless they mean to destroy the existing party system and the network of influence which connects politics to the power centers of society. It will not tolerate, however, reopening the question of the secret bombing of Cambodia because that would inevitably raise the great question of presidential power. The reason why that question is a sensitive one and why, since the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, Congress has raised it only halfheartedly is that the inflation of presidential power has become a fundamental part of the new constitution.

Several years ago a famous constitutional scholar observed that the end of World War II marked the completion of a constitutional revolution in which our system had evolved from a constitution of restraints to a constitution of powers. Subsequently any "reasonable" exercise of power would be countenanced by the courts so long as procedural niceties were respected. The main beneficiaries of the new system were the president and, through him, the civilian and military bureaucracies. But at the same time that governmental power was being increased, the structures of power outside government were also increasing: big business was joined by big labor, big education by big science. Since each thrived on expansion and growth, it was inevitable that they should realize their dependence on one another.

They learned, too, that the presidency was the one political institution which possessed the power to galvanize expansion. Congress was too fragmented in its leadership to serve as anything but a tactical device, useful when obstruction was called for. All that was needed to complete the new constitution was for its constituent parts to realize how to convert dissidence into a force for expansion. If, for example, women and minorities could be taught to package their demands in the form of economic opportunities within the system, then the forces of change would be

linked to economic expansion and made to promote the power of the new system.

A notable example of how the new system has reshaped the old is in the institution of the opposition party. The traditional justification for a two-party system is that the party out of power will help to control the party in power by exposing misbehavior and proposing alternatives. To be sure, we have all become educated to believe that no substantial differences distinguish the two major parties; but we had not been prepared for the policy of silence which the Democratic party has observed since the summer of 1972. The reason, of course, is obvious: the Democrats hope to inherit the system that produced Watergate.

It might seem that the role of opposition party has been picked up by the press, which discovered Watergate and kept it alive. This interpretation is plausible if we remember that the mass media belong to the same system of power which has been superimposed on the traditional constitutional arrangements. Its affiliations are with big business and finance, advertising, big science, and the multiversity. If this is true, then it is possible to explain the tenacity with which the press and the networks pursued Richard Nixon.

From the beginning the Nixon Administration served notice of its intention to "get" the media, or rather, their most powerful representatives. The situation came to a head in the court battle over the Pentagon Papers. It was clear then that the press was fighting for its existence not as defined by the First Amendment but as defined by the new constitution of corporate structures. Nixon could get away almost indefinitely with violations of the old Constitution if he had not egregiously threatened the new system. Anyone who has doubts about the system to which the loyalties of the media are attached need only recall the media's treatment of the movements of the Sixties. That experience, combined with the Eagleton affair, the McGovern campaign, and, now, Nixon's resignation, reveal the new role of the press and television in our new system: they are the power that defines the tolerable limits of deviation within the new system.

It is, then, the new system that has worked to produce Nixon's resignation and to prevent his impeachment. Its success has obscured what should have been the ultimate political significance of Watergate and of Richard Nixon. Watergate was America's first genuine experience of tyranny. The Huston Plan, the role of the FBI and CIA, the attempts to bribe and corrupt the courts, the efforts to make the federal bureaucracy into an instrument of ideology, the studied contempt for Congress, the promotion of repressive legislation—it is a catalogue of abuses fit to be placed alongside the list which the colonists attached to the Declaration of Independence.

But Nixon's tyranny was not George III's. In his inept and visionless way he was the underlaborer of the new system, clearing away the debris of the old system, accomplishing his task in a faceless, private way, indifferent to the value of public things except as pomp or squalid profit, preaching political quietism in the guise of the work ethic. It is fitting that technological society, which dwarfs men by things, should have found so mean an instrument.

KANG SHIM OK SENTENCE
PROTESTED

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a telegram

which was sent by Niall MacDermot, Secretary-General of the International Commission of Jurists to President Park Chung Hee of the Republic of Korea. The Commission protests the 8 year sentence given to the defense lawyer Kang Shim Ok.

Mr. Ok served as the defense lawyer of a number of political dissidents and objected, in court, to the severe sentences including the death sentence which had been given to some of his clients. For this statement, he was arrested and given an 8-year sentence.

The action against Mr. Ok by the Park government represents a serious infringement of human rights. President Park has lifted the emergency decrees but he has not released the persons, such as Mr. Ok, who were arrested and convicted under these decrees. Unless these people are released and freedom of expression and the other internationally recognized human rights are restored, Congress should begin to reduce U.S. military assistance to South Korea. The telegram follows:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1974.
L. T.

President PARK CHUNG HEE,
Seoul, South Korea.

International Commission of Jurists protests against extremely harsh 8-year sentence given by secret military tribunal against defence lawyer Kang Shim Ok for matter of professional conduct stop as law under which convicted now repealed urge immediate review and release.

MACDERMOT,
Secretary-General.

INCREASE IN MASS TRANSIT IS OPPOSED

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, it has been popular for some time now to stress that the use of the automobile must be cut down. Last year, with the coming of the energy crisis, the clamor to subsidize mass transit systems grew. It was said that we would save a great deal of energy by subsidizing mass transit. However, the left hand of the Federal Government does not appear to know what the right hand is doing. The Environmental Protection Agency is going great guns in its drive to cut down the use of the automobile, while Mr. Train acknowledges that in order for this to work, we need a simultaneous increase in public transit systems.

In another part of Washington, the press reports that the Department of Transportation will soon release a study showing that better fuel economy will save 20 percent in total energy over a 20-year span and that car pooling would save another 13.9 percent. Switching to other means of mass transit would only save 1.8 percent and require an investment of \$6.2 billion over the next 10 years. So, in my view, we ought to go slow on mass transit subsidies until we have a better assessment of what can be accomplished with such things as better

fuel economy and car pooling. The taxpayers might appreciate it. The relevant articles from the Detroit Free Press of September 18, 1974, and the Detroit News of September 17, 1974, are included for the serious consideration of my colleagues:

[From the Detroit News, Sept. 17, 1974]
INCREASE IN MASS TRANSIT IS OPPOSED

(By John E. Peterson)

WASHINGTON.—More efficient use of more efficient cars—not increased mass transit—is the best way to conserve fuel, according to a report being readied by the Department of Transportation (DOT).

The report, scheduled for release early this fall, says that improved car efficiency would save nearly six times as much energy as could be saved by shifting passengers from cars to buse and train.

Improved automobile gas mileage, increased car pooling and retention of reduced speed limits would save about 37 percent of the nation's projected energy consumption over the next 15 years and cost an added \$10 billion, the report said.

By contrast, the energy savings gained by switching car passengers to rail and bus mass transit, intercity trains and buses and even bicycles and walking would total, at best, 6.5 percent and cost \$14.2 billion over the same time span, the report said.

The bulk of the report was completed by four researchers at DOT's Transportation Systems Center (TSC) in Cambridge, Mass., last October and then sent to DOT headquarters in Washington for final approval.

Myron Miller, director of DOT's Office of Transportation Energy Policy, indicated the report is one of the key factors in DOT's decision to begin seeking alternatives to rapid mass transit, which it once boosted as a panacea for the nation's transportation ills.

Among the alternatives DOT plans to push, Miller said, is one that would allow cars with three or more passengers to share high speed freeway lanes with express buses during rush hours. Such cars also may get substantially reduced fares over toll roads and bridges during times of heavy traffic.

Similar plans have encouraged car pooling in the San Francisco area, Miller noted.

DOT also has asked that auto makers be required to manufacture cars with greater fuel economy and that the national speed limit be kept at 55 m.p.h.

Ranking the options in terms of "ultimate" savings, researchers found that improving fuel economy through better engineering of new cars headed the list—with savings of more than 20 percent in total energy over a 20-year span. The savings would require an investment of an additional \$10 billion.

Increased car pooling was second with a 13.9 percent energy savings within a two-year period.

Continuing reduced speed limits would conserve another 2.9 percent of the country's projected transportation energy needs and cost an extra \$2 million, the report said.

The best savings in energy found possible by switching passengers from autos to urban bus and rail transit was only 1.8 percent. To effect that saving, the report said, would require 10 years and an investment of \$6.2 billion.

Transferring auto passengers to intercity trains and buses for longer trips, the report said, would save another 2.9 percent with a cost of \$6 billion over 15 years.

Shifting auto commuters to bicycles and foot, the report found, would save about 1.8 percent in energy and cost about \$2 billion for additional bikeways and footpaths.

The report also contains similar findings relating to freight shipment.

Improving the operating efficiency of trucks would save 6.3 percent of the total

energy used in transportation over the next 15 years and cost about \$3 billion, it said.

Increasing the maximum legal weight of truck loads would save another 3.2 percent in energy during a 10-year span, it said, and cost nothing.

Together, the two measures would save 9.5 percent of the total transportation energy consumption over 15 years and cost less than \$3 billion.

Shifting cargoes from truck to rail, the TSC report said, would produce energy savings of only 1.6 percent at a cost of \$15 billion in the same time span.

Overall, the report found that improving the efficiency of cars and trucks would result in a combined energy saving of 46.3 percent at a cost of about \$13 billion over 20 years.

A massive shift to rail and bus transit, however, would save only 8.1 percent in transportation energy consumption over a 15-year period and cost \$29.2 billion, according to the report.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Sept. 18, 1974]
MILEAGE GAINS OF 20 PERCENT SEEN ON
SOME 1975'S

The head of the Environmental Protection Agency, Russell E. Train, told a Chicago meeting of the American Automobile Association Tuesday that fuel economy improvements on 1975 model cars will "in some cases be 20 percent or more."

Train, who will hold a press conference Friday in Washington to announce the specific mileage results from EPA 1975 model tests, said "we are very encouraged" by the improvement.

He acknowledged that in some cases the fuel economy improvement was less than that. But the results of the tests the EPA is finishing have proved earlier statements that a seven percent improvement was "too conservative," Train said.

"These gains merely bring us to a temporary plateau in our efforts to meet the (emissions) standards," he said. "Evidence of the serious consequences of failing to meet those standards continues to mount."

Train said the auto manufacturers, in response to EPA queries, said they foresee no significant problems from eliminating the lead from gasoline.

Some reports had predicted a substantial increase in "knock" from use of unleaded gasoline.

Catalytic converters will be standard equipment on 60 to 85 percent of all 1975 cars. For the pollution-controlling catalytic converter to work it requires unleaded gasoline.

In another address to the AAA, John C. Sawhill, chief of the Federal Energy Administration, called the car "our least efficient means of transporting people" in terms of gasoline usage. He urged a program of federal "disincentives" to compel Americans to leave their cars in the garage and take more effective buses, trains and rapid transit.

He joined Train in reiterating the EPA's commitment to "transportation control" a timetabled program to drastically cut the number of cars driven in the central city.

Both men conceded that asking Americans to use other means than autos to get to work would be foolhardy without a simultaneous increase in public transit systems.

There was a subdued response from AAA convention delegates when Sawhill said of the gas-guzzling cars now jamming the nation's roadways:

"I know it sounds drastic, but the way to prevent this is for government at all levels to actively discourage us—I will not use a stronger term—from using our cars in the central city."

There was a veiled hint of mandatory action at some future date. The disincentives Sawhill mentioned included higher bridge tolls, parking fees and special rush-hour licensing.

He also suggested that employers require workers to pay for parking space.

Sawhill took some of the edge off when he noted, "I'm not saying the auto won't remain the backbone of our transportation system. I love cars. We just have to stop pampering them."

OIL-EXPORTING COUNTRIES

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my full support of President Ford's statements of displeasure regarding recent actions taken by certain oil-exporting countries. I also urge my colleagues to give full support to our President in this matter.

It is easy to understand the frustration which the administration feels with regard to the world energy situation. President Ford and Mr. Kissinger have worked diligently at seeking solutions to the world's energy and economic problems. They have extended the cooperation of the United States at every door.

In return for their efforts we recently have seen the countries of Libya, Kuwait, and Venezuela curtail production rather than reduce the price of petroleum. Saudi Arabia canceled a proposed August oil auction. In addition to this came the announcement of another price increase from the OPEC nations.

In his address to the United Nations on September 23, Secretary Kissinger stated:

The world cannot sustain even the present level of prices, much less continuing increases.

To those delegates he also pointed out:

Unlike food prices, the high cost of oil is not the result of economic factors, of an actual shortage of capacity or of the free play of supply and demand. Rather it is caused by deliberate decisions to restrict production and maintain an artificial price level.

The Secretary of State has warned that the economic threats to world stability are becoming uncontrollable and that these threats could lead to "a general depression" and acts of world aggression. However, most oil-exporting nations have remained deaf to warnings of an international economic collapse.

President Ford has not called for a return to precrisis prices. We all realize that energy will no longer be the cheap commodity we once took for granted. No one is quarrelling with the right of OPEC countries receiving a reasonable profit from the export of petroleum.

However, the President has called on OPEC nations to assume the responsibility concomitant with their new positions in the world. With power goes responsibility. Perhaps never in the history of the world, has such tremendous power been suddenly thrust into the hands of the leaders of heretofore internationally insignificant nations. If these leaders wisely assume their newfound economic power, history will praise them. If they refuse to assume these responsibilities,

along with the benefits of their economic power, the world will not remain idle while its foundations crumble.

President Ford's stern warning to OPEC leaders, shows commendable insight into the dangers of present OPEC policy. His insistence that the United States is not considering military action does not rule out the possibility of action by other nations if the present menace continues. The President's call for an energy consumer cartel is a step taken for world peace as well as world economic order.

In his Detroit address, President Ford stated that "war brings unacceptable risks for all mankind" and that "there is no rational alternative to international cooperation." But, if the OPEC nations continue their present irrational policies, they could possibly lead to irrational retaliation.

The recent behavior of certain oil-producing countries could easily be interpreted as a belligerent act on the stability of the world and well-being of its citizens. The economic missiles of the OPEC nations are as destructive as any warhead. The specter of famine, death and untold human suffering are the results of the economic warfare which certain countries seem to want to wage.

I applaud the firm approach to these problems which President Ford and Secretary Kissinger have taken recently at international meetings. It is time for our Government, in concert with our allies, to recognize fully the danger inherent in the unconscionable actions taken by certain oil-exporting countries.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MANPOWER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, MDTA is now history and those of us who have been involved in this landmark effort to improve the employability of the unemployed and poor take pride in its accomplishments. Many lessons from a dozen years of MDTA experiences will be passed on to the local manpower administrators responsible for programs under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973—CETA.

However, an aspect of MDTA often overlooked is its title I, which supported a modest research and development program over those years—modest in cost but not in accomplishment. Much of the success—and modification where lack of success was discovered—which has marked the manpower experience is attributable to that research effort.

Commendation is due Dr. Howard Rosen of the Labor Department Office of Research and Development and his staff who have leveraged a limited funding into outstanding and extensive contributions to knowledge and policy.

Three years ago, Dr. Garth L. Mangum, director of the Human Resources Institute of the University of Utah, did an assessment of the manpower research experience for the Industrial Relations Research Association. Because CETA lacks that research title and must depend on administrative and congressional decisions to allocate an appropriate amount of research support from program funds, I would like my colleagues to read some excerpts from that appraisal:

MANPOWER RESEARCH AND MANPOWER POLICY (By Garth L. Mangum)

Traditionally, a hierarchy of acceptability has existed, particularly in academic circles, between those "pure" researchers pursuing research for truth's sake and those "applied" researchers who view their search for information and insights primarily as a prerequisite to implementation in more effective policies. Perhaps other social scientists may view manpower researchers with some disdain, but in the manpower fraternity the hierarchy has been inverted. The prestige accrues to those whose research results have affected policy.

In few other fields of academic endeavor has there been such explicit concern with identifying research areas primarily in hopes of impacting upon policy and so much effort to bring that knowledge to the consciousness of the decision maker and entice him to use it.

That does not mean that all manpower research affects policy or even that it deserves to. Researchers and policy makers are separate groups and types, though there have been important areas of overlap in manpower. But there has been much built-in communication. There have been sincere attempts by policymakers to tape the research community. There have been even greater efforts of researchers to "sell their wares."

Without denigrating other efforts and groups, it seems fair to credit one piece of legislation, MDTA, and one set of "midwives," those responsible for research, evaluation, and policy planning within the U.S. Department of Labor, with more than their share of impact on both the conduct of research and its implementation in policy . . .

The amazingly rapid switch which occurred from industrial relations research to manpower research in the early 1960s and the crowd of young researchers attracted to the field during the decade could only have been bought by an infusion of public funds and aggressive government recruitment. Interests do not normally shift that rapidly. Though the research funds were essential, so was a philosophical commitment to an "active manpower policy"—the notion that government ought to intervene in the labor market on behalf of those it was not serving adequately and that researchers ought to make their contributions. The success is relative, of course. There are still policy problems suffering for lack of research and research results lying around unutilized, but relative to comparable fields, the interaction between policy and research in manpower has been unusually great.

This review explores the relationships between research and policy within the generally accepted boundaries of the manpower field; those activities having to do with the utilization of human beings as an economic resource or the role of employment as a source of income and status to human beings. Having explored the research/policy boundaries, actual research efforts will be chosen for review by the test: "which have significantly affected the course of manpower policies and programs during the past decade?" The review ends with some examples of significant research results not yet incorporated into policymaking and policy

problems not yet adequately researched. Since the most relevant research has been sponsored from one source and that source, the Labor Department's Office of Research and Development has itself summarized and disseminated the results of that research, this review accepts no obligation to be exhaustive. Only those research efforts having the most direct impacts on policy or those best illustrating the interrelations between research and policy are cited.

Most important of all was the alertness and vigor of the staff to which research administration was assigned within the Labor Department. Rather than an academic concentration on the rigor of research methodology or a bureaucratic concern for dispensing funds in a risk-free manner, their almost total absorption from the moment manpower research funds became available was, "how could the funds be used to influence policy?"

The Manpower Development and Training Act emerged in 1962 with its Title I written primarily within the Labor Department and dedicated to research into: (1) technological changes, establishment of techniques for their detection in advance, and development of solutions to the problems of displacement; (2) study of labor mobility-restricting practices of employers and unions; (3) appraisal of the "adequacy of the nation's manpower development efforts to meet foreseeable manpower needs and recommendation of needed adjustment"; and (4) dissemination of the information thus obtained. Through the various reorganizations from the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training; the Office of Manpower Policy Evaluation and Research; and the Office of Research and Development, the same leadership, drawn largely from BLS, pursued a steady course, attempting to force policy issues and have information available at the critical moments.

Few researchers were committed to manpower studies and only with the advent of the manpower programs was there a source for funding and promoting manpower research. The later the program in the manpower history the more likely it was to have a research background. Also, the more policy decisions emerged internally from administrative rather than legislative action, the more likely research was to have contributed. In 1963, military officers alerted Labor Department officials to the extraordinary fact that one-half of all Selective Service selectees were being rejected for physical and educational reasons. A hastily mounted internal research effort by the Labor Department found that, when volunteers were included, the overall rejection rate was one-third of a nation. The first result was an almost meaningless effort to refer all rejectees to the Employment Service for remediation or placement. More meaningful in the longer run was Project 100,000, the decision to admit 100,000 per year with slightly poorer mental and educational qualifications and observe their performance.

The Labor Department, through the United States Employment Service, had established apprentice information centers throughout the country to aid youth, minority and otherwise, in gaining access to apprentice programs. A city-by-city review of this experience by Ray Marshall and Vernon Briggs not only demonstrated that their centers were accomplishing little and that discrimination in apprentice selection was rife, but identified the one program that did seem to have promise. A handful of aggressive young blacks in New York City working under the aegis of the Worker's Defense League were recruiting other young blacks of considerable promise and coaching them until they were able to corner the top slots on most rosters of apprenticeship applicants. This Apprentice Outreach program then spread nationwide, as the Department of Labor's prime weapon in the fight for

equal employment opportunity in construction. Involved was a carefully planned strategy by Labor Department research administrators to bring the research results in dramatic form to the attention of the Secretary of Labor, achieving a drastic revision of Labor Department policy and practice.

By 1967, a certain amount of disillusion was setting in vis-a-vis manpower training programs. They seemed to work well in suburban and modest sized city settings were job locations and residency of target populations were not too discontinuous. But for the central city residents who had become the prime targets of manpower programs, completion of a skill training program was rewarded too often only with a hunting license to search for jobs which were out of reach. A sub rosa debate had continued from the formulation of the antipoverty program. Were the obstacles to employment inherent in the individual's lack of education, skills and incentive, or were they institutionalized into the structure of the labor market—was the individual at fault or was the system? Research into the hiring and internal promotion practices of firms and into the employment patterns of ghetto labor markets by Peter Doeringer and Michael Piore were influential among those pressures shifting the weight of opinion. Training programs had assumed the former, now attention shifted to the hiring system.

Kalacheck, Knowles, Reder and others had posited at the beginning of the sixties, by deduction rather than research, that the labor market could be usefully viewed as a queue with workers ranked according to their productivity. Employers were expected to move smoothly from one member of the queue to the next as economic growth added to the purchasing power of their customers. Mangum, observing experience in the early days of the manpower programs, thought it more useful to emphasize discontinuities in the system. He saw a queue which was also a "shape-up" with workers having access to jobs ranked by employers' subjective judgments. All employers were viewed as an aggregate hiring boss. At the back of the line might be those with limited education, skills and experience, but it was just as likely to be those whose age or skin color clashed with the employer prejudices. Discontinuities occurred because, as an alternative to digging deeper into the queue, individual employers could meet expansion needs by competing for those at the front of the line, with inflationary effects. But on the other hand, operating on the specific reasons for low ranking in the queue—training, remedial education, improved labor market services, forbidding discrimination, subsidizing employment—could make it possible for some to improve their ranking and become more competitive. But there would always be those at the back of the line dependent upon subsidized employment, publicly created "last resort" jobs and income maintenance.

Piore and Doeringer added two additional notes of sophistication to the queue concept: (1) Employers, too, were in a queue. Workers chose among jobs and between employment and non-employment and some jobs had few takers or experienced high turnover; (2) there was a primary labor market of good jobs with reasonable pay, security, advancement and status and a secondary labor market of jobs lacking all of these prerequisites. And there was a practically impervious wall between the two markets. The first was clear from the fact that certain jobs "went begging," even in areas of high unemployment or low labor force participation. The discontinuity and imperviousness of the wall between the hypothesized dual markets was less firmly demonstrated. The policy recommendation was clear, however, Particularly for semiskilled and unskilled jobs the system was more at fault than the worker. For those entry level jobs which people normally en-

tered without special training, it was more logical to focus on reforming the labor market and the employer than on changing the worker.

Such a momentous policy decision rested upon more than one series of research projects, of course. The Chicago Labor Market Studies, headed by George Shultz and Albert Rees, had reiterated the message that job access was primarily an informal system of "who do you know?" Alice Kidder had demonstrated that Negroes and other minorities had less access to the informal machinery than non-minority workers and were forced to rely on the formal placement agencies which touched only margins of the labor market. Experimental and demonstration projects had recruited employer support and subsidized them to hire the disadvantaged and train them on the job. There had been some experience with locating plants in ghettos, with and without government encouragement, financial support or contracts for goods and services. On the basis of this experience and research, the National Alliance of Businessmen-Job Opportunities in the Business Sectors (NAB-JOBS) program was launched. . . .

Whereas the relationship between research and political decisions on manpower problems tended to be coincidental, the relationships in the evaluation, feedback and modification of existing programs could be more deliberate. Of particular note are experimental and demonstration efforts (E&D) and evaluative research.

As pointed out above, the Labor Department's experimental and demonstration efforts, began as a strategy to divert funds from the initial state-run MDTA program for adult, nondisadvantaged workers to a clientele needing assistance and without other resources. However, even though it was not until the mid-1960s that a research discipline was built into the E&D projects, there was considerable learning by experience in the earlier ones.

Early E&D projects made direct contributions to the original design of the Community Action program, Neighborhood Youth Corps, New Careers, NAB-JOBS and CEP. However, its greater contributions had been in the modification of existing program and the development of supporting institutions. Emphasizing ways of dealing with the problems and the institutions of the disadvantaged, E&D projects, both in the Department of Labor and OEO, have tended to draw heavily on psychology, sociology and other social scientists than the economists who have tended to dominate manpower research.

As examples of policy contributions from E&D efforts are involvement in the development of concepts and practices of outreach, experience in group counseling and use of nonprofessionals as aides, work sample testing, postplacement counseling (job coaching), one stop neighborhood multi-service centers, training, placement and support of prison inmates, the role of growth as tutors to youth, and private employer involvement. It made substantial contributions to the development of preapprenticeship and some of the concepts of skills centers. A major effort has been the development of racially or ethnically concentrated private nonprofit self-help institutions. In addition to developing new institutions new techniques have been developed for integration into existing agencies such as the Employment Service. Rarely was an innovation thoroughly validated before it was grabbed and put into action. The hunger for working tools was too great to wait when any approach showed possibilities of success. But there was a mechanism for innovation and some semblance of testing.

Evaluative research evolved into a major activity after 1966 and influenced policy by suggesting modification of existing forms. Nowhere in public policy in the United

States (or anywhere else) has the demand for evaluation been so intense, nor the response so thorough as in the antipoverty and manpower areas. Education had never been called to account for the billions in public investment. Evaluation in that field meant only a look at the inputs to see if conventional notions of "best practice" in pedagogy were being followed. The value of the output was never questioned. The present demand for accountability in education may be a reaction to overinvestment in schooling of the existing types. However, it (the demand for accountability in education) has been heavily affected by spillover from closely allied manpower program evaluations. No strong demand has yet been heard for objective evaluation of the cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness results of agricultural parity programs, national defense, highways, or space exploration, or various business subsidies. Reclamation projects and the vocational rehabilitation program have long used cost-benefit jargon to argue for continued and expanded funding, but not to question the worth of their activities . . .

RESPONSE TO SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, last week, in response to a short questionnaire distributed at the doorways and plant gates of some local Minnesota firms, I received the letter reproduced below. One short personal paragraph has been deleted from the letter, and the sender's name and address also have been removed. What remains, however, ought to make informative reading for any Member of Congress, and I commend it to all of my colleagues. The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I received a copy of your questionnaire the other morning when you were outside of my place of employment.

I felt that the questions indicated were important, but much too important for the simplistic answers that of necessity are required by a questionnaire. Therefore, I am going to expand on the themes mentioned. Many of these items of necessity are intimately related.

I do not believe that the wage and price control programs, as implemented, was effective generally. In my employer's case the wage controls were very effective, but the exceptions to the controls were much too readily available, especially to the people with political clout.

To help fight inflation, I would favor both reduced Federal spending and some raising of taxes. I am in favor of a very careful examination of all items in the budget, but the Congress should keep in mind that inflation has hit the cost of everything so that of necessity an adequate defense program and the continued funding of ongoing programs must require more of the cheaper dollars of 1975.

I doubt that the budget can be balanced by raising taxes, but I believe that some increases in taxes are justified particularly on the windfall profits of the oil industry.

Aside from this issue (inflation control) I feel that simplistically the tax system should be revised so that one could look at the amount of money required by the federal budget could be compared with the gross income of all taxpayers and a gross income tax of the appropriate percentage be levied across

the board, subject to a maximum income of a modest level on which there should be no tax.

For example, if the federal budget is \$3,000,000,000 and the sum of the gross income exceeding \$3,000 per taxpayer is \$30,000,000,000, then all taxpayers cough up 10% of their gross income.

I believe that environmental standards should be relaxed to some reasonable level to save energy. In addition I believe that conservation as advocated by some people is foolish. For example, would it not be better to utilize renewable crops such as timber for paper and building material rather than let timber die and rot in the woods.

I believe that all of the groups listed on your card are to blame for the energy shortage. Government probably most of all, for poor or non-existent planning based on a predictable increase in consumer demand. Government for failure to sell nuclear power for the generation of electricity. Government for failure to encourage the proper use of energy—petroleum for small mobile vehicles—coal for large mobile vehicles (i.e., trains)—coal and nuclear power and water power for electricity generation.

Government and industry for failure to investigate with vigor other energy sources such as solar, geothermal and windpower. Look what a clearly stated objective and a well defined program did to put man on the moon—and all the people working on that program paid taxes and bought goods from people who also paid taxes.

Election reform is necessary, but I don't believe in public financing of any campaigns—I as an old line democrat surely don't want my money supporting a George McGovern because through some weird spasms within the party becomes a candidate. I feel a limit on what any one person or group should be able to give to a candidate would be adequate and would allow me to support my choice of candidates of whichever party.

I don't believe Congress should limit the length of a campaign—I think financial limits would take care of that.

I think Congress is doing generally a lousy job. Some of the reasons for this belief have already been listed. More are: The great amount of carping about the usurpation of power by the executive branch of government. Hell, Congress gave that power away piecemeal and apparently quite willingly until it became a political issue. Congress' contribution to inflation particularly as related to the automobile industry—mandatory pollution controls that I believe are excessively strict—Why does the guy buying and using a car in say Minot, North Dakota have to pay for all that garbage because of Los Angeles' auto traffic and peculiar geography—One beautifully convenient way to allow Detroit to hoist car prices. Mandatory 5 mph bumpers to save small damage claims but increasing the cost of repairs astronomically when that protection level is exceeded. Mandatory seat belt interlock systems and air bags that quite obviously nobody wants. (Happy to say, the house has finally done something about that monumental boo-boo). These legislated improvements? Have led to auto price increases of \$500-\$1000 per unit.

How about pollution control, bumpers and air bags made desirable by a system of incentives—a pollution tax if you will, insurance company discounts for cars with good bumper systems.

(I realize a few companies have that now but it followed the legislation). How about an incentive system to get people to wear existing seat belts. Say a bonus if you are in an accident and would have been hurt but for a seat belt. Or, a negative incentive—the medical insurance payments on your car are reduced if you are hurt in an accident and are not wearing seat belts.

Our most pressing problems are twofold as I see it are our combination inflation/recession—exorbitant interest rates—bottom out of the stock market—Oil company profits and high fuel prices. If the oil companies need all that windfall money for oilfield development and exploration—why isn't it spent there.

The second problem is excess government—the auto examples—invasions of privacy and civil rights violations. I ran into one here in New Hope on operation Crime Watch. The identifying of one's property with an NCIC number which is fine *except* that some local police departments insist on an inventory of all one's personal property that has been marked even before issuing, the Operation Identification window stickers. Laws written with specific provisions and then embellished with the phrase "And other such provisions as the director (or similar word) may require" are particularly onerous because they often submit the will of the legislative body passing the law.

Please excuse my rambling and what may sound like bitterness, but I did want to express some opinions beyond checking boxes on a form.

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION ENDORSES SPEEDY TRIAL LEGISLATION

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 weeks the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Committee on the Judiciary has conducted hearings on legislation which would provide for the speedy disposition of criminal cases in Federal courts. Under consideration is the Speedy Trial Act of 1974, S. 754, which passed the Senate unanimously on July 23, and eight related House bills. A number of distinguished witnesses have testified on this legislation from each of the components of the criminal justice system including the courts, prosecution, and the public and private defense bar.

In addition, other interested individuals and organizations have expressed their views in correspondence to the subcommittee; and I am pleased to include in the RECORD the endorsement of S. 754 by the National Rifle Association which was expressed in the following letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, Representative JOHN CONYERS, JR.:

NATIONAL RIFLE

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,

Washington, D.C., September 24, 1974.

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.,

Chairman, House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONYERS: As Executive Vice President of the National Rifle Association of America, I am taking this opportunity to express our views briefly on S. 754, the Speedy Trial Act of 1974. NRA is the largest and oldest national sportsmen's organization in the United States with over one million members. One of the many objects and purposes listed in our bylaws is to promote law and order in the United States. Accordingly, we are interested in all types of legislation designed to modernize and improve the criminal justice system in our nation. S. 754 is, in our estimation, such a bill, in tune with the basic principles of our organization

and worthy of favorable consideration by you and your colleagues.

The two main concepts embodied in S. 754 have been discussed in depth by legal and judicial experts from across the country. NRA joins these learned spokesmen for the legal profession in supporting these concepts to affect a long overdue change in the criminal trial procedure in our nation.

First, S. 754 would establish a comprehensive planning process for trying criminal cases to which our criminal trial procedure must adhere. This process would also diminish injustice by assuring all citizens their Constitutional right to a speedy trial.

Second, and most important in our opinion, S. 754 would authorize pilot projects to facilitate pretrial release and, when necessary, provide pretrial supervision of high-risk persons released pending trial. This supervisory system, coupled with the reality of speedy trial, will decrease the likelihood of a law breaker from committing a second crime while awaiting trial for the first offense.

NRA views these two concepts as steps which will establish a more effective criminal justice system and which will automatically establish a more effective crime control system. This highly desirable goal is shared by all responsible persons and organizations. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, NRA urges you and your colleagues to report favorably S. 754, and guide its passage through the Congress so that the American public will have concrete proof that its concern over law and order has been realized and manifested in appropriate legislation.

If NRA may be of further assistance in this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

MAXWELL E. RICH,
Major General, retired,
Executive Vice President.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS W. "TEDDY" GLEASON, LABOR LEADER-PATRIOT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor and privilege to be on the dais for the dinner which was held in honor of one of America's greatest labor leaders and patriots, Thomas W. "Teddy" Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, who was designated as the 1974 winner of the prestigious AOTOS award.

Teddy Gleason for almost 60 years has been one of the most respected and admired leaders of the maritime community in this Nation. Teddy Gleason's commitment to the longshoremen of this Nation stretches back to the days when he was working with his father at the young age of 15. He saw and experienced then, first hand, the rugged and oftentimes dangerous conditions which existed on the waterfront. After this experience, Teddy Gleason dedicated his life to improving the quality and dignity of life for all men on the docks in this Nation.

He began his rise in the ranks of the International Longshoremen's Association soon thereafter, and his ascent reached its apex in 1963 when he was elected president of the ILA. Throughout the succeeding 11 years up to the present, Gleason has continued to hold this high

and important office, and it has been during these years that the entire Longshoremen's Association with Gleason at the helm has gained a national and worldwide reputation as being one of the most progressive labor movements in the world.

Several key characteristics have aided Teddy Gleason during his years as president of the ILA. One of these has been his ability to adapt to the changing and expanding needs of the maritime industry. He has successfully incorporated new technological and automated improvements in the industry, but has been equally successful in insuring that the workers of the ILA are able to benefit from these improvements, rather than be displaced by them. Further, he has demonstrated an exceptional ability to deal on both sides of the bargaining table, as exhibited by the landmark contract agreement worked out for the ILA members, which was accomplished without a strike and well before the September 30 deadline.

In addition to his duties as president of the ILA, Teddy Gleason, in recognition of his immense contributions to the international maritime industry, was elected in 1974 as the vice president of the International Transport Workers Federation, an association which boasts a membership of more than 6 million transport workers in 78 countries of the free world. In 1968, he was elected vice president and executive council member of the AFL-CIO, and was reelected to these posts in 1973.

Yet in addition to his distinguished career in labor, Teddy Gleason has gained worldwide fame as one of America's foremost patriotic spokesmen. He has demonstrated an unyielding allegiance to the cause of freedom and democracy in this country, and recent Presidents have looked to Teddy Gleason for support in times of adversity, and unflinching he has answered each call. Some memorable examples to Teddy Gleason's unique form of patriotism include: during the height of the Vietnam war, Teddy responded to a call from U.S. military personnel who were alarmed about the blocked harbors which were preventing U.S. supplies from reaching South Vietnam. Teddy personally flew to Vietnam and secured the safe and open passage of the harbors for U.S. vessels. Other examples came in the late 1950's and early 1960's when Gleason and the ILA refused to load or unload any Russian ships during key crises in the "cold war" between our two nations.

The accompanying words of the AOTOS award "In recognition for his pioneering of the maritime industrial revolution and for his bringing about a historical partnership on the waterfront of machines and men," represents only part of the Teddy Gleason story. To both millions of longshoremen in this Nation as well as to the overall American labor movement, Teddy Gleason is looked upon as a giant. A giant in the class of other esteemed labor leaders of the past and present such as John L. Lewis, Walter Reuther, and George Meany. He is looked upon by many others as a true American statesman as well due, to his effective

and action oriented support of the goals which keep this great Nation strong.

Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor for me to have the opportunity to pay tribute to a man of the caliber of Teddy Gleason. He is a man who has dedicated his life to achieving a better life for the longshoremen of America and the world. He is an exemplary leader, able to rally thousands to his side. He is a man richly deserving of the AOTOS award, and I join with the many dignitaries from the President on down in extending to Teddy Gleason my personal congratulations on receiving this award, as well as my best wishes for continued successes in the future.

MRS. FORD DESERVES A LITTLE PEACE AND PRIVACY

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Star-News carried a column by Mary McGrory which I feel very eloquently expresses the thoughts of millions of Americans whose thoughts and prayers are with our new First Lady, Betty Ford. It is a touching tribute to a charming woman.

I would like to place the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a warm wish for Mrs. Ford's quick recovery:

MRS. FORD DESERVES A LITTLE PEACE AND PRIVACY

(By Mary McGrory)

Mrs. Ford's sudden, awful illness has made us a family, something we haven't seen in a long time. We all would like to take her hand and tell her we wish it hadn't happened.

She isn't First Lady now. She's every woman who has had the operation that women dread most, radical mastectomy, the ugly name for the ugly fact of breast-removal. Gerald Ford, the leader of the Western world, is just an anxious lonely husband.

When the woman of the house is away—if it's the Executive Mansion or a housing project—the house is empty.

Everybody sat in the hospital waiting room last Saturday morning. The news they heard turned the whole country pale. It was cancer.

What makes Mrs. Ford's experience so poignant too is that it struck her when she was beginning to flower a little. She never wanted her husband to be president—her ambition is to go back to Grand Rapids. Ford's remark that he would let Betty decide if he should run in 1976 tells the story. It was the best comfort he could offer.

She had not looked forward to the White House, obviously. Her face, the day he was sworn in, was tense and strained. But like some other retiring women, she found that life there is bearable, and offers a measure of control undreamed of outside.

All of life's little worries are ironed out by the perfect servants. For a woman, particularly one like Mrs. Ford who was in her younger days a fashion model, it makes a difference that she doesn't have to dash to the hairdresser—he makes house calls. Clothes are brought to her. Schedules are presented. She can say yes or no. She's never late. Social events begin when she arrives.

She saw her husband probably more in the last seven weeks than in 25 years of married life—no more waiting around for

NONGERMANE AMENDMENTS

telephone calls from the banquet hall in Sioux City or the rally in Westport. He was right there, a floor below. She was an essential part of the picture. After years of being pulled apart by demands of family versus politics, her life had come together.

Before she married Ford, a mutual friend told her that she would have a good marriage if she could reconcile herself to the fact that politics would come first and the marriage second. Mrs. Ford seems to have accepted that hard truth, but by her own account, she had a thin time of it.

She had almost the whole responsibility of bringing up four children, three boys and a girl. She felt overwhelmed by it. She developed a pinched nerve. She consulted a psychiatrist, took tranquilizers. Characteristically, she made no bones about it.

In the White House, she found that people wanted to know what she thought about things. As "just a wife," she had seldom been consulted. Her part was to nod and smile on the platform and murmur inanities to interviewers. Her first press conference was rather uneasy, but proved she had her own ideas. She was open with the press. She told about her husband's conversation with San Clemente.

She plainly took to the social life.

After all those years of tripping over tricycles, wiping noses and driving carpools, this pleasant unassuming woman obviously enjoyed being dressed to the nines and dancing with heads of state. She was coming into her own.

Last Thursday, she went to the doctor, dutifully, for a routine check-up. He found the lump. She carried on. Friday, she made her rounds—the Lyndon Johnson Grove dedication, the Salvation Army fashion luncheon. Saturday, very game, she was taken to surgery, and ever since the world has been immersed in clinical detail about her case. She may even be philosophical about that. It seems a bit much.

People say that since it's the First Lady, we have the right to know, but do we? What about her right to privacy? She's not president. Could we leave her alone and let her regroup in her own way? Maybe she will in time want to talk about her experience, to alert or encourage other women. Right now, she deserves a little peace. We're always ransacking our First Family's lives for "humanizing" data. A cancer operation does not require that treatment.

Her husband says we should send contributions to the American Cancer Society. It seems the best way to express our sympathy.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM PLAN A
"TIMID" APPROACH

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee reorganization plan is a timid and faltering step. It falls far short of the sweeping reforms the House so urgently needs.

To hear the howls of anguish from special interest groups, and some Members, one would think Congress was considering a major overhaul. Indeed, the public has been led to believe House Resolution 988 will drag Congress into the 20th century at long last.

Nothing could be further from the truth. This proposal is far more notable for reforms which are ignored than for those which are fostered.

This proposal does nothing to eliminate the curse of nongermane amendments which have resulted in confusion, delay, and bad legislation.

For example, when the House passed a routine environmental bill—amendments to the Scenic and Wild Rivers Act—the Senate hooked on the National Emergency Energy Act. When the House passed the 1973 extension of the so-called temporary debt ceiling extension, the Senate insisted on adding provisions for a Presidential election campaign fund to be financed by a tax return checkoff. Similarly, the Senate added a 10-percent increase in social security benefits to a bill extending the Renegotiation Act.

Mr. Speaker, these are but three of many, many instances in which totally unrelated proposals are hooked together in a manner that often results in killing bills and passing bad ones and, in the process, makes it impossible for Members to give proper consideration to the proposals.

Unfortunately, the reform proposals now being considered do not solve this problem.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

This proposal does nothing to eliminate conflict-of-interest voting. It is disgraceful for Members of Congress to vote on legislation directly affecting their own pocketbooks. But this is exactly what happens under present rules and precedents.

Congress should promptly adopt a rule requiring Members to excuse themselves from voting whenever their own personal interests are directly affected—to avoid the unsavory situation of farmer-Congressmen voting on agriculture subsidies, land developer-Congressmen voting on land use, broadcasters on FCC bills, owners of mining stock voting on strip-mining legislation, Members with oil interests voting on oil tax preferences, and so forth.

EXCESSIVE POWERS OF CONFEREES

This legislation does nothing to curb the excessive powers of conferees. Conference committees have become the Nation's super legislative body. Over and over again, conferees ignore the wishes of the House and rewrite legislation in conference.

When every major bill goes through this process, conferees are in a position to dictate the final terms of settlement and present the House with a take-it-or-leave-it proposition. It is time to curb the power of conference committees. The Bolling-Martin proposal does not do so.

This legislation does nothing to straighten out the idiotic scheduling procedures of the House, such as the procedures that are being used in consideration of this very bill. On Monday, the House began consideration of committee reform. On Monday evening the House was urged by the Appropriations Committee chairman to drop committee reform and begin work on supplemental appropriations. We were told this matter is so urgent and the deadline for passage so pressing it would be foolhardy to put off until Tuesday consideration of this matter. So debate began.

However, after a couple of hours, the House adjourned for the day and when

we resumed on Tuesday started again on committee reform. After working on this for a while, the House again turned its attention to supplemental appropriations—the matter which had previously been described as urgent.

Today, we are advised by the majority leader, the House will work from 10 a.m. until 12:30 on supplemental appropriations, from 12:30 to 4:30 on committee reform, and then we will go back to the supplemental appropriations bill. This is lunacy.

Haphazard scheduling like this is typical of the way the House is being run. And it is no more inconvenience. It leads to confusion in consideration of legislation, and sometimes an atmosphere that approaches hysteria, as we have seen on all-too-many important bills. Sometimes things get so wrapped around the axle neither the presiding officer nor Members of Congress know exactly what is going on. As a consequence, serious legislative mistakes occur.

A well-defined calendar, with adequate advance notice and firm scheduling is long overdue in the House. But the resolution before us does not establish such a calendar.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Bolling-Martin recommendations do not constitute the kind of far-reaching reforms the House needs. However, this proposal does provide a somewhat more logical grouping of committee responsibility along functional lines as it upsets some of the cozy relationships between Members and lobbyists. All to the good.

In addition, the Bolling-Martin proposal will outlaw proxy voting in committee—which should never have been permitted in the first place—and will assure adequate staffing for the minority which should never have been denied. So despite the fact that this reform package does not go far enough and is only a faltering step, it is clearly a step in the right direction, in my opinion. Therefore I do intend to vote in favor of this proposal.

But I cannot help wondering whether or not the reforms, modest as they are, will really be permanent. When the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 was adopted, some of these same reforms were written into law. But when Congress reconvened in January of 1971, the majority party promptly turned its back on such reforms as minority staffing. Will this happen again? I trust not. But such action has already been threatened.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has come to the floor ballyhooed as a great reform.

Certainly changes in the House Committee structure are long overdue. Last year's energy crisis proved that—when 94 committees and subcommittees wrangled over the energy problem and debated fruitlessly for months before slapping a legislative bandaid over the entire gaping question, gasping in relief when the Arabs lifted the boycott and allowed Congress to get off the hook temporarily. But the Bolling-Martin recommendations, worthwhile though they are, are only a start. When this proposal is adopted, it is essential that we proceed to the consideration of other necessary reforms.

A VETO-PROOF CONGRESS
WOULD REPEAL 14(b)

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the phrase, "a veto-proof Congress" is becoming very familiar to all of us in this election year. One result of such a Congress which has not been discussed at great length is the possible repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

One of my constituents, Charles Holmes, of Schaumburg, Ill., has called to my attention the comments of Mr. Walter E. Trauffer, editor of *Pit and Quarry* magazine, on this subject and I would like to share them with my colleagues:

A VETO-PROOF CONGRESS WOULD
REPEAL 14(b)

(By Walter E. Trauffer)

Ever since the Taft-Hartley Act became law in 1947, there has been steady pressure from labor unions to repeal this law or to invalidate it by scratching out one paragraph, Section 14(b). This Act legalizes the union shop, but says in Section 14(b) that if states wish to outlaw the union shop, state law in this respect shall supersede the federal law. Nineteen states now have such "right to work" laws in effect, and labor unions are constantly working to get these laws repealed and to keep other states from passing similar laws. Industry is now faced with the possibility that the labor unions might achieve this purpose by electing a Congress that could repeal Section 14(b), even over a presidential veto.

Leading in the fight to retain freedom of

choice for the worker with respect to union membership has been the National Right to Work Committee, a non-profit organization, which has for over 20 years been committed to defend at all levels an American citizen's right to hold a job without being forced to join a labor union. The Committee has done its job well, and an important factor in its success is the "National Right to Work Newsletter," a monthly publication devoted to this cause. It has repeatedly called attention to special efforts to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act or Section 14(b).

A *Pit and Quarry* editorial in November, 1953, quoted an article, "How to save Taft-Hartley," in the September 21, 1953 issue of *The Freeman*, by Joseph H. Ball, former senator from Minnesota. An authority on labor relations and labor legislation, he pointed out in detail the danger to the Act, and what must be done to save it. Among other things, he presented a chronological sequence of events in the development of labor policy under the Eisenhower administration. In September, 1952, President Eisenhower, speaking to the AFL convention, emphatically opposed repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and favored only minor amendments.

In December 1952, the President announced the appointment of Martin P. Durkin, then president of an AFL union as Secretary of Labor. From that time on, there was one indication after another that Taft-Hartley was under fire. This culminated on July 31, 1953, in the "proposed Eisenhower message" to Congress, which suggested 19 amendments, including 24 concessions to union demands, and left out all of the industry proposals that were opposed by Mr. Durkin.

"Protests by Vice President Nixon and others stopped this message. . ."

The March 26, 1974 issue of the "Newsletter" warns against the latest, and perhaps the most serious threat against Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. We quote: "The election of a Congress with a two-thirds

majority controlled by George Meany & Company would undoubtedly mean the end to state Right to Work Laws."

According to the March 11, 1974 "Washington Report" of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States: "Organized labor is determined to seize upon Watergate—plus inflation, plus the energy crisis, plus unemployment—to win the 1974 Congressional elections in overwhelming style.

"For the AFL-CIO and COPE, its political arm, winning means more than gaining a working majority in both Houses of Congress. Labor wants to win by such sizable margins that President Nixon's veto power is rendered useless the last two years of his term.

"Under the slogan "Target for '74—A Veto-Proof Congress," the campaign is already under way to elect 20 to 23 additional pro-labor friends in the House and five to 10 additional Senators who can be counted on to do labor's bidding on veto count downs."

Quoting the June 26, 1974 "Newsletter," a special issue: "A new national survey, showing that most Americans feel union officials have too much power, indicates clearly that the so-called "veto-proof" Congress demanded by George Meany and top AFL-CIO officials would be inconsistent with the public interest.

"The study shows that some 70% of the American voting-age public—95 million people—favor voluntary unionism, favor curbs on union political spending and think union officials already have far too much power. A "veto-proof" Congress would extend compulsory unionism to all 50 states, allow unions to spend even more compulsory membership dues on politics, and greatly increase the power of top union officials.

"Right to Work supporters are urged to use the new survey material to win pledges from their U.S. House and Senate candidates to support the Right to Work principle, in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of their constituents."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 3, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Robert N. Meyers, founder and director of the Christian Service Corps, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we worship You today as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. We confess our sins—sins of selfishness, indifference, mistrust. We ask for divine forgiveness. May we be open to hear Your voice in times of plenty, in times of want, in crisis, war, and peace. We are grateful for the redemption that You offer to us and to all men through repentance and faith in Christ, and we pray that we will continue to listen as You speak to us through His words and parables.

We pray that You will bless this legislative body. We remember people around the world today in their physical and spiritual need. In gratefulness and thankfulness to You for Your many blessings, we pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14215. An act to amend the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act to revise and extend the programs authorized by that act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3204. An act to eliminate discrimination based on sex in the youth programs offered by the Naval Sea Cadet Corps; and

S. 3265. An act to amend the Jury Selection and Service Act of 1968, as amended (28 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.), by revising the section on fees, section 1871, and by adding a new section 1875, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 93-426, appointed Mr. TUNNEY and Mr. BROCK to the National Commission on Supplies and Shortages.

REV. MR. ROBERT N. MEYERS

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Mr. Robert N. Meyers, our guest chaplain today, is the founder and president of the Christian Service Corps.

The Christian Service Corps is a private program of volunteer service, designed to challenge men and women of all ages, in all walks of life, to use their skills and share their faith in Christ with people in physical and spiritual poverty throughout the world. Each volunteer receives a choice of assignment with established mission agencies in the United States or overseas. After a minimum level of support is raised, the corpsman is trained intensively in language, culture, and Christian witness before proceeding to his assignment. The corps has placed volunteers with over 60 different mission organizations in 42 countries in Asia, Africa, Europe, North America, and South America.

The Christian Service Corps has its headquarters in Washington, D.C., where it trains the volunteers prior to their mission service. I am pleased to note that Dana B. Ebeling from Farmington, Minn., is one of these trainees. She is a registered nurse and will be serving in Yurimaguas, Peru, with Regions Beyond Missionary Union, working among the Chayahuitas Indians. The Chayahuitas