

came out second best on that deal. We know what the Russian grain deal cost the consumers of the United States. We know what the Russian grain deal cost the taxpayers of the United States. Still the State Department is not satisfied and wants the Senate and the Congress to vote the Export-Import Bank without any restrictions on what can be loaned to Russia.

Another reason I am persuaded that I do not want to give a blank check to the State Department on this matter, nor to the Export-Import Bank on this matter, nor to the President on this matter, is the settlement which the State Department made with Russia on the Russian debt.

One of those who participated in the negotiations with the State Department said that the United States drove a hard bargain. Well, here is the bargain: They settled the Russian debt to the United States at 3 cents on the dollar, plus another 24 cents, provided the United States gives Russia most-favored-nation treatment in the way of tariffs, and provided we make huge loans to the Soviet Union. I do not call that much of a deal.

I am perfectly willing to cooperate with President Ford insofar as giving early consideration to the Export-Import Bank bill, but I shall oppose, as strongly as I can, the passage of this legislation unless it includes a savings on the amount of loans to the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S.J. RES 258—DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 29, 1974, AS NATIONAL STUDENT GOVERNMENT DAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating November 29, 1974, as "National Student Government Day".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

tion, which was read the second time at length.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, this resolution has been cleared with Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. McCLELLAN, and with the joint leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 258) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating November 29, 1974, as "National Student Government Day", and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McCLURE AND SENATOR MANSFIELD TOMORROW AND FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, Mr. McCLURE be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which Mr. MANSFIELD be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes; after which there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, until 10:45 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that statements during the period for the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE CONSIDERATION TOMORROW OF H.R. 16900, THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1975

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of routine morning business on tomorrow, the Senate resume consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill, Calendar No. 1188, H.R. 16900.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, on tomorrow, the Senate will convene at 10 a.m.

After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, Mr. McCLURE will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which Mr. MANSFIELD will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

There will then be a period for the transaction of routine morning business which will extend to 10:45 a.m., during which period statements will be limited to 5 minutes each.

At the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate will resume the consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 16900.

At 10:50 a.m., the time on the amendment by the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HUGH SCOTT) will be running. There is a time limitation of 10 minutes, to be equally divided. At 11 a.m., a vote will occur on the amendment by Mr. SCOTT. That will be a yeas-and-nays vote, the yeas and nays already having been ordered.

On the disposition of the Scott amendment, the Senate will take up the Mondale amendment, on which there is a time agreement which was previously entered into, limiting time on amendments to 1 hour.

On the disposition of the Mondale amendment, the Senate will take up the amendment by Mr. JOHNSTON.

There will be several yeas-and-nays votes on tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and at 6:02 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 20, 1974, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 19, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Theodore R. Britton, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Barbados, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Grenada.

ADMINISTRATOR OF FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY

Hugh E. Witt, of Virginia, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy. (New position.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BERLIN—TEST CASE FOR PEACE, FREEDOM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recognizing the preoccupation of the Members

and the media with the present Presidential visit to the Far East, the growing circumstances in the Middle East and the unresolved Cyprus dispute, I, nevertheless, feel it practical for us to review another trouble spot which has, in the past, been a center of the struggle between forces of freedom and forces of oppression.

I refer to Berlin—which remains a symbol of resistance to Communist ex-

pansion. Therefore, I deem it most appropriate to insert into the Record a speech by Axel Springer that he made in Berlin. The speech was reprinted in the San Diego Union of November 3 and now follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Nov. 3, 1974]
BERLIN—TEST CASE FOR PEACE, FREEDOM
(By Axel Springer)

I accept the view that it is possible for peoples to fall victims to demonism.

And I support the view that Soviet imperialism represents the greatest and most dangerous evil facing the world today.

However, this is a point on which opinions are divided.

The American Senator Henry Jackson, critic of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, has repeatedly said that a policy of detente must be based on human rights. According to Jackson there can be no detente unless the Soviets abandon their power politics and their immoral principles.

Or in simpler terms: unless Moscow gives up its intention to compel the world by force, lies and terror, to submit to the Soviet yoke.

A policy of detente would be critically dangerous if it were simply aiding and abetting an immoral and abhorrent tyranny over half the world. Many have escaped from this hell only with difficulty and at high cost. However, the danger has not been exorcised.

Where could the need for a rethinking of attitudes be proclaimed with more justice than in the capital of the German people—which is at the same time the German town with the largest number of refugees?

This is where resistance must begin. This is the place where there must be no capitulation to the aggression of Soviet imperialism.

Berlin, all of Berlin, is Moscow's main target on the way to the Atlantic. Its strategy is attrition.

The city is losing its life blood. In 1973 the excess of deaths over births was more than 21,000—the worst figures since 1946. And nearly 10,000 more German citizens left the city than came into it.

But for an influx of 16,000 foreign workers the position would have been serious.

Worst of all, however, Berlin's right to exercise the functions of a capital city has been surrendered. Since the four-power agreement, there have been no official visits by the Bonn Government to Berlin.

The shifting of this year's Free Democratic Party Conference to Hamburg is rightly regarded by Berliners as the most striking piece of complaisance by a democratic party towards Soviet imperialism which has yet occurred.

Berlin has an unrestricted right to be the capital city of the German people, the capital of a German nation which lives on despite the frontiers imposed by force.

This is the particular and exceptional feature about Berlin: it remains a capital city despite demarcation lines, fences of death and walls of shame.

What will become of Berlin?

The East German regime will not even permit Berlin to have a federal office for environmental protection. This, they say, would interfere with detente.

However, the four power agreement, the agreements with the East German Government and the policy of detente, on the other hand, do not prevent the Soviet Bloc from continuing its material, spiritual and political isolation and blockade of West Berlin.

The "German Democratic Republic," the Soviet Union and other East Block countries continue to infringe upon the letter and the spirit of the four power agreement and treaties.

If Berlin is to survive the struggle, if it is to remain a vital metropolis of the German nation, open to the world, then it is necessary that a commitment to Berlin must be created.

From a number of facts we know that the Soviets have made a very precise study of the works of the Prussian master of the art of war, Carl von Clausewitz.

One of Clausewitz's maxims is: "The principal objective in a war is always the enemy's capital."

They maintain this objective even in time

of peace. For it was Lenin who said: "Whoever holds Berlin, holds Germany, and whoever holds Germany holds Europe."

The first objective of the Soviets is Berlin. They will then lay claim to the whole of Germany.

Berlin then must become the center of a German nation, open to the world, peace loving, industrious and courageous—even while the nation remains divided.

Berlin is a test case—where peace and freedom have to be won.

In contrast to those across the wall who are constantly marching, parading and clanking their weapons, our arm is justice. Our demand is for self-determination for the way to reunification can only be via self-determination.

Human rights, the right to live in one's own country, and the right of self-determination, are the triple constellation of our aspirations.

ENERGY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT OF 1974

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senate will soon be considering the conference report on H.R. 8193, the Energy Security Transportation Act of 1974, or the so-called cargo preference. This bill mandates that 30 percent of U.S. imports of petroleum and petroleum products be carried in American constructed and registered tankers.

The House has passed this conference, so our Nation is the only hope left for the consumer. Only we stand in the way of a highly inflationary bill being passed.

Tomorrow, I will report to the Senate in detail on the inflationary analysis of this bill. I just today received an excellent analysis of the highly inflationary impact of H.R. 8193 by Mr. Roy Ash, Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to this letter so they can clearly understand the anticonsumer, inflationary aspects of H.R. 8193.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ash's letter to me dated November 19, 1974, be made a part of the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., November 19, 1974.

HON. CARL T. CURTIS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CURTIS: Thank you for your letter of October 29, requesting our views on the inflationary impact of H.R. 8193 ("Energy Transportation Security Act of 1974").

The Office of Management and Budget remains strongly opposed to enactment of this bill. In addition to the problems it would create for our national security and our relations with other nations, it is clear that it would have a serious inflationary impact.

The bill would result in a serious and immediate increase in the cost of petroleum imports. Estimates of the cost of using older and less efficient U.S. tankers that could be

dedicated to foreign trade show that existing U.S. flag ships would require rates at least 200 percent higher than for foreign flag ships, and this differential could be as much as 300 percent depending on the route.

There would also be a serious cost increase for the domestic transportation system. Current U.S. flag tanker capacity is not sufficient to meet both domestic requirements and the 20 percent of oil imports reserved under the oil cargo preference bill. This overall shortage will put strong upward pressure on domestic shipping rates. Freight rate increases of 150 percent for domestic ocean borne transportation of petroleum could be expected.

The total short-term cost impact could vary from \$300 to \$600 million per year depending on the level of oil imports and the prevailing foreign flag charter rates. Increased oil imports are anticipated, and freight rate projections suggest that a serious over-tonnage situation is developing worldwide which is expected to depress freight rates. Both these factors would tend to increase the cost impact resulting from the use of U.S. flagships.

The bill would also have an adverse inflationary impact on the U.S. ship construction industry. Most major U.S. yards are now operating at or near their current capacity. The demand for labor at shipyards is now increasing at a rate of 8 to 12 percent per year, resulting in severe skilled labor shortages. Serious material shortages began developing in 1973 and steel shortages have become critical for some yards. A recently completed nationwide survey of yards by the Maritime Administration showed almost half had experienced delays or anticipated future delays in the delivery of steel. The added demand for ships created by this bill will aggravate these shortages and add to the difficulty faced by the Navy in contracting for ships to meet its force requirements.

The material price index for ships has gone up 22.6 percent in the six month period ending July 1974, while the increase for all of FY 1973 was only 6.2 percent. Average hourly earnings have increased nine percent during the last year. Given the demand for new ships which will be created, yard capacity may have to be expanded by as much as 50 percent, according to industry sources. Unfortunately, the bill provides no incentive to the yards to hold down construction costs. Whatever industry wide increases in investment or operating costs occur in the scramble for new ships would be passed along to consumers through higher than prevailing world freight rates, which the bill would allow.

Supporters of the bill have argued that it provides for a rebate on oil import fees to offset part of the cost impact. They fail to point out, however, that no more than 5 to 10 percent of all crude oil imports incur such fees today. Since the bill's provision for rebate is only for a five year period, rebates will cease at about the time that import fees begin to be applicable to the majority of crude oil imports. Consequently, there would not be any meaningful relief from the increased costs associated with the bill through this rebate provision. In any case, whatever reduction in oil import fees that does occur will reduce revenues to the Treasury and will, therefore, be absorbed by the American public.

The serious adverse impact that this bill would have on our economy, our national security and our foreign relations is clear. The passage of this bill by the Congress would be extremely undesirable.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our views. I hope that this information will be useful to you.

With warm regards,
Sincerely,

ROY L. ASH,
Director.

WILL MANGANESE NODULE MINING
DISTURB THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT?

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one of the leaders in research on the effect of the mining of manganese nodules on the marine environment is Dr. Oswald A. Roels, chairman of Biological Oceanography, Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory of Columbia University. A summary of one of his reports is part of the hearing record on "Mineral Resources of the Deep Seabed"—Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on S. 1134, May-June 1973.

Last month Dr. Roels presented a paper entitled "Will Manganese Nodule Mining Disturb the Marine Environment?" at the International Conference on the Exploration of the Oceans held in Bordeaux, France. In September he had presented the paper at the annual meeting of the Marine Technology Society here in Washington. It appeared in the Marine Technology Society Journal of September 1974.

Dr. Roels makes the point that, on the basis of admittedly incomplete research to date, it appears that the effect of seabed mining of manganese nodules and lifting them, together with sediment and near-bottom water, to the surface would be small.

However, if processing began at sea, it would be a different ball game. As Dr. Roels writes:

The processing and extractive metallurgy of manganese nodules at sea, and the discharge of waste materials resulting from this processing, could be far more dangerous unless adequate precautions are taken.

Mr. President, I commend this important paper to those interested in this future source of minerals basic to our economy. I ask unanimous consent that the above mentioned paper be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

WILL NODULE MINING DISTURB MARINE ENVIRONMENT?

(By Oswald A. Roels)

The presence of extensive manganese nodule deposits over much of the deep ocean basins and the increasing need for the metals contained within these nodules has recently led to international commercial interest in mining these deposits.

This interest, particularly on the part of the most highly developed nations, has been greatly stimulated recently by the use of rapidly decreasing, known, land-based mineral resources by smaller nations to further their national and international, political, economic or military objectives.

There is no doubt that environmental considerations and arguments—with or without sound technical basis—will be used in international legal, political and economic deliberations concerning the exploitation of the mineral resources of the seafloor, as has already been the case in the United Nations Seabed Committee.

Several mining tests have already been completed, many more in preparation and at least one full-scale mining vessel is undergoing sea-trials. The prospect of imminent extensive deep-sea mining requires serious consideration of the environmental impact of this activity, since it could affect the benthic and pelagic environments. It is essential that the environmental implications of manganese nodule mining from the deep-seafloor should be thoroughly understood, evaluated and documented before such mining is attempted on a large scale.

UNIQUE COLLABORATION

The proposed mining of manganese nodules from the deep-seafloor has triggered a perhaps unique collaboration in the United States between the government, the mining industry and academic institutions to determine the environmental impact of the proposed mining operations before their start. This is in great contrast to other important industrial developments, where environmental concerns have usually only arisen after—sometimes serious—damage was caused to the environment. By taking preventive action, it should be possible to greatly reduce or completely eliminate potential environmental hazards due to the mining operations.

It is our sincere hope that collaboration to ensure safe deep-sea mining methods will bring together all nations interested in this activity, and thus lead to the development of mining techniques with beneficial environmental effects.

This discussion will be restricted to the consideration of the impact of manganese nodule mining on the marine environment. The metallurgical operations to extract the valuable metals such as copper, nickel and cobalt from the manganese nodules should be comparable to their environmental effects to land-based operations of a similar nature. However, if the ore processing would take place at sea, special precautions would have to be taken for the discharge of waste materials. Since secondary land use (including land-based processing plants and tailings disposal sites) and social and demographic patterns affected by marine mining or ore processing are not exclusive problems of deep-sea mining, they are outside the scope of this recommendation. Similarly, the environmental impacts of alternative means of obtaining metal ores and the environmental analysis of the utilization of minerals obtained from the marine environment are not considered here.

The manganese nodule areas of the greatest commercial interest are situated in the north equatorial central Pacific Ocean in water depths between 10,000 and 18,000 feet at least 1,000 miles from shore. The nodules are generally found in areas of extremely slow sedimentation of red clay and siliceous (radiolarian) ooze. The manganese nodules lie mainly on top of the sediments covering the ocean bottom underlying oceanic water masses of very low biological productivity. No deep penetration of the sediment will, therefore, be required to retrieve them. Manganese nodules are extremely rare in areas where there is rapid sedimentation, e.g. on those parts of the seafloor underlying areas of high biological productivity in the water column, giving rise to rapid sedimentation of biogenic oozes.

Manganese nodule distribution on the ocean floor and technical and economic factors governing their retrieval from the depths will, therefore, greatly limit the areas to be mined. We will, therefore, consider in our discussion only relatively flat, sediment-covered parts of the ocean floor, with a high density of manganese nodules on, or very close to, the surface of the sediment.

In the first steps of the mining operation, the manganese nodules are collected from the ocean floor, usually from great depths,

and transported through the water column to a surface vessel.

MINING TECHNIQUES

The collection of manganese nodules will result in the removal and redistribution of sediments and benthic organisms on the ocean floor. In all mining operations, it is likely that there will be considerable resuspension of sedimentary materials in the near-bottom waters. All the different techniques under consideration for nodule mining will try to avoid as much as possible the retrieval of sediments with the nodules. The continuous-line-bucket-dredge (CLB) system tested in the Pacific in 1971 and 1972, used buckets of 40-centimeter depth with a maximum penetration into the sediment of about 20 centimeters, but probably much less in practice. The other systems propose to utilize bottom-gathering devices connected with hydraulic or air-lift pumping systems to transport the nodules to the surface through a pipeline system.

All these machines have components which contact the ocean bottom to make a first separation of the nodules from the surrounding sediment. This first separation is achieved by a chute with water jets, heavy spring rake tines, a radial tooth roller, harrow blades and water jets, or spaced comb teeth. Many of the machine concepts employ adjustable collecting elements so that changes can be made during the mining operation to accommodate variations in the nodule deposit and sediment characteristics. A second important feature of all the collecting machines is a controlled digging depth into the ocean bottom. The interest is usually centered within the upper few inches of the sediment.

It is obviously in the interest of the mining operation to separate the nodules from the sediment as well as possible on the ocean floor and to disturb the sediment as little as possible, compatible with efficient collection of the nodules. However, it is equally obvious that significant disturbance of the sediment and the sessile benthic organisms which cannot escape the oncoming dredge will occur. A cloud of sediment will undoubtedly be stirred up in the near bottom water layers. The distribution and resedimentation of the stirred-up particles will obviously be governed by their density and other sedimentation characteristics as well as by the near-bottom currents. This resuspension of sedimentary materials will influence the near-bottom water mass as well as certain areas of the ocean floor from which sediments have been removed, as well as other areas where redeposition will occur.

The near-bottom water mass may retain in solution certain compounds leached out from the sediment or from the interstitial water. For instance, it is conceivable that the trace metal content of the near-bottom water could be increased by this resuspension of sediment, this stirring up of the bottom. This enrichment of the near-bottom water in certain compounds may have a stimulatory or inhibitory effect on organisms living in the deep ocean near the seafloor.

POSSIBLE EFFECTS

On the whole, important effects seem unlikely both in view of the relatively low density of the near bottom prowlers and the fact that the sedimentary material arrived on the seafloor as a result of natural sedimentation processes. It has been argued that the redistribution of sediment on the ocean floor resulting from natural phenomena exceeds by many orders of magnitude on a world-wide scale any disturbance caused by all the dredges ever likely to be utilized in deep sea mining. However, it remains equally clear that local disturbance of sediment may have a certain impact on the deep-sea fauna and flora. This is particularly the case of

sessile animals which may have a very slow reproductive cycle. However, it is unlikely that any mining operation will cover 100 percent of a given area of the seafloor; thus, if bands of adequate width on the seafloor were left undisturbed in a mined area, the deep-sea fauna and flora should be able to reestablish themselves in those areas where the dredge heads have destroyed it. This process of recolonization would be quite rapid on a geological time scale.

In general, we know that the biomass of the sessile fauna on the deep-seafloor is very small particularly in manganese nodule areas and therefore the quantitative impact of deep-sea mining on the marine flora and fauna should be quite small. Another possible result of the disturbance of the sediments and their resuspension in the water column is the transplantation of spores or other dormant or live forms of microorganisms from one area, where they lay in the sediment, to another, whether they may be transported by water currents in the overlying water masses after resuspension from the sediment by the dredge. Initial observations on some viable phytoplankters occurring in deep-sea sediment have been described.

After the manganese nodules have been collected from the seafloor with certain quantities of sedimentary material, they are transported through the water column to the surface mining vessel either in the buckets of a continuous line dredge or in a water stream through a pipeline. In both modes of transport, some or all of the accidentally gathered sediment and near-bottom water may be discharged, either at the surface or at intermediate depths in the water column. The effect of these discharges at the surface has been measured or forecast by my group.

To date, there is no information concerning the rate of sedimentation of discharged particulate matter. We have some information concerning the influence of deep-sea sediment on the productivity of waters in the euphotic zone. The influence of dissolved nutrients from interstitial water, or near-bottom water, on the chemical composition of the overlying water column can readily be calculated from the rate of mixing and the fate of the discharged near-bottom water. This mixing will be governed by the salinity and temperature of the near-bottom water at the time of discharge as well as by the salinity and temperature of the receiving water mass.

The possibility of the introduction of foreign species of phytoplankters which were dormant in the sediments but may come to life under the temperature, light and oxygen conditions prevailing in the overlying water column should also be considered.

From the admittedly incomplete results of our work to date, it appears that the effect of the mining operation and of the vertical transport of the manganese nodules, sediment and near-bottom water to the surface, and its discharge at the surface or at intermediary levels in the water column, is small.

The processing and extractive metallurgy of manganese nodules at sea, and the discharge of waste materials resulting from this processing, could be far more dangerous unless adequate precautions are taken.

However, most major concerns involved in the development of manganese nodules have determined that at least for first generation plants, economical processing can only be accomplished ashore. The principal reasons for this area that the reagent transportation costs will be equal to, or greater than the nodule transport costs, and problems of waste disposal and environmental protection will be much greater at sea than on land. However, should all processing take place at

sea, at least as great care should be taken for waste disposal resulting from the metallurgical process as is now done on land; we should have learned the lesson that we cannot willfully damage our environment without bad consequences for the quality of life.

PROPOSALS

To ensure the safe development of this resource, and to avoid costly and drawn out legal wrangling based on the unsubstantiated opinions of "experts" for opposite viewpoints, it is clearly necessary that an orderly procedure be followed and that all environmental factors related to deep-sea mining be well documented.

We therefore propose that the following procedure be adopted:

1. The establishment of base-line conditions in the potential mining areas. This study could be continued and completed—if necessary—simultaneously with the subsequent phases of the procedure.

2. The environmental monitoring of pilot and/or full-scale mining operations.

3. The documentation of changes induced in benthic and pelagic ecosystems by deep-sea mining and evaluation of their implication in relation to current and potential maritime resources.

4. If necessary, the recommendation of changes in mining methods and equipment based on the facts established in 2 and 3.

5. The formulation of environmental criteria and regulations for future mining operations to minimize harmful environmental effects while enhancing the development of potentially beneficial by-products.

6. The monitoring and enforcement of 5. This procedure could be implemented rapidly by the United States alone or in collaboration with one or more of the most interested nations and could then serve as a model for possible international adoption. We believe that there is no other way to develop this resource and preserve and protect the quality of our marine environment.

References

- Horn, D.R., Horn, B.M. and Delach, M.N., "Ferromanganese Deposits of the North Pacific," Technical Report No. 1, National Science Foundation, GX-33616, Washington, D.C. 20550, U.S.A., 1972.
- Masuda, Y., Cruickshank, M.J. and Mero, J.L., "Continuous Bucket-Line Dredging at 12,000 Feet," Offshore Technology Conference, April 1971, p. 1410.
- Welling, C.G. (Lockheed Missiles & Space Company, Inc.), "Some Environmental Factors Associated with Deep Ocean Mining," Eighth Annual Marine Technology Society Meeting, Washington, D.C., Sept. 11-13, 1972.
- Garland, Charles (Director of Advanced Engineering) and Hagerty, Royal (oceanographer, Deepsea Ventures, Inc.), "Environmental Planning Considerations for Deep Ocean Mining," Eighth Annual Conference and Exposition, Marine Technology Society, Washington, D.C., Sept. 11-13, 1972.
- Malone, T.C., Garside, C., Anderson, O.R. and Roels, O.A., "The Possible Occurrence of Photosynthetic Micro-organisms in Deep-Sea Sediments of the North Atlantic," *Jour. Phycology*, in Press.
- Amos, A.F., Garside, C., Haines, K.C. and Roels, O.A., "Deep-Ocean Mining: Some Effects of Surface-Discharged Deep Water," in: *Papers from a Conference on Ferromanganese Deposits on the Ocean Floor*, Jan. 20-20, 1972, Arden House, Harriman Campus, N.Y., David R. Horn (Ed.), Publ. of Office of IDOE/NSF, Washington, D.C., 1972, pp. 271-281.
- Cardwell, Paul H. (Director of Research, Deepsea Ventures, Inc., Gloucester Point, Virginia), "Extractive Metallurgy of Ocean Nodules," 1973 Mining Convention/Environmental Show of the American Mining Congress, Denver, Colorado, September 9-12, 1973.

(Oswald A. Roels is chairman, biological oceanography, Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory, Palisades, New York, and professor of oceanography, City University Institute of Oceanography at the City College, New York.)

ISRAEL AND THE "PLO"

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the world is being subjected to an unprecedented propaganda barrage by Arabs who favor the liquidation of Israel. The occasion is the invitation by a majority of the United Nations to the Palestine Liberation Organization—PLO—to speak before the General Assembly.

This unprecedented invitation to allow a nongovernmental group to address the U.N. raises serious questions about the continuation of the world organization as a responsible international forum.

Just as disturbing is the ability of the Arabs, fueled by their new oil-based power in world affairs, to spread lies and falsehoods about the situation in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note just a few important points which unmask the intentions of the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization.

First, we should recall that there are already 20 Arab states and 37 Moslem states in the world. The Jewish people, with a history and culture extending back over 4,000 years, need apologize to no one for insisting upon the continued existence of Israel as the one Jewish state in the world.

Second, the Palestinians already have an independent Arab state of their own. The majority of the population of Jordan is comprised of Palestinian Arabs.

Third, the Soviet Union is a major force behind the continued existence of the PLO. The weapons and the military training of PLO terrorists come from the Soviet Union. It was no accident that Arafat's first stop after the U.N. was a visit to Castro's Cuba, Russia's prime base in the Western Hemisphere.

Fourth, the PLO is not a legitimate government, but rather a collection of terrorist groups. The PLO does not wage war against military targets where the killing of civilians is accidental. Rather it purposely seeks out civilian targets for murder such as the Olympic athletes in Munich, the U.S. Ambassador in Khartoum, the school children in Maalot, and the housewives at home with their infants in Kiryat Shmona. Arafat even had the insensitivity to address the U.N. wearing a pistol, an action which should offend peace-loving people everywhere.

Fifth, the problem of the Palestinian refugees is not a problem for Israel to solve. It is an Arab problem. The solution which should have come years ago and which is still valid today is the re-

settlement of the Palestinian refugees in the 20 Arab countries, including Palestinian Jordan, which have the land and the wealth to easily accomplish this move. With far fewer resources, Israel long ago resettled some 700,000 Jewish refugees from Arab lands.

Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt for 1 minute the resolve and ability of the people of Israel to stand in their own defense. Nor do I doubt the continued support of Israel by the people of the United States. What I do question is the behavior of those scores of nations who welcomed the PLO terrorists to the United Nations Assembly.

SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS—SIGMA DELTA CHI URGES CONGRESS TO OVERRIDE THE VETO OF H.R. 12471, FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week the President addressed the annual convention of the Society of Professional Journalists—Sigma Delta Chi—in Phoenix, Ariz. His address and a wide-ranging press conference were broadcast nationally and received considerable press coverage the following several days. In his remarks, President Ford defended his October 17 veto of the amendment to the Freedom of Information Act, passed by Congress last month by a virtually unanimous vote.

Several days later, the members of Sigma Delta Chi attending the convention adopted a resolution reaffirming their support of H.R. 12471 and urging Congress to override the veto. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that one of the many outstanding witnesses who testified on the bill which later became H.R. 12471 was Mr. Courtney R. Sheldon, a distinguished journalist for the Christian Science Monitor and then chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of Sigma Delta Chi.

Since the Sigma Delta Chi resolution adopted on Saturday, November 16, 1974 naturally did not receive the attention that the President's appearance at the convention invoked, I include the full text of the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE CONVENTION OF THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY OF JOURNALISTS—SIGMA DELTA CHI—PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Whereas: Weaknesses in the Freedom of Information Act of 1966 have prevented adequate public access to Government data, and

Whereas: Congress overwhelmingly passed a measure that would have removed some of those weaknesses, and

Whereas: The measure passed by Congress was adopted only after considerable debate and compromise over objections that sensitive military and intelligence information needed protection, and

Whereas: Despite overwhelming support of

CXX—2306—Part 27

the measure and the compromises made to insure its passage, the measure was vetoed by President Ford on October 17, and

Whereas: The Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi has long supported efforts to assure the greatest possible public access to public records, now, therefore:

Be it resolved that the Society restates its belief that the measure passed by the Congress would be of significant benefit to the American people by providing greater access to Government data, and

Be it further resolved that the National Convention of the Society urges Congress to override President Ford's veto.

PHILADELPHIA SAVES TAXPAYERS' MONEY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, government at every level must always be on the lookout for ways to save the taxpayers' money.

My city, Philadelphia, will cut its costs by some \$63,000 a year by switching to longer lasting synthetic motor oil for its 954-vehicle Police fleet.

According to city officials the synthetic engine oils provide at least 40,000 miles of driving, compared to 5,000 miles with customary lubrication. Oil filters are good for at least 20,000 miles with the new synthetics, instead of 5,000 miles with the present petroleum-based oils.

Although the synthetic oil is more expensive initially, direct cost savings will come from using less oil, fewer oil filters, and considerably less garage times and manpower. An added benefit will be that each vehicle and its driver will remain on patrol an additional 9 hours per year, an estimated 8,586 patrol hours for the fleet.

Philadelphia police vehicles patrol an average of 60,000 miles per year. Following routine maintenance programs now, each vehicle received an oil change and new filter every 5,000 miles or 12 times per year. This adds up to 5 fresh quarts of oil, 1 filter, and 1 hour of mechanic's time, every visit. During that hour, the car is off the street.

The new synthetics, although they cost more per quart, will require less than two oil changes and only three filter changes each year. Additionally, the city will need to store less oil, for a space saving and a reduction in fire potential.

Present annual per-vehicle maintenance cost is \$101.28, for a total fleet cost of \$96,621.12. With the new synthetic motor oils, the costs will be \$35.22 per vehicle and \$33,599.88 per year.

Synthetic motor oils are used extensively in military and aircraft applications. City officials anticipate no trouble with the switch, especially since they will continue their routine motor-oil inspection program.

Each vehicle in the police fleet is involved in the program whereby a sample of oil is extracted monthly and subjected

to laboratory analysis to determine its condition.

THE CASE OF GENERAL BROWN

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent public comments of Gen. George S. Brown, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are outrageous for a man in his important position.

General Brown is confused about the situation in the Middle East. The real threat there, to the existence of Israel and to the interests of the United States, does not come from the Arab nations themselves. On their own, the Arabs can do little but commit terrorist acts. The real threat to peace in the Middle East comes from the Soviet arms which are continuing to flow in enormous quantities to the Arab States.

General Brown is further confused about the reasons for congressional support of Israel. The support for Israel in Congress is not the work of some powerful lobby but rather results from the widespread belief that Soviet influence should not be allowed to spread unchecked and that America has both a moral and a political interest in the survival of the only democracy in the Middle East.

The general is also confused about the cause of the oil situation in the United States. Even if Israel did not exist, the Arab States would continue to use oil as an economic weapon to acquire wealth and power. It is important to note here that countries which are friendly with Israel, such as Iran and Venezuela, have contributed equally to the world's oil problems.

We should have serious reservations about the character and ability of a man in his high position who repeats timeworn, anti-Semitic myths. To set the record straight, the vast majority of newspapers in this country are not owned by Jews. Furthermore, banking is a profession from which Jews in this country have been generally excluded.

The security of our country is in danger if it depends on a man who bases his opinions and his judgments on information that is biased, false and designed to mislead.

If a military leader is duped by absurd anti-Semitic charges, what kind of response can we expect from such a man when subjected to the effects of subtle and beguiling Soviet propaganda?

The welfare and security of this country can best be served by the removal of General Brown and his replacement by someone not so easily taken in by phony information.

I do believe General Brown sees his error and that his apology is sincere.

The problem is that in time of national crisis our top military leader may not have a second chance to correct his bad judgment.

FORMER SOUTH TEXAN NAMED CITIZEN OF THE YEAR IN WHITTIER, CALIF.

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished newspaperman, who for some years was editor of the McAllen Monitor in my district, recently was named citizen of the year in Whittier, Calif.

Mynatt Smith moved 20 years ago from McAllen to Whittier, our loss becoming that city's gain. As editor and publisher of the Whittier Daily News, he has carried forward the reputation for community service that he established in South Texas. The Whittier-Area Chamber of Commerce and the Whittier District Board of Realtors, cosponsors of the annual citizen of the year award, have given deserved recognition to his civic activities.

We of south Texas are in no way surprised by the honor that has come to Mr. Smith. He laid the groundwork for his distinguished journalistic career in our area, and we are proud of him. And I am proud to say that as a youth I wrote high school sports for the McAllen Monitor when he was editor.

I extend my congratulations to Mynatt Smith and to the California city he and his newspaper serve so well. As part of my remarks, I include a story from the Daily News giving details about his community service:

SMITH NAMED WHITTIER CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

Mynatt Smith, active in Whittier community organizations and projects in the 20 years he has lived here, has been named Whittier's 1974 citizen of the year.

Smith, editor and publisher of The Daily News, was named at a reception in his honor at a Whittier restaurant Monday afternoon.

The honor came from the Whittier-Area Chamber of Commerce and the Whittier District Board of Realtors, cosponsors of the award. Board members of both groups were present.

Smith will also be honored at a traditional citizen-of-the-year banquet at the Friendly Hills Country Club Nov. 21.

A member of the First Baptist Church of Whittier and the Whittier Rotary Club, Smith is on the board of governors of the Museum of Natural History of Los Angeles County, a member of the boards of directors of the YMCA of Greater Whittier, the Whittier Heritage Assn., the Whittier Community Concert Assn., the Whittier Uptown Assn., and the Whittier Bicentennial Committee. He is treasurer of the Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital Foundation.

Smith is a past president of the Whittier Area Chamber of Commerce, a past chapter director of the American Red Cross, and has been active in United Way finance efforts. He is a former member of the Whittier City Library Board.

The dinner honoring Smith Nov. 21 will begin at 7:30 p.m., preceded by a social hour at 6:30 p.m. Tickets may be obtained from the chamber or the realty board.

This is the second year that the two sponsoring groups have jointly presented the award. Formerly, the presentation was a project of the realty board.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESOLUTION PASSED BY B'NAI B'RITH DISTRICT THREE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations, in a shocking display of disregard for the murders of hundreds of innocent people, has agreed to allow the Palestine Liberation Organization to take part in the debate on the Middle East. During our recess many organizations in the United States protested this action. At this time I enter into the RECORD a resolution of protest issued by District Three of B'nai B'rith:

RESOLUTION

For most Americans and, therefore, for most members of B'nai B'rith, the United Nations has represented the best hope for lasting peace among the nations of the world, and has been a forum in which the world's leaders might express their concerns and work constructively together to find solutions for the troubles that beset them. Unfortunately, as the family of nations has grown, and more and more emerging countries, lacking in knowledge and understanding of the democratic and humanitarian principles which motivated its founders, have been admitted to membership, it has veered off course as a catalyst for the ills of mankind, and has become little more than a debating society in which nations, spurred by self-interest or intense economic pressure, have vented their hatred and frustration on those who have tried to uphold the ideals and purposes of the United Nations Charter. This development was sadly and dramatically underscored on October 14, 1974, when the General Assembly, in a shocking and unprecedented action, voted to admit the Palestine Liberation Organization as a participant in the forthcoming debate on peace in the Middle East, notwithstanding its avowed purpose of destroying the State of Israel, repeatedly demonstrated by its unrelenting campaign of kidnaping and hijacking and the murder of innocent persons.

Now, therefore, the 34,000 members of B'nai B'rith in District No. 3, comprising the states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware and West Virginia, resolve as follows:

1. They express their outrage and dismay over the incomprehensible action of the United Nations General Assembly in admitting the Palestine Liberation Organization as a participant in the debate and discussion on peace in the Middle East scheduled to begin on November 4, 1974.

2. They commend and congratulate the United States government for its courageous action, in the face of overwhelming odds, in voting against the resolution seating the Palestine Liberation Organization, and urge the implementation of that commendation in the form of letters, telegrams and petitions to President Gerald R. Ford, Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, and United States Ambassador to the United Nations John A. Scall, and to their Senators and Representatives.

3. They propose to join in the national expression of disapproval over the action of the General Assembly by traveling to New York City on Monday, November 4, 1974, to participate in a solidarity rally at United Nations Plaza.

November 19, 1974

WILL THE SOCIAL SECURITY BUBBLE BURST?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, concern is growing over the long-range viability of our social security system. Projected demands on the system indicate that it is headed for a financial crisis which may require significant changes in resources, benefits, or both.

While the actual crunch may be some way further down the road, we had better be doing some serious thinking now about how we can deal with it, and just what our alternatives are.

The dimensions of this problem are very well outlined in an article in the November issue of Nation's Business entitled "Will the Social Security Bubble Burst?" I hope that my colleagues in the House and the general public will give some attention to this and other analyses of the situation so that we can begin to develop a better awareness of what we are faced with, and some understanding of what our options are in coming to grips with it.

The article follows:

WILL THE SOCIAL SECURITY BUBBLE BURST?

(By Robert T. Gray)

After teaching school for more than 12 years, Ida M. Fuller was hired in 1904 as a bookkeeper, secretary and clerk in the law offices of Stickney, Sargent & Skeels in her home town of Ludlow, Vt.

In 1937, her employers—she was still there—explained that the slight deduction they had started taking from her weekly pay represented a 1 per cent tax required by the new Social Security Act to finance retirement benefits for the elderly.

Though the tax was imposed in 1937, the start of benefit payments was deferred until 1940 to allow a buildup in the fund from which they would be made.

Miss Fuller retired in 1939 and applied for benefits.

In January, 1940, she received a check for \$22.54.

Numbered 00-000-001, it was the first monthly Social Security check ever issued.

From that droplet, the flow of payments has increased to a trickle, a stream, a river and now a mighty torrent. In 1940, a total of \$62 million went to 222,000 beneficiaries. This year, \$65 billion is being paid to more than 30 million recipients.

All told, \$400 billion has been distributed since the program got underway—three quarters of it in the last 15 years alone.

Social Security has been accorded the popular status of a national institution whose financing method makes it invulnerable to uncertainties that might threaten other government programs. Most Americans have no doubt that the bounty will continue indefinitely.

In fact, if you look at Social Security Administration projections into the next century, it appears on the surface that the program will flourish at a level far beyond its originally envisioned role as a provider of modest retirement income.

The Administration currently forecasts that the maximum payment to an individual retired worker, now \$3,660 a year, will go up like this in the future:

1980—\$5,580.
1990—\$8,976.
2000—\$15,082.
2010—\$25,693.
2020—\$42,908.
2030—\$71,292.

UNDER THE SURFACE

Behind the glittery promise, however, are some hard economic facts. Congress is only now beginning to face up to them after years of increasing benefits and expanding coverage of the program.

In the last five years alone, Social Security increases totaling nearly 70 per cent have been voted—a considerably greater rise than the rise in living costs.

While the original Social Security Act set up an "old age insurance" plan covering only employees who had paid taxes into a trust fund, the scope has been enlarged in stages to cover: survivors and dependents of workers; the self-employed; preretirement-age workers who are disabled—long-term or permanently—and their dependents; and individuals 72 or older who have never paid into the program. The most sweeping expansion came in 1965, when the Medicare system of health insurance for the elderly was established.

There is now a growing awareness that the Social Security system is being strained by the constantly growing demands on it and is headed for a financial crisis that can be resolved only through major tax increases—even beyond hefty ones now scheduled—or by restraint on future benefits increases, or a combination of both.

Those scheduled increases are hefty indeed.

Workers now pay—and employers match—5.85 per cent Social Security tax on income up to \$13,200, a total of \$772.20 each.

In 1972, Congress set up an automatic escalator on which benefits will go up along with the Consumer Price Index, beginning next year. That same law provided for raising the taxable wage base to finance the increases, also automatically.

At the same time, Congress adopted what it termed "dynamic assumptions"—that wages would go up an average of 5 per cent a year over the next 75 years and prices only 3 per cent, so that workers' income would be going up faster than the benefits it financed.

The official forecasts of future maximum payments listed above are based on those assumptions, which obviously do not take into account the current inflationary situation.

The other side of the coin is, of course, the tax levels that will be needed to pay the future benefits.

Based on tax schedules in the present law and Social Security Administration projections of benefits, this is how the maximum tax that employer and employee each pay will go up:

1975—\$825
1980—\$1,071
1990—\$1,875
2000—\$3,019
2010—\$4,954
2011—\$6,005 (a major jump in the tax rate occurs this year)
2020—\$9,319
2030—\$15,176

WHERE DID WE GO WRONG?

Why, in the light of tax increases like that, should anyone be worrying about the future financing of the retirement system?

What in the world has gone wrong?

In answering those questions, it is first necessary to recognize that the Social Security system operates through transfer financing—taxes taken in from workers go

immediately out in benefits to retirees and other recipients, not into any reserve or individual account.

The theory is that the economy will continue strong over the long range, with enough workers employed at rising pay levels to assure that taxes coming into the system will at least equal benefits going out. Also, that the working public will accept whatever tax increases are necessary to maintain this balance.

But this theory must be evaluated against recent developments: declining birth rates that will affect future worker-to-beneficiary ratios; inflationary trends in which prices are rising faster than wages, contrary to Congress' 1972 expectation of a 2 per cent annual increase in real wages; unexpectedly high costs of providing benefits to the disabled; and new public attitudes as Social Security taxes climb. To elaborate:

Population trends. Children born during the great baby boom of 1946-69 began entering the work force in the 1960s and the influx will continue into the late 1980s.

Over the next 35 years or so, then, there will be a large work force providing retirement and other benefits for a relatively small retired population of the pre-1945 era, when birth rates were low.

So far, so good. But during the early 1970s, the birth rate dropped suddenly to the zero population growth level—a development that had not been expected until after the year 2005.

Therefore, when those in the baby-boom generation reach retirement age starting about 2010, a relatively small work force will be providing high benefits for a large number of retirees.

Back in 1940, when Miss Fuller received that first check, 35 million taxpayers contributed to Social Security and, as mentioned earlier, benefits went to 222,000 beneficiaries—ratio of 150 workers to one retiree.

By 1950, the ratio had dropped to 14 to one—over 48 million working and 3.5 million receiving.

In 1960, there were 72.5 million workers and 14 million beneficiaries—a little over five to one.

Right now, some 95 million workers are providing benefits to 30 million retirees—about a three-to-one ratio.

This could be down to two to one by the turn of the century or not long thereafter.

The number of beneficiaries is considered certain to be over 40 million by 1995, some 45 million 10 years later and nearly 60 million by 2020. The increase in the work force, on the other hand, will be affected by the unknown factor of general economic conditions.

Inflation. The cost-of-living increase that beneficiaries will get next year, on the basis of the Consumer Price Index at the end of the first quarter, will show up as a higher wage base beginning Jan. 1, 1976. By current estimates it will be around \$15,300—which translates into a tax of \$895 each from employer and employee.

As long as the inflation rate is more than 3 per cent a year, the benefits level will keep going up—and so will the wage base.

But nobody envisioned the current double-digit inflation when Congress set up the automatic escalator two short years ago.

Such living-cost pressures will send the benefits level up in amounts that simply can't be recovered solely by raising the wage base. Boosting the base from \$15,300 to \$17,500, for example, would produce extra revenue only from those making more than \$15,300 a year, and none from the majority of workers making less.

Without increases in the tax rate affecting all workers, the Social Security system will plunge into the red in 1980, if not before,

and the deficit will build up by billions of dollars a year.

Presently scheduled increases in the tax rate—to 6.05 per cent in 1978 and 6.30 in 1981—won't be enough to keep Social Security in the black. So Congress is going to have to make some difficult decisions on tax rates and benefit levels in the near term.

Robert J. Myers, longtime chief actuary for the Social Security Administration and currently a professor of actuarial science at Temple University [see "Is It True What They Say About Social Security" NATION'S BUSINESS, June, 1973], views revisions in the escalator plan as an important element in resolving the problem.

"If the automatics operate in their present method indefinitely," he says, and current inflationary trends continue, Social Security benefits "will rise unduly and the system will get out of control."

He points out that if the price increases that trigger higher benefits continue running ahead of wage boosts, "the benefits would, after some decades, be more than final pay for most people."

Mr. Myers adds: "And you can see what that would do to both the cost of the program and to any private sector activities in the economic security field."

Disability coverage. "For reasons that are not quite clear yet," says Mr. Myers, "far more people are being awarded disability benefits" than a few years ago.

From just a preliminary study, he says, one factor appears to be a policy under which determinations of disability are made by state agencies, rather than the Social Security Administration—which, until 1971, reviewed each case but since then has checked only on a sample basis.

The fact that the number of disability cases has increased since 1971 "may be a coincidence," Mr. Myers says. "Or it may not."

Public attitudes. Under the present transfer system, the existence of Social Security depends on the willingness of the working generation to be taxed to pay direct benefits to those covered.

Historically, there has been little protest over that concept. Congressional action has reflected the viewpoint that more political mileage is gained in raising benefits than lost in raising taxes to finance them.

But as those taxes have taken a bigger and bigger bite of the income of families whose cost-consciousness has been heightened by inflation, there are signs of unrest, especially among younger taxpayers.

"I am 27 years old, married, have three children and am an employee of AT&T," Bruce Wheatley of Forrest City, Ark., wrote his Congressman. "The Social Security tax is becoming more oppressive and burdensome from year to year to both employer and employee, and it appears there is no letup in sight under the present system."

The complaint is not an isolated one. Says Rep. Ancher Nelsen (R.-Minn.): "As do all of my colleagues, I regularly receive letters from the elderly who say they need even more . . . to get along. Needless to say, I also receive letters from those who are paying the rapidly increasing payroll tax to support the system and who believe the tax has risen far enough."

Social Security Commissioner James B. Cardwell agrees that "the rising voice of the middle-income worker, challenging the equity of the payroll tax and its growth rate," is among the reasons why the system is at the center of unprecedented controversy.

Declining worker-retiree ratios and prolonged inflation are matters of proper concern, he says, and there's no question the program is heading into deficit. But, he adds:

"I would stress . . . that all that exists at the moment is the possibility of this hap-

pening in the distant future and that we possess the means of preventing it from happening. . . . I do not believe that even the specter of a future deficit will be allowed to last beyond the next session of Congress."

"THE SIREN SONG"

The focal point for Congressional action on resolving the impending financial crisis will center on a report due by Jan. 1 from an advisory council that is making a complete appraisal of Social Security, covering such fundamental questions as what the nation expects of the system and how it is to be financed.

Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger appointed the panel last April under a law requiring a periodic review of Social Security.

W. Allen Wallis, chancellor of the University of Rochester and a former special assistant to President Eisenhower, is chairman. Other members represent business, labor, retirees and the public.

While the council's work, and even its existence, might be unknown to most Americans, the recommendations it makes will be the starting point for legislation that will have a major impact on business well into the next century.

The debate inevitably will produce a resurgence of proposals to tap general revenues for partial financing of retirement benefits, rather than make hard decisions on raising taxes or moderating increases in benefits.

Mr. Myers has a warning for the business community on that score.

Beware, he says, of "the siren song" of those trying to sell general-revenue financing as a way to ease the burden of payroll taxes.

"Money that comes out of general revenues is money that business is going to pay in one form or another," he adds. "The same is true for individual taxpayers."

"As long as people see the payroll tax rates directly, I think they will be more interested in keeping the system within bounds."

FIRST COME, FIRST SERVED

The year she turned 65, Ida M. Fuller traveled from Ludlow up to Rutland, Vt., one day to inquire at a U.S. government office about the new Social Security retirement plan.

It was 1939, and the first benefits were to be paid the following year.

By coincidence, the day's mail to the Rutland office contained its allotment of the first shipment of application blanks from Social Security headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Miss Fuller was invited to fill one out immediately, and it was mailed off the same day. Because of that timing, she became the first individual to receive a benefit check under the new program of retirement benefits.

She's been getting them ever since.

Now 100 years old, Miss Fuller received her 474th check this month—\$105 after a deduction for Medicare, compared with \$22.54 in that first check.

In 1965, as part of the 25th anniversary of the start of Social Security benefits, Miss Fuller was featured in a promotional film made for the Social Security Administration.

The camera recorded a ceremony in which her footprint, movie star style, was impressed on wet concrete. The hardened block is now part of the Social Security archives in Washington.

Miss Fuller, who lives with a niece in Brattleboro, Vt., was in good health and active up to her 100th birthday last September, but since then has been showing her years.

LABOR UNREST COULD BREED NEW CONFLICT

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the article by Hobart Rowen which follows appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, November 10, 1974, and presents a possibility which policymakers in the Federal Government must consider seriously:

LABOR UNREST COULD BREED NEW CONFLICT

(By Hobart Rowen)

"You can't screw all of the workers all of the time."

That blunt comment on the failure of the recent explosion in wages to keep pace with an even faster advancing inflation comes not from a labor leader but from a top official of a major American financial institution.

For all of the efforts of labor leaders, which have about doubled last year's average wage boost, the value of a pay check, measured by what it can buy in the stores has fallen.

This pattern not only frustrates U.S. labor leaders, but leads some of the most thoughtful among them to suggest that the deepening recession lying ahead could bring with it the seeds of a new social conflict.

Jerry Wurf, the dynamic president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, makes the point that, even at the height of the big depression, the labor movement remained largely pro-Establishment, in marked contrast to what happened elsewhere in industrial societies.

But confrontation politics in the 1960s on race issues and the Vietnam war, and more recently the bitter struggle in New York and Boston on school issues, point to the possibility of direct action by groups of workers in striking contrast to labor's traditional role of working within the system.

It's a pattern that some observers felt might first rock the industrial economies of Europe—especially in Italy and the United Kingdom where inflation is even worse than here and the oil-induced depression hits even harder.

But Wurf thinks it can happen in this country, too, unless business leaders and government take "draconian steps" to insure a better distribution of the national wealth and income.

In a candid interview in his new Washington headquarters on L Street, Wurf said that the labor movement in recent years has paid lip service to real change, but has actually tried to be "more patriotic than any institution in America."

Now, labor leaders' failure—including his own—to keep the bulk of the labor force "equal to where they were—let alone reaching out for the new sights that they've been led to expect is their right"—is causing a basic upheaval, Wurf says.

It's probably too early to predict a rank and file rebellion against the present union leadership, Wurf says. But there is a stirring: "At this moment, it is a sort of gradual, grumbling discontent, and it seems to escalate as they get closer and closer to the (economic) precipice.

"You take those auto workers. They're not making a lot of noise right now. But when they use up the supplementary unemployment compensation that's part of their union contract, and when they use up unemployment insurance, listen loud and clear. They're not going to be content to sell apples on the corners, you believe me!"

Wurf, in his mid-50s, came out of college into the depression of the 1930s—an experi-

ence that the younger men and women in today's work force have so far missed.

Until recently, Wurf feels, the factory and construction union worker was less concerned with security against unemployment than with increasing his affluence, his two-car status, and enjoying his leisure time.

Thus, two years ago, the big issue fought within the United Auto Workers Union was over "optional overtime": Union men didn't want to be forced to work overtime.

Now, with unemployment at 6 per cent, and threatening to go to 7.0 or 7.5 per cent next year, things look so different, Wurf believes, that workers may reject the restraining influence of their leaders, and take to the streets.

Moreover, the work force increasingly is concentrated in the services, rather than industry—and service workers, being the least well organized, are the hardest hit by today's combination of inflation and recession.

"I think they're angry and they don't really believe that they've got to accept meekly what their parents and grandparents accepted," Wurf said. "When you exhaust all of the remedies of reasonableness, then you go to non-violence, civil disobedience, and"—Wurf didn't finish the thought—"I'm not one for making wild predictions."

That's a sober perspective from a sober and responsible man who is frustrated by the fact that, no matter what he brings back from the bargaining table, "it's wiped out" by price increases.

"You know," says Wurf, "people are saying there's something wrong, somebody is ripping me off, and I'm not going to sit still for it."

A PRAYER FOR OUR MIA'S

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the Daniel M. O'Connell, Post 272, American Legion, has made a vigorous effort to keep the subject of our missing in action servicemen in the forefront of public attention. I share the objectives of the O'Connell Post and have been particularly impressed with the activities of that post's chaplain, John Weiss.

Chaplain Weiss recently sent the text of a prayer for MIA's to me which had been offered at an O'Connell Post breakfast earlier this year. The message is so important that I want to share it with you by placing in the RECORD at this point the text of "A Prayer for Our MIA's":

Lord, shelter the living and dearly departed MIA's in S/E Asia. Open the hearts and minds of those who know of their existence or death to advise those at home who love and miss them. As soldiers, these MIA's carried the burden of battle; discharged on obligation of his country; faced hazards, pain and imprisonment beyond the lot of the soldier.

O Lord, these gallant men who bore so great a burden during the conflict must not be forsaken.

God of justice, to whom we pray, thy compassion we beseech—lift the curtain of secrecy and indifference which is a burden they should no longer be expected to bear, give them the strength to survive the thoughtlessness that is denying them the freedom of America and the love of those at home. Amen.

HOW YOUR MONEY IS BEING SPENT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the voter turnout in the recent election was the lowest since 1946, and those of us in the Republican Party are all too aware of what impact that vote turnout had on our forces here in the Congress.

There has been much speculation as to the reasons for that voter apathy, and it occurs to me that the feelings expressed in a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. H. Keith Leggott of East Peoria, Ill., typifies the feeling of frustration and impatience which so many people feel toward government at all levels.

I ask that the text of Mr. Leggott's letter, together with the enclosure, be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

HOW YOUR MONEY IS BEING SPENT—AT LEAST \$6,002,737 OF IT

(By John Epperheimer)

"Cut the high cost of government" is a familiar campaign slogan in election years.

If the following list of government projects is any indication, we should heed that slogan.

The Hardin (Mont.) Herald obtained the list from the Congressional Record. It's been widely reprinted, and Johnny Carson talked about it on his show.

Here's the list, which has to serve as an indictment of our bureaucracy:

\$35,000 for chasing wild boars in Pakistan.

\$70,000 to study the smell of perspiration given off by Australian aborigines.

\$28,361 for odor-measuring machine for above project.

\$50,000 to study life views of the Gaujiro Indians in Colombia.

\$17,000 for a dry cleaning plant to spruce up the djellabas of the Bedouins.

\$37,314 for a potato chip machine for the Moroccans.

\$117,250 wages for Board of Tea Tasters.

\$68,000 paid to Queen of England for not planting cotton on her plantation in Mississippi.

\$14,000 to Ford Motor Co. for not planting wheat.

\$19,000 to Libby McNeil for growing no cotton.

\$2 million to Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito for purchase of a yacht.

\$31,650 for Speaker of the House Carl Albert's new carpet; \$21,000 for his new draperies; \$44,000 for his chandeliers; \$65,000 for other furnishings.

\$80,000 for a zero gravity toilet for the space program.

\$230,000 for environmental testing of the same.

\$250,000 to Interdepartmental Screw Thread Committee, established as a temporary agency to speed the end of World War I, still laboring to make nuts and bolts fit together.

\$100,000 per year to servants at Alaskan Chateau in Anchorage, which is a retreat for government bureaucrats.

\$6,000 to study Polish bisexual frogs.

\$85,000 to learn about the "cultural, economic and social impact of rural road construction in Poland."

\$20,000 to study the blood groups of Polish Zlotnik pigs.

\$5,000 to collect a rare moss in Burma.

\$8,000 to track down specimens of a certain Burmese ant.

\$5,000 to learn about Yugoslavian intertidal hermit crabs.

\$15,000 as a bounty for finding Yugoslavian lizards.

\$5,000 to tabulate the differences between native American and Indian whistling ducks.

\$20,000 to investigate the German cockroach.

\$71,000 to compile the history of comic books.

\$5,000 for an analysis of violin varnish.

\$50,000 for analysis of the fur trade between the United States and Canada between 1770 and 1820.

\$20,324 to learn about the mating calls of Central American toads.

\$203,979 to city of Los Angeles to extend traveler's aid to migrants lost on the freeway.

\$50,000 paid to the genius who wrote the poem "light." (That is not the title of the poem, it is the whole poem.) The whole thing comes to seven letters worth \$714.28 each.

\$19,300 to Health, Education and Welfare Department to find out why children fall off tricycles.

\$375,000 spent by the Pentagon to study the frisbee.

\$1 million spent by Air Force to invent a device to cover the tips of missile silos.

\$600,000 to outfit executives' jets for the Pentagon.

\$121,000 to find out why people say "ain't".

\$33,101 to the Israeli Institute of Applied Science to conduct a "test of the husband-wife relationship."

\$15,000 to find out how fishing boat crewmen cause conflicts in Yugoslavian peasant towns.

\$3,000 to search for Indian lizards.

\$25,000 to study biological rhythms of the catfish in India.

\$8,000 to study medieval Spanish satire and invective.

\$14,000 to learn about speciation of cave beetles.

\$2,458 to train 18 Good Humor Peddlers.

\$70,000 to classify and determine the population biology of Indo-Australian ants.

OCTOBER 14, 1974.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The enclosed is a clipping taken from a recent issue of the "Tazewell Courier." When I first read it, I searched for the punch line because I thought certainly it must have been authored by some well-known joke writer. Then I realized that what I read was a serious offering. The first thought that came to me following this realization was that "you've got to be kidding." I repeat this thought to you: "you've got to be kidding."

For a number of years, I have been aware that govt. money was used in to say the least, some odd ways, but little did I realize that these "odds" were of such magnitude. What disturbs me more is just how incomplete the enclosed list may be! I would almost wager that this is only the "top of the iceberg."

I have never opposed the spending of federal funds for basic and related research; however, in all honesty, some of the listed "grants" would have to be classified as ridiculous while others are almost laughable. I'm sure that my 74 year old widowed Mother along with thousands of others living on social security would derive a great deal of comfort and pleasure from knowing that \$5000 was spent to learn about Yugoslavian hermit crabs or that \$117,000+ was spent for salaries of the board of tea tasters etc.

Come on now, isn't this a little much for the American tax payer to put up with!! My gosh, when the nation is begging for some budget cuts and some tax relief, can't anyone over there in Congress find some of this stuff to whittle away at. When I read about this junk, I can only judge that all this talk about budget cuts and spending reductions is just talk and that few are really serious or really even care. I just wish someone would pursue this type of junk as

diligently and with as much vengeance as Watergate was pursued. Now that would be something wouldn't it? Have a heart you guys—Get Serious!!

You know, it could be that if a little less were extracted from the taxpayer and let those who would, obtain their own funds to find out "how fishing boat crewmen cause conflicts in Yugoslavian peasant towns, perhaps we could take better care of widowed mothers. Did anyone ever think of that?

Very truly yours,

H. KEITH LEGGOTT.

RIISING UNEMPLOYMENT SHOULD BE HALTED

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for taking effective steps to combat the rising tide of unemployment is immediate and urgent. Fortunately, the basic machinery for doing this is already in existence. I refer to the public works impact programs of the Economic Development Administration.

As my colleagues know—and as the people of my south Texas district certainly know—EDA has made grants to communities in order to provide useful work to the underemployed and unemployed in high unemployment and low income areas. Many useful community projects of lasting value have been carried out under EDA's public works impact program.

In recently enacting a 2-year extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, Congress added a provision for a new economic adjustment authority designed to reach communities either experiencing or on the verge of facing high levels of joblessness among their people. Grants can be made directly to communities for them to use in job-providing projects of their own devising.

In an address before Congress on October 8, President Ford proposed creation of a Community Improvement Corps to assist jobless workers who had exhausted their unemployment benefits. This program, the President said, would provide "short-term, useful work projects to improve, beautify, and enhance the environment of our cities, towns, and countryside."

Mr. Speaker, the Economic Development Administration has extensive experience with exactly these kinds of projects. It is a going concern. Its administrative procedures have been tested. It is the ideal vehicle for carrying out the President's proposal.

Accordingly, I am today introducing a bill to expand EDA's public works impact program. My bill authorizes up to \$500 million each year for these purposes during the 2-year life of the Public Works and Economic Development Act. The money would be expended for precisely those purposes set forth in President Ford's October 8 address to Congress.

The need for this expanded program is shown clearly in the rising tide of unemployment among our people. And the need is now.

"UP WITH DOWNS"**HON. JAMES V. STANTON**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on October 17, a great Cleveland, Ollie Downs, was inducted into the National AAU Boxing Hall of Fame and was named the 1974 Man of the Year.

I am extremely pleased to extend to Ollie my warmest congratulations on these honors, which are only the most recent to be bestowed upon him. Ollie, who has been active in the AAU for over 50 years, now serves as first vice president of Cleveland Golden Gloves, and his years of coaching have produced innumerable boxing champions.

In 1972 the local newspaper of Ollie's home, Gates Mills, wrote an article which well sums up his achievements, and I now insert this article from the Gatepost into the RECORD:

OLLIE DOWNS: A LIFETIME OF ATHLETICS

White-haired, florid-faced, jovial, peripatetic Ollie Downs, who has lived at Gates Mills Towers II in Suite 551 since January 1971 with his wife Helen, is quite a multi-talented gent. Retired from Railway Express Agency in 1962, where he served for 45 years. Ollie has permeated his life with sports activities from his youth to this day. A star baseball and basketball player at East Tech High School and sandlot team champ, Ollie then became a skillful boxer, and he was "hooked" for life. He became a trainer, handled Golden Gloves fighters, and trained many aspiring young boxers for national competitions. Four of his boys made Uncle Sam's Olympic Boxing Team in the 1920's and boxed in the competition in Belgium. Boxing remained the main impetus of his prodigious pursuits in a stream of activity that led him into local, regional, and national involvements. He became supervisor for community centers of the Cleveland Public Schools, a post which he held for 17 years, and where he was the innovator of many youth-oriented sports programs. As boxing coach for John Carroll University, from 1947-49, Ollie's teams were rated among the best in the country for small colleges.

Numerous honors have been bestowed upon him for his service to amateur athletics and physical fitness programs . . . among them the coveted plaque given to him in September 1964 by the AAU (Amateur Athletic Union of the United States) for 50 years of intensive and dedicated activity. He's probably the only sports figure in Ohio to have achieved this honored status.

Ollie served as secretary-treasurer of the Ohio Association of Boxing and Wrestling Commission and was made a life member when he resigned several years ago. Still active on the national level, Ohio is the secretary-treasurer of the National Wrestling Association and will represent that group as a delegate at the annual convention of the World Boxing Association in August in Hawaii. It will be his 22nd convention.

Along the way, Ollie Downs has made hundreds of friends . . . among them . . . comedian Bob Hope, whom Ollie dissuaded from becoming a boxer . . . George Steinbrenner III . . . sports writer Hal Lebovitz . . . Mayor Ralph Perk . . . recreation director John Nagy . . . Babe Triscaro, who became a national boxing champ, under Ollie's tutelage.

People still reminisce about the many gymnasiums that Ollie operated in the old neighborhoods of Cleveland. To say nothing of the dance halls, where people waltzed the night

away. But, Ollie doesn't dwell on past achievements. He's too busy being chairman of the Finance Committee of the Lake Erie Amateur Athletic Union, where he is a past president . . . being helpful in various capacities for the Cleveland Boxing and Wrestling Commission, and raising funds to support physical fitness programs for Youth. We say "Up With Downs" . . . amateur boxer, trainer, coach, supervisor, and coordinator . . . who has made a unique and penetrating contribution to the World of Sports.

OPENING FEDERAL FILES**HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday we will have an opportunity to vote to override President Ford's veto of the Freedom of Information Act amendments contained in H.R. 12471. As an advocate of "open government" and as a supporter of the effort to strengthen the public's right to know, I intend to vote to override the Presidential veto of this legislation.

The editorial, written in the October 26 edition of the New Haven Register, makes an excellent case for the Freedom of Information Act amendments and exemplifies the importance of overriding the veto of H.R. 12471. I would like to commend to our colleagues the full text of the New Haven Register's editorial:

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Oct. 26, 1974]

EDITOR'S NOTE—OPENING FEDERAL FILES

The idea of this Editor's Note column, since its inception, has been to provide some Saturday morning shoptalk about the New Haven newspapers, and newspapering in general, for the casual reader.

If I seem to be discussing the relationship between news reporters and government almost too frequently, it's because news about government is so important today to the entire thrust of our society.

I'm back on the subject this morning because President Ford has just vetoed a series of new amendments to the Federal Freedom of Information Act. News people everywhere in the country are girding themselves to make sure that the veto does not mean an end to efforts to improve this act.

Some editor groups and reporter groups are trying to organize congressional action to override the Ford veto when Congress meets again after the election. Others simply want to make sure that President Ford will, as he promised, "shortly submit language which would dispel my concerns." His objections, he said, were based on fears that the Freedom of Information Law would become both unworkable and unconstitutional if the revisions stuck.

The original Freedom of Information Act was passed in 1966. Its purpose was to provide a clear legal mechanism for opening up government information, and particularly government records, to the public and to the press. Because it is a long and complex law shaped to the needs and concerns of the whole, huge federal establishment, government bureaucrats have never had any difficulty in finding loopholes which permit them to duck away from citizens who want information—often about themselves, or from reporters who desire to look over official papers for news purposes.

The big and continuing hang-up between government insiders and those on the out-

side is the matter of classified documents. The proposed changes in the law would have given the courts power to review the classification of documents by a government agency. The new amendments also authorized a court to suspend a federal employe from his job for up to 60 days if it found that the employe had withheld requested records without a reasonable basis in law.

President Ford felt that there was danger of letting a judge poke around in secret government papers in a way that would "risk exposure of our military or intelligence secrets and diplomatic relations." Other critics felt that discipline against an erring federal employe could best be handled by one of his or her supervisors rather than by a judge unfamiliar with the routines of the office. And there were other technicalities to which objection had been made.

The point of concern, however, is that after eight years of the Freedom of Information Act it is still most difficult for an individual citizen or for a working reporter to dig out facts which any agency of government wants to keep buried. Ford insists that the government agencies need more than 10 days to decide whether to furnish a requested document. He claims that the 20 days allowed for deciding an appeal are unrealistically short for such decision-making. This seems like bureaucratic stalling.

In the confusion that is certain to prevail when a lame-duck Congress comes back to work after Election Day, the whole painfully-achieved proposal for constructive amendment to the Freedom of Information Act could simply go up in smoke—unless the presidential veto is overridden. Or unless enough pressure is put on President Ford to make him keep the concept alive by submitting his own revisions to the law. The House voted 349 to 2 in favor of the revisions. The Senate passed the amendments on a voice vote with only one member raising objections. Obviously Congress was willing.

In a period when the power of the press is occasionally considered too great, the power of the federal government to avoid detailed scrutiny by press or public is obviously greater. Because dry legal language is at the center of the argument, it isn't easy to make the issue lively for our readers. But it is vital to good government—and to better government.

Closing quote.—"I view the guarantee of the First Amendment as the foundation upon which our government structure rests and without which it could not continue to endure as conceived and planned. Freedom to speak and write about public questions is as important to the life of our government as the heart is to the human body. In fact, this privilege is the heart of our government. If that heart be weakened, the result is debilitation; if it be stilled, the result is death."—Justice Hugo Black, 1941, *Bridges v. California*.

PLANS TO OFFER AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 16373**HON. M. CALDWELL BUTLER**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 16373, the Privacy Act of 1974, comes before the House, I plan to offer the following amendments:

I. To section 3(b) add: (9) pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction;

II. To section 3(b) add: (10) to assist an agency of the Government enforce the criminal law.

FOOD AID ABROAD

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, returned over the weekend from Rome, Italy, where he headed the U.S. delegation to the World Food Conference.

The Secretary met yesterday with the news media to discuss the conference. He also released some pertinent facts about America's food aid abroad—both past contributions and our current level of support.

I applaud this action of the Secretary. During the 11 days of the conference, I was shocked by news reports from Rome that indicated how little some Americans know about the magnificent role of the United States in providing food assistance to lesser developed countries of the world.

Charges of "foot dragging" by the United States were leveled by some non-delegate observers and groups.

These unsubstantiated charges simply are not true.

For 25 years, the United States has led the way, beyond the capacity or desire of any other nation to follow, battling hunger and providing food assistance to the needy of the world. Our long-range commitment is to stamp out starvation everywhere.

True, we got in the food assistance business because of the productive capacity of our American farmers. They produced more than we could use or find markets for. As a matter of national policy, we elected to share our surpluses with others, rather than destroy them.

But the acid test of our humanitarian policy came last year, and this.

Last year, although the Government did not own a bushel of available grain, the United States contributed \$890 million worth of aid. This year that amount was boosted to nearly \$1 billion.

From 1965 to 1972, the United States provided 84 percent of all food aid—a figure that, Secretary Butz rightly told the World Food Conference, was too high. The Secretary has asked other nations of the world to help broaden the base of giving. He points out that food aid is actually a resource transfer, and therefore it should involve the commitment of resources of all nations.

One additional note. I saw in the Washington Post a dispatch from Rome indicating that Sayed A. Marei, Egyptian Secretary General of the U.N. World Food Conference, found it necessary to defend the U.S. food aid record in a formal speech to conference delegates. He reminded the delegates that the United States is still the "leading food aid contributor" in the world today.

I agree with Secretary Butz; it is embarrassing that Secretary General Marei felt it necessary to differ publicly with observers and nondelegates—including some Americans—who have been holding press conferences in Rome to de-

nounce U.S. food aid policy. Nevertheless, I am glad he did it. Secretary General Marei's action puts into perspective some of the irresponsible charges hurled at the United States by those who should know better.

The following summary of U.S. assistance over the years clearly refutes the claim of anti-USDA, anti-Butz groups that the United States has been dragging its feet when it comes to helping others:

U.S. FOOD AID

In eight years 1965-72, provided 84 percent of all food aid contributions of developed countries (both bilateral and multi-lateral).

46 percent of all World Food Program aid since beginning in 1962. (Canada second with 13 percent.)

\$25 billion in donations and concessional sales since beginning of P.L. 480 in 1954.

143 million tons of wheat, rice and other grains since 1954.

Current year: Higher spending level. More wheat and rice.

U.S. TECHNICAL AID

400 U.S. Agriculturalists assigned to other countries.

1200 foreign farm scientists studying in U.S.

Thousands of foreign students in U.S. colleges.

AID TO BANGLADESH

U.S. contributed a third of all food aid since independence (1972).

Current year already programming 250,000 tons of wheat and rice (Title I).

Watching situation closely.

AID TO INDIA

U.S. leading provider of economic development aid since independence.

Last year, sent outright donations of \$67 million (far more Title II than any other country).

Now consulting with India in effort to meet current needs.

AID TO SAHEL

Direct donations of over a half million tons of grain in FY 1973 and FY 1974.

This year, additional donation of 100,000 tons now moving to Sahel.

\$3.3 million to UN Sahelian Trust Fund through FAO for assuring delivery of food in drought relief programs.

U.S. has donated \$29 million for aid supplies including medicine, vitamins, tools and equipment.

Supplied aircraft to assist in delivery. Providing technical assistance to improve production there.

FERTILIZER DEVELOPMENT AID

In FY 1975, will provide 329,000 tons of fertilizer valued at \$164,000,000.

Could increase substantially during year. 3/4 or more will be purchased offshore.

DEVELOPMENT AID AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Over \$1 1/2 billion in last 10 years for Agriculture.

Current year: USDA has asked that it be doubled. 60% of all U.S. development assistance is earmarked for agriculture.

TRAINING PROVIDED FOR FOREIGN NATIONALS IN UNITED STATES

For 22 years, have averaged over 1,000 a year.

OVERSEAS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SINCE 1966 (BEGINNING OF PASA)*

USDA people average 300 in any given year on location overseas.

Land Grant Colleges: Over 1,000 man years since 1960.

* Participating Agencies Service Agreements.

PUBLIC LAW 480 RESEARCH GRANTS

Since 1954 P.L. 480 counterpart funds have provided 1500 research grants in 32 countries.

DIRECT GRANTS TO OVERSEAS RESEARCH CENTERS

USDA provides one-fourth of budgets of 10 research centers including IRRI** (Philippines) and the Center for maize and wheat improvement in Mexico.

By 1978, these contributions will double.

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROCEEDS FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

In 20 years, \$11 billion generated by P.L. 480 for development use by foreign countries.

A TOTAL OF 100,000 METRIC TONS OF WHEAT AND RICE TO SYRIA?

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Register of November 13 contains a Presidential determination of November 4 finding that—

The making of an agreement with the Government of Syria for the sale . . . of 75 thousand metric tons of wheat and 25 thousand tons of rice is in the national interest of the United States.

I find it interesting that this decision was made on November 4 but not announced until 9 days later. Apparently, the White House did not feel it was in the national interest to make this announcement prior to the elections.

If carried through, such a concessional sale, at interest rates of 2 to 3 percent repayable over 20 years, would be a scandal. Syria is the center of aggression and anti-Americanism in the Middle East. Syria, more than any other nation, has been receiving massive, destabilizing arms shipments from the Soviet Union. This virtual giveaway of food—food which is desperately needed by nations far more friendly to the United States—is a bribe. The "finding" by the President is another new low point in American diplomatic history.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago, when the Barbary states held American and foreign seamen ransom, we alone, of all the nations of the world, fought those pirates. There are nations in the Middle East today who are 20th-century pirates. We are feeding them and they are biting our hand. I do not believe that the American people will accept this policy of bribing pirates, terrorists, and avowed enemies of the United States.

If Syria needs food, let it make a decision to obtain food purchases at world market prices instead of using its credit and resources for arms procurement. If Syria needs food, let it get "foreign aid" for food from those nations which currently provide extensive supplies of weapons.

I support efforts to obtain a peaceful settlement in the Middle East—but the administration should draw a line between bribery and diplomacy.

** International Rice Research Institute.

A LIFELINE FOR RUNAWAYS—
AND IT WORKS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most trying and tragic times which can befall a parent is when a child runs away from home. The parent can search and wait futilely for years and never even know if his child is still alive.

Sparked by the tragedy of multiple kidnap-murders of young teenagers and runaways in Houston, the State of Texas and concerned citizens of the Houston area set up a "Peace of Mind" hotline for runaway children.

The function of the toll-free telephone system is simple: To allow runaways to make contact with their parents or to receive expert advice without disclosing their location. In the past year the volunteers who man the phones at Peace of Mind have helped over 4,000 runaway children, and the State has now provided a paid director for the program.

Key to the success of the program is the organization's absolute strictness in maintaining and respecting the confidence of the runaway. Runaways are often afraid to call the police or some other public medium for fear of being located and punished.

Although all runaways who call Peace of Mind do not come home, many a worried parent has at least learned that his child is alive and well.

I insert a reprint of an article from the October 27, Parade magazine explaining this service, which has now been instituted in Florida and has interested many other States as well:

[From the Parade magazine, Oct. 27, 1974]

HOT LINE FOR RUNAWAY KIDS

(By Don A. Schanche)

HOUSTON, TEX.—A desperate and hungry 15-year-old runaway named Laura stepped into a phone booth in Jacksonville, Fla., a few weeks ago and hesitantly dialed the toll-free number, 1-800-231-6946. She had spotted the number on a poster just a few minutes earlier when she had tried without luck to panhandle a meal in a coffee shop.

"Are you still alive?" its headline asked. "Let somebody know."

The poster's message, advertising a little-known group of telephone hot-line volunteers in Houston, Tex., was simple. "You call us. We'll call them. No tricks, bugs or traps. We're just here to pass on the word. To let them know you're still alive. Whoever they are."

Last April Laura became one of the million American youngsters who run away from home each year. Since then her imagination had worked overtime, with nightmares of being arrested, spending weeks in a juvenile detention cell, then facing punishment at home. She loved her parents but feared them, too. She was afraid that if she telephoned them directly, they would track her down.

But Laura had even more urgent problems. She had not eaten for three days. She had no place to stay. And she was afraid that she was pregnant.

Laura's desperate call was answered by a confident, reassuring voice 900 miles away,

from a crowded Houston motel room by a "Peace of Mind" volunteer.

"No," the soft-spoken volunteer, Mrs. Philip (Lee) Didelot, told Laura, "we can't trace your call, and you don't have to tell me where you are. I'm just here to let your family know you're alive and well."

Laura broke down in tears. She was alive, but not well. Mrs. Didelot, a Houston mother who has been taking calls from kids like Laura for more than a year, listened quietly. She did not interrupt with adult judgments and criticism, nor gush with motherly advice.

"If you want to tell me where you are, I can find someone to help you," she said. "And I'll call your parents. I won't tell them how to find you, but I'll give them any message you want to send. If you call back later, I'll pass along their message to you."

SHE GOT HELP

Within an hour Mrs. Didelot and other telephone volunteers had made arrangements for food, lodging and a free medical exam for Laura in Jacksonville. They also had tried to call her parents, failed, and reached Laura's grandmother instead. From her they learned that Laura had run away because her strict and occasionally abusive parents had refused to let her take refuge at the grandmother's house. Later the tearful parents telephoned the 800 number to say that they were willing to let Laura move to her grandmother's.

Laura telephoned Peace of Mind the next day, vastly relieved by the results of her medical checkup. She was not pregnant, just severely undernourished. And she was overjoyed by the message from her mother and father.

A week later Peace of Mind Director Grace Surguy, a 23-year-old social worker on the staff of Texas Gov. Dolph Briscoe, heard from Laura again. She was happily settled in her grandmother's house in Kentucky, back in school, and trying hard to resolve her differences with her parents.

Laura's is but one of more than 4,000 similar human dramas that have been played out entirely by telephone during the past year over the nation's only hot line for runaway kids. Houston's free message and referral service has reunited more than 1,000 youngsters with their families. In many more instances it has passed reassuring messages to parents who feared that their children were dead. Never has the hot line given away the location of a runaway.

AROSE IN A CRISIS

Like most telephone hot-line services, Peace of Mind was formed to meet a crisis. It began in August, 1973, when two Houston teenagers blurted out an incredible story of sexual depravity and murder involving runaway kids. As the now notorious mass murder story unfolded, authorities began digging for bodies. All of the victims were youngsters from the Houston area. Soon, police and social agency lines were jammed with anxious calls from the more than 5,000 families in the area whose children had left home. Each caller hoped against desperate hope that his or her missing child was not among the bodies then being disinterred by the police. But there was no way to reassure them. Broadcast appeals by newspapers and TV and radio stations failed to induce the runaways to call home or the police.

"They weren't about to call the police, because they were afraid of being arrested," says volunteer Mrs. George (Suzanne) Randolph, "and if they felt free to call their parents they probably wouldn't have run away. So our organization got together, to give peace of mind to parents at a time when the police were still looking for bodies."

With Governor Briscoe's backing, Rev. Travis Key, a local Baptist minister, brought

together a force that eventually included 250 volunteers. Some of them were former runaway kids and some the parents of runaways. Holiday Inn donated two rooms, and two toll-free long-distance lines were installed—1-800-392-3352 for runaways still living in Texas, the other—1-800-231-6946—for kids in any other state except Hawaii and Alaska.

It soon became apparent to Governor Briscoe and Lt. Gov. William P. Hobby that the hot line was providing a sorely needed service. The state of Texas supplied a paid director, Grace Surguy, and Peace of Mind has been taking calls nationwide ever since at a rate that has zoomed from 32 in the first month to more than 700 a month today. Its monthly costs of \$4,000 have been met almost entirely by contributions, mostly from Texans and grateful parents, and its phones have been staffed around the clock by volunteers working in four-hour relays.

Last summer Gov. Reubin Askew of Florida, distressed that his state spends more than \$700,000 a year to detain and process runaway children, responded to a call for help from Governor Briscoe. Askew sponsored a national conference at which Peace of Mind volunteers briefed his and 24 other state governments on the problem and their work. The Florida legislature promptly appropriated \$20,000 with which to publicize the toll-free hot line with posters, billboards, ads and spot radio and TV announcements volunteered by the Miami Advertising Club. Other states have promised to follow suit. (The advertising material is available at cost to public and private social agencies from the Miami Advertising Club and Peace of Mind.)

CALLS FROM FLORIDA

A few weeks ago, when Parade sought out Peace of Mind the new surge of publicity in Florida already was being felt, as indicated by Laura's call from Jacksonville.

(When Peace of Mind gets a plea for help of any kind the volunteers try to locate private and public agencies, including 80-odd runaway houses in the U.S. where confidential assistance is available.)

Grace Surguy explained why many kids leave home. She had just helped to reunite three 12-year-olds with their families after the youngsters had run away on what proved to be merely a lark.

"They weren't serious about it," she said, "but most of our callers are. They run away for two reasons, mostly. Many leave homes that supply all of the basic physical needs but no emotional support or communication. Many of the others come from intolerable homes, where the parents are violently abusive, alcoholic or so deep into poverty that the kids leave to ease the burden."

FOUR REASONS

Once they hit the road, she said, the kids who call Peace of Mind commonly become desperate for four reasons: "They need shelter; they need health care for drug problems, pregnancy or illness; they need legal aid, or they need counseling. And almost all of them want to send word home, if only to tell their parents that they are alive."

About a quarter of the youngsters who call eventually return home, she said, but the majority, for reasons of their own, elect to keep their whereabouts secret.

"We are absolutely strict about maintaining and respecting their confidence," she said. "Some parents have called to complain that we're just encouraging them to stay away. But our success depends entirely upon the fact that the runaway doesn't have to reveal himself. The kids are willing to make contact through a third party—Peace of Mind—as long as there's no risk of being located. If we betrayed that confidence, this hot line wouldn't work. And the parents might never learn whether their kids are alive or dead."

THE OLYMPIC MASSACRE OF 1972

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, many Americans were jolted by the events of the past week at the United Nations. For those who remembered all too clearly the murdering of diplomats and the Olympic massacre of 1972, the U.N. sessions last week were an almost unbelievable spectacle.

An editorial last weekend in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch stated well the feelings of the millions of Americans who cannot possibly reconcile in their minds these grossly conflicting events. A full reprint of the editorial follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Nov. 16, 1974]

If the spectacle at the United Nations this week did not shock and disgust many Americans, then Americans have become too jaded by varied atrocities to be shocked and disgusted by anything.

There was Yasir Arafat, the Palestinian terrorist leader, being whisked from Kennedy International Airport to the UN headquarters in a helicopter of the United States Army. Yasir Arafat and his entourage of nomadic gunmen being protected by more than 1,000 American security officers, federal and local.

This is the same Yasir Arafat who has been accused of giving the orders to the Black September thugs who murdered American Ambassador Cleo A. Noel, American charge d'affaires George C. Moore, and Belgian charge d'affaires Guy Eid in the Saudi Arabian embassy at Khartoum, the Sudan, on March 2, 1973. Do we forget so soon? Does a fresh shave and flowery rhetoric make a statesman of a pistol-packing desert rat?

Accompanying Arafat were three guards who actually participated in the Khartoum slaughter of the unarmed diplomats, according to The London Evening Standard. The State Department has confirmed that at least one of the guards—Farouk Al Hussein—was in Khartoum at the time of the slayings, but the department said it did not have evidence that Hussein participated in the crime.

During his rambling 90-minute oration, Arafat sought to portray himself as a fearless fighter for an oppressed people rather than as a wanton terrorist. It is true to an extent that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter, and vice versa. But a guerrilla foray against enemy defense installations is one thing; the slaughter of diplomats, Olympic athletes, and schoolchildren is quite another. Arafat and his gang have defiled their cause by their selection of the weak and the innocent as targets.

The UN General Assembly exhibited once again its own moral degeneration by according Arafat a warm greeting, including a standing ovation and all the protocol normally reserved for heads of state. Arafat's message was clearly and uncompromisingly revanchist: he would restore the Palestine that existed before 1948 and destroy the existing Jewish state.

Yet, it was the United Nations that decided in the aftermath of World War II and the Nazi holocaust that the historic Jewish aspiration for statehood ought to be honored. Palestinian Jews and the surviving remnants of European Jewry thus were given their state of Israel with the partition of Palestine. For Palestine Arabs there remains a nation today; it is called Jordan.

All signs are that a UN now controlled by an Afro-Asian-Arab-Communist coalition whose ranks have been swollen by admission of many so-called "emerging" nations (many of them dictatorships) would side with Arafat in the desire that the UN-aided creation of Israel be repealed. This aim very likely could not be realized by actions short of a second holocaust for the Jewish people. It must be an especially bitter pill for a people that looked to the United Nations for moral leadership after Adolph Hitler to realize that the enemy has now become . . . the United Nations.

CONGRESS URGED TO OVERRIDE VETO OF H.R. 12471, FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AMENDMENTS—IV

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, newspapers from all parts of the Nation have condemned President Ford's unwise veto of H.R. 12471, the bipartisan legislation making strengthening amendments to the freedom of information law. Such unwarranted and illogical action, coming on the heels of the President's pledge to the American people of an "open government," forces us to recall all of the sordid happenings of his predecessor's administration that were first spawned and then covered up by abuses of Government secrecy. Excessive Government secrecy, whether to hide criminal action by Government officials or to prevent the public from knowing about embarrassing policy mistakes, has undermined the faith of millions of Americans in our governmental institutions.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must act to help restore public confidence in government and the integrity of our political process by voting overwhelmingly to override the unwarranted Presidential veto of H.R. 12471, the legislative symbol of "open government." The freedom of information law is the best tool to curb excessive secret dealings by the executive bureaucracy, while at the same time protecting legitimate national defense and foreign policy matters. It must be strengthened and reaffirmed as is provided for in H.R. 12471, the result of more than 3 years of bipartisan effort.

At this point in the Record, I include another representative sample of articles and editorials from newspapers urging that Congress act promptly to override the freedom of information bill veto:

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 10, 1974]

FORD'S "OPEN GOVERNMENT" CLAMMING UP?
(By David Hess)

WASHINGTON.—When President Ford was sworn in last August he promised to run an "open government"—but his critics now say he has flunked his first major test on the secrecy question.

In mid-October, heeding the advice of Nixon holdovers in the White House, Justice Department and Defense Department, Ford vetoed a "freedom of information" bill granting broader and quicker public access to government information.

The bill, painstakingly constructed by

Democrats and Republicans in both houses after months of investigation and exhaustive hearings, would have:

Given federal judges the right to determine whether confidential government documents were properly classified by federal bureaucrats.

Required the government to respond to requests for information within 10 days and to administrative appeals within 20 days. Such deadlines would greatly speed the government's usually slow response to such requests.

Opened some investigatory files, under strict limits designed to protect individual rights, to the public.

Provided a stern administrative wrist-slap, including up to a 60-day suspension, to any federal bureaucrat who "arbitrarily and capriciously" withheld public information.

Granted attorney fees to any citizen who had to go to court to win access to government files, and limited the price of access to files to the costs of copying and searching for the information.

From the outset of hearings on the bill, the federal bureaucracy has bucked it.

Rep. William Moorhead (D. Pa.), whose government operations subcommittee forged the legislation in the House, snapped: "Those guys have served their entire careers shrouded in secrecy, and they don't want the people minding the people's business."

In his veto message, Ford said he agreed in principle with the "direction of this legislation."

But he added that its major provisions went too far in granting public access and were, in some cases, "unworkable and unconstitutional."

Ford later offered several proposed amendments to the bill and said he would sign it if his proposal were adopted.

These amendments would curb the power of judges to rule on the validity of security classifications; force citizens to pay all costs above \$100 incurred in making the information available; deny access to virtually all investigatory files; and extend the time for responding to requests for information.

One White House official close to the issue said Ford's major concern over the Moorhead bill centers on the "national security" question.

"Suppose," the official said, "that a court ordered the Defense Department to release targeting plans for the Soviet Union, to take an exaggerated example."

"The President then would be faced with a constitutional quandary as to whether he should abandon his constitutional role as commander-in-chief and protector of the nation's security or whether he should adhere to his role as the enforcer of the laws."

This official added that Ford agreed "in principle" with the notion of "judicial review" of disputes over access to information.

But, the official said, the President believes the "standard of review" ought to be based on the question of whether a federal official had a "reasonable basis" for classifying a document—not on whether the classification was correct.

Moorhead and other lawmakers say this standard would "legitimize" practically any classification and would lead to a gross abuse of classifying powers.

Moorhead has branded the Ford proposals "unacceptable" and said he intends to ask the House to override Ford's veto when Congress reconvenes on Nov. 18.

Although it is risky to forecast how a lame-duck Congress, some of whose members are ranking from election defeats, might act, Moorhead and the bill's Senate backers feel they have the votes to overturn the veto.

The House passed the bill 383-8 late last winter, and the Senate soon followed suit 64-17. Both votes are well within the two-thirds range needed to override a veto, assuming the lawmakers stick to their guns.

Moorhead and his subcommittee staffers are still a bit dazed by the Ford veto.

During a House-Senate conference on the bill, conferees agreed to a number of Ford proposals to modify the measure and thought they had an agreement with the White House for a presidential signature.

"Good Lord," exclaimed subcommittee staffer William Phillips, "we'd even talked about plans for a bill-signing ceremony in the White House. The President could have shown a dramatic example of his 'open government' policy."

New to the office, however, and heavily dependent upon the support of holdovers from the tainted administration of Richard Nixon, Ford was persuaded to reject the bill.

Most of the pressure to veto it came from Defense Secretary James Schlesinger, White House legislative counselor William Timmons, and Attorney General William Saxbe and his chief deputy, Laurence Silberman—all Nixon appointees.

Schlesinger feared the compromise of military and national security secrets, although the Moorhead bill contains explicit safeguards against such disclosures.

Timmons sided with Senate conservatives, who also fretted about the possibility of Central Intelligence Agency leaks.

Saxbe and Silberman—heeding the alarms of the FBI, their civil and criminal divisions, and their office of legal counsel—insisted the bill would permit unwarranted intrusions into investigative files and heap "impossible administrative burdens" on the Justice Department.

All of these issues had been debated at legislative committee sessions dating back to 1966, when the first Freedom of Information Act was passed.

They came up again when the latest bill, designed to broaden the scope of the 1966 act and plug loopholes through which inventive bureaucrats were eluding the spirit of the law, was moved through Congress.

"We gave a lot of ground to the bureaucrats on this," Phillips admitted, "but they wanted all or nothing. Secrecy is an obsession with them, they don't want the public looking over their shoulders."

"Then the Nixon Administration came along and brought secrecy to a high—and I might add, malevolent—art. Talk about obsessions, whew!"

Subcommittee counsel L. James Kronfeld said the FBI was "consistently opposed to our bill but they would never say what would be acceptable to them. We went as far as we could to accommodate our differences, then we finally had to stop short and say: 'Here's our bill, live with it.'"

Phillips and other congressional sources agree that Ford probably got "bad advice" from his Nixon holdovers.

"But let's face it," Phillips went on, "Ford's the boss, and he had the final say-so."

Jerald terHorst the Detroit News reporter who served briefly as Ford's press secretary, partly during the time when the new administration was dickered with Moorhead over the information bill, recently wrote in a column:

"... no serious efforts to work out a compromise were made by the Justice Department, the FBI, or the Domestic Council or other administration agencies whose leaders supposedly were now responsive to Ford."

terHorst complained that the "Nixon holdovers... have sandbagged the new President's pledge of new openness in government."

Instead of turning the issue into a triumphant affirmation of his "open government" promise, Phillips said, Ford now faces the humiliating prospect of a congressional repudiation of his veto.

Even if this lameduck Congress fails to overturn the veto, Phillips added, Ford faces a more liberal and possibly hostile Congress next year, when scores of new lawmakers

elected in the anti-Nixon, anti-secrecy backlash flock into the House and Senate.

"You know," Phillips mused, "if I were Ford I'd kind of hope that my veto were overridden by this Congress. The next one might pass a bill that's even broader and more open than this one."

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Oct. 20, 1974]

WHAT HAPPENED TO CANDOR?

Early this month Congress passed a number of amendments to the Freedom of Information Act. The amendments were sound, designed to vastly improve access to government documents and to records of government decisions. The measure sailed through the Congress—the House passed it 349 to 2. It should have sailed through the White House. Instead, President Ford ignored his pledges of an open and candid administration, succumbed to the dire warnings of the Secrecy Set and vetoed the measure. Congress should reverse his action.

Among other things, the bill would have limited the amount of time allowed a federal agency to respond to a citizen's request. Such a limitation is essential to due process and necessary to forestall frustrating delays by arrogant bureaucrats. The bill also would have granted the federal district courts the right to review the classification of documents. Certainly, such a review is to be desired. Classification is too frequently employed to cover mistakes rather than to protect national security data. And certainly it has been shown that federal courts are equal to the demands of such review.

Ford says the bill he vetoed is unworkable. We question that. He says he will put forth proposals of his own for the next session of Congress. Congress should make that unnecessary by overriding his veto. It is likely that the proposals the administration would substitute would be drafted by the very agencies which insist they cannot operate efficiently if they must be accountable to the taxpayers.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Oct. 21, 1974]

CUTTING COILS OF SECRECY

President Ford's veto of antisecrecy legislation probably will be overturned when Congress reconvenes after the elections, but it reflects the deep resistance within the bureaucracy to letting the public know what's going on. It is a sign, itself, of the need to provide more access to government operations.

The legislation, in the form of 17 amendments to the Freedom of Information Act, was passed overwhelmingly by Congress—366-8 in the House and 64-17 in the Senate. Congress has had its own battles to get information from government agencies, including the Nixon tapes. It also is sensitive to the great public concern that has grown out of secretive U.S. involvement in Chile and Cambodia and other matters, as well as Watergate.

One of the amendments would permit judicial review of classified foreign policy and national defense information to determine whether it should be released to a petitioner. Such information had been excluded from court review in the original 1966 act. This apparently was the major point of disagreement between Congress and the administration. Ford said in his veto message that he objected to the courts making "the initial classification decision in sensitive and complex areas where they have no expertise."

It was a classic type of confrontation between the two branches of government. Despite the wide margin of approval and undeniable public support, virtually every government department and agency was reported opposed to the legislation. The same was true in 1966 when President Johnson signed the act. Most of the pressure came

from the Justice Department, the National Security Council and other departments involved in domestic and foreign intelligence. This is the part of the federal bureaucracy that is most loath to divulge information. Ford seems to have bought its line.

Jerome Wiesner, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, recently called secrecy "public enemy No. 1." Many Americans would agree with him. From Indochina to Watergate to South America to who knows where secret intrigues have been reported that seem to violate the principles of American democracy. A researcher on Watergate contends in an article in Rolling Stone magazine that at least 100 break-ins, "apparently political in nature," can be traced to the government during the Nixon administration. Clarence Kelley, FBI director, was moved last year to pledge to the Senate Subcommittee on Oversight of the FBI "complete candor, with no reservation whatever. . . ."

The President's objection about court review is weakened by the fact that federal judges already have this authority in criminal cases. They often declassify "secret" or "top secret" information. Moreover, such court authority would seem to fit naturally into the system of checks and balances between the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government. Ford has promised his own antisecrecy legislation. But if it comes with the blessing of the bureaucrats, it is not likely to be very helpful. The vetoed bill is what the country needs.

WHO OWNS THE NIXON TAPES?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Society of American Law Teachers has recently released a statement outlining their argument for the reversal of the decision to allow Mr. Nixon to retain custody of his Presidential papers. It is imperative, for the preservation of our democratic system that these papers and tapes be open to the Government and the public for their scrutiny.

The Society of American Law Teachers' well written statement follows:

The Ford-Nixon agreement rests on a widely shared misapprehension about the ownership of the tapes and documents. All Presidential tapes and documents that flow from the President's conduct of his job, all that are produced, so to speak, on government time, belong to Mr. Nixon's employer. If he were any other employee of the United States, he could not claim any literary property in his official conversations or his writings, nor any personal property in the papers or tapes that embody them. The Office of the President does not create different rights.

"It is true that long-standing custom has tolerated and even encouraged the removal and custody by former Presidents of their papers. Congress may be thought to have given its approval with respect to presidential libraries, and perhaps has recognized this custom in other bits of legislation. But even if this were so, Congress can change a custom if it conflicts with the public interest.

It is surely clear that the disposition of these state papers, especially those that are discreditable, should not be left to the person who was disgraced by their disclosure.

The Board of Governors of the Society also voted their strong disapproval of the pardon of Mr. Nixon and urged the Special Prosecutor, Leon Jaworski, to test its validity in the courts.

NUCLEAR MATERIAL SAFEGUARDS

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, many critics of nuclear power and the nuclear industry have attacked what they believe to be negligent or insufficient control and safeguarding of nuclear material. These attacks are frequently pursued by those with high motives but little if any factual information about past and ongoing materials management and safeguards efforts.

Dr. G. Robert Keepin, who heads the nuclear safeguards technology group at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratories, N. Mex., has written a number of articles contorting the sensationalism often inherent in media accounts and reports which purport to demonstrate the ease with which terrorists could steal nuclear materials and could make nuclear explosives. Dr. Keepin's comments, if read and understood should go far toward mitigating the fear and concern of the many who cannot judge the validity of the lurid and generally incredible scenarios on nuclear blackmail and sabotage.

It has been forgotten, ignored, or glossed over by most of those who state how easy it is to make a nuclear explosive that it took the Indians as a nation, employing about 12,000 workers and outstanding scientific and engineering talent in well-equipped laboratories, almost 12 years to develop and test a nuclear explosive.

At this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD the aforementioned material plus a chart which compares the accessibility to and consequences of sabotage to various targets:

[From Nuclear News, September 1974]

NUCLEAR MATERIALS SAFEGUARDS—A PROFESSIONAL SPEAKS OUT

OR, "A JOURNEY INTO THE AWESOME & AUTOMATED SAFEGUARDS WORLD OF G. ROBERT KEEPIN"

(By G. Robert Keepin)

A timely monograph on a sensitive and controversial political/technical issue is bound to make absorbing reading, especially for those whose specific area of professional interest is under fire. So it was for this reviewer with John McPhee's book, *The Curve of Binding Energy* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1974), and with the more technical companion piece, *Nuclear Theft: Risks and Safeguards*, by M. Willrich and T. B. Taylor (Ballinger, 1974). In both of these books the authors argue for the public's right-to-know generally how nuclear explosives and radiation weapons can be made and where in the nuclear industry the requisite nuclear materials are to be found; they cite the fact that

* Editor's subtitle, with permission from the author.

nuclear energy, with its bright promise of a major new energy source, does at the same time pose some inherent long-term risks about which the lay public should be as fully informed as possible. Agreed—emphatically. But as with any complex technical subject, and especially one that is largely classified, there remains the judgmental question of what degree of detail constitutes adequate informing of the public.

A common denominator of concern arising from all the recent publicity concerning Taylor, terrorism, and nuclear material diversion stems mainly from the extraordinary dialogue between Taylor and McPhee over a period of several days at a primitive cabin in the Maryland woods. "The place was convenient," McPhee recounts, and Taylor "was pursuing, in its many possible forms, the unclassified atomic bomb." Without elucidation, this reviewer would simply record here the opinion that it is both unseemly and counterproductive for a former professional in the weapons field to speculate—however hypothetically—on how a would-be diverter might proceed with design and fabrication of an illicit atomic bomb. Genuine concern with safeguarding against diversion of nuclear materials could surely take more constructive forms than indulging in what could turn out to be self-fulfilling prophecy.

The dictates of reason and prudence would appear to reject Taylor's assertion that "it seems necessary to be quite specific" in order to make the risks of nuclear terrorism credible, and to convince the public of the gravity and urgency of the nuclear materials diversion problem—so that, in turn, public pressure can be applied to the AEC, among others. (This somewhat circuitous rationale apparently derives from the rather extreme view: "Historically public pressure is the only kind that the nuclear community responds to.") In rebutting the need to be specific it can be argued that—based on AEC-released public information on the general characteristics of nuclear weapons and their effects—the informed lay citizenry has acquired a general appreciation of the risks, realities, and public issues (civil defense, ABM deployment, etc.) associated with nuclear weapons without knowing, or caring to know, details of weapons design.

One reviewer, obviously shaken by his first glimpse into the "awesome and alarming world of Theodore B. Taylor," concludes flatly that "The Curve of Binding Energy" constitutes "a serious . . . indictment of the Atomic Energy Commission and the private nuclear industry." Such a broadside calls for some factual rebuttal. Aside from the obvious need for tighter physical security around nuclear plants (as stressed by Taylor and others, and now being implemented), it has long been recognized that the *pro forma* methods for materials safeguards and control within plants do indeed leave much to be desired. Principal among these shortcomings are: (1) a lack of timeliness of material assessment, especially for bulk flow material which must be accurately and frequently measured for stringent accountability (i.e., as opposed to the more straightforward piece counting of discrete fabricated units); (2) the relative insensitivity (to pinpointing diversion) of the cumulative data representing material unaccounted for (MUF); (3) the practical difficulties of determining MUF to within an accuracy of 0.5 percent (e.g., as required in the Code of Federal Regulations—10 CFR 70) or to within some designated "trigger" quantity of fissile material; and (4) the severe operational and economic penalties imposed by frequent process line shutdowns and cleanouts. Although these shortcomings have recently been identified by critics, such deficiencies have been well known to safeguards professionals and indeed are receiving requisite R&D attention.

A general commentary on much of the recent high-profile criticism of U.S. safeguards posture is the seeming preoccupation with scenarios, sensationalism, and technical superficialities rather than an in-depth attempt to understand, evaluate, and interpret for the public the scope and thrust of the AEC's ongoing safeguards R&D program. As seasoned professionals know only too well, truly constructive contributions to an effective, balanced safeguards system for the nation require competent dedicated, and sustained hard work—nearly always at low profile.

It is particularly regrettable that safeguards dilettantes and neophytes generally choose to ignore or fall to grasp the fundamental significance and key role of the new nondestructive assay (NDA) technology and instrumentation being developed and now beginning to be applied throughout the nuclear industry. This new instrumentation coupled with advances in low-cost on-line computers will provide automated in-plant accountability and control of nuclear materials on an essentially realtime basis. Augmented by automated surveillance and verification instruments, this total NDA capability can meet, efficiently and economically, the stringent new federal regulations on security and accountability, and can provide requisite levels of assurance against nuclear material diversion from all types of nuclear plants. Additional important economic benefits of automated in-plant instrumentation include better process and quality control, criticality safety, and the reduction or elimination of costly shutdown and cleanout procedures during each inventory campaign.

The important over-all point to be made here is that—withstanding certain glaring shortcomings and sins of the past—the AEC and much of the nuclear industry are in fact making great strides toward effective, stringent control of the nuclear materials which are the lifeblood of that industry.

To switch gears from technical to literary commentary, McPhee's style really is hard to beat. The "Curve of Binding Energy" is fascinating exposition. Undoubtedly some will find it entertaining, albeit scary entertainment. Nearly all readers should find the book intellectually exciting and a model of clarity throughout the skillfully interwoven technical and nontechnical subject matter.

Except for the notable deficiencies discussed above, both of the subject monographs are unquestionably worthwhile for their timely contribution to public awareness of an increasingly important and complex national issue.

[From Laser Focus, October 1974]

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS

Focus on books.—"The Curve of Binding Energy." John McPhee, Farrar, Straus and Giroux 1974, 231 pp., \$7.95.

"Nuclear Theft: Risks and Safeguards." Mason Willrich and T. B. Taylor, Ballinger 1974, 256 pp., \$13.50.

In less than six months nuclear materials safeguards, has emerged from relative obscurity to become a major nuclear issue in the United States. Safeguards concerns—which today encompass not only diversion of nuclear materials, but also overt attack, nuclear blackmail, and other forms of terrorism—have escalated recently with the explosion of a nuclear device by India, the rise of terrorism in the U.S. and abroad, and the prospect (spectre) of nuclear power being introduced into Middle East countries. Although such events have "fed the flames," the continuing firestorm of safeguards publicity in the U.S. seems to have been sparked by the various publications earlier this year by and about Theodore B. Taylor, a former weapons designer who has seen fit to "go public" in order to emphasize dramatically the growing threat of diversion and theft of

special nuclear materials with their by-now-well-advertised potential for making crude atom bombs.

In all candor, it must be stated at the outset that seasoned safeguards professionals, this one included, generally have serious reservations about any publicity-oriented, sensational approach to the complex problem of nuclear diversion, so they have had understandable reticence to respond publicly on this sensitive issue. Unfortunately, however, the continued silence of safeguards people has been construed by many as tacit endorsement of Taylor's claims and modus operandi. This perpetuation-by-default of a grossly false impression has finally become intolerable, so in response to repeated urging this reviewer seems, de-facto, elected to speak out for safeguards professionals—the "safeguards establishment" if you will!—in the improbable form of a double book review!

IS SUCH SPECIFICITY NECESSARY?

In both "The Curve of Binding Energy" and the somewhat more technical companion study "Nuclear Theft: Risks and Safeguards" the authors argue for the public's right to know, generally, how nuclear explosives and radiation weapons can be made and where in the nuclear industry the necessary special nuclear materials (SNM) are to be found. Their argument hinges on the fact that nuclear energy is no temporary phenomenon, but rather a major national commitment and a burgeoning worldwide industry with certain inherent longterm risks about which the lay public should be as fully apprised as possible.

While concurring generally in the obvious merits of "candid disclosure," this reviewer must take issue with Taylor's thesis that "it seems necessary to be quite specific" about considerations of weapon design and fabrication in order to make the risks of nuclear terrorism credible, and to convince the public (and thereby, he argues, the Atomic Energy Commission) of the gravity and urgency of the growing nuclear-materials diversion problem. In countering Taylor's claim it can be argued that on other national issues involving nuclear weapons—e.g., antiballistic-missile deployment, civil defense, nuclear disarmament, etc.—the informed lay public has traditionally expressed policy views, debated alternatives and, through elected representatives, participated in the national decisionmaking process without access to particulars of weapons design and fabrication. From the mass of pertinent AEC-released documentation, concerned citizens have been able to acquire a general appreciation of the risks and realities associated with nuclear weapons without knowing, or caring to know, details of weapons design. Further, it is clearly the prerogative of any citizen sufficiently concerned about technical details to dig out for himself whatever weapon information (or misinformation) may exist in the open literature. On the other hand, in this reviewer's opinion it is most unseemly for a former professional weaponeer to gratuitously screen distill and document pertinent technical literature in this sensitive area. It seems a further impropriety, bordering on irresponsibility, for the same source to then pursue detailed technical speculation—and then proceed, with apparent impunity to release same for publication without formal AEC classification review—on how a would-be diverter might fashion an illicit homemade atomic bomb. Genuine concern with safeguarding nuclear materials could surely be directed along more constructive lines than indulging publicly in what could turn out to be self-fulfilling prophecy.

MATERIALS CONTROL WITHIN PLANTS

Turning to another area of concern to safeguards professionals generally, the recent criticism of U.S. nuclear-safeguards posture in the popular press has focused on

the obvious need for improved transportation safeguards and for tightened physical security around nuclear plants—and indeed these much-needed improvements are now being widely implemented. There is, however, an equally important need for stringent control of materials within plants to protect against SNM diversion, theft and loss by covert rather than overt means. Perhaps because it is not as readily understandable as physical security, the urgent need for, and solutions to, better in-plant control of SNM are not delineated, interpreted, or developed adequately in any of the recent popular assessments of our national safeguards posture.

To gain some appreciation of the difficulty of SNM control within an operating nuclear plant, it need only be recognized that all in-process bulk-flow materials require frequent, if not continual, measurement for stringent accountability and control; this is clearly in sharp contrast to the safe-guarding of fabricated discrete units which, like money, can be piece-counted for exact accountability. Thus many important types of SNM control problems simply do not involve physical security *per se*, but depend rather on timely knowledge of what, where, and how much SNM is found in the various process and storage areas of a nuclear plant. For example, in the assessment of an accident (either real or contrived as a "screen" for diversion) or in the assessment of a nuclear blackmail threat, current and accurate information on plant inventory status and level of assurance against diversion are essential input data which can only be provided by direct SNM measurement and control on essentially a realtime basis.

It must be candidly acknowledged that the traditional methods of SNM accountability, off-site analysis of attribute samples, etc. generally fail to meet the key requirements of assay accuracy and timeliness. Cumbersome, inefficient and sometimes wholly ineffective, the older accountability methods can also impose severe economic penalties, e.g., in the frequent plant shutdowns and cleanouts required for physical inventory campaigns. It follows that rigid enforcement of increasingly stringent safeguards requirements will pose a growing threat to the economic viability of commercial reactor fuels containing plutonium or highly enriched uranium, i.e., light-water reactor (LWR) recycle, liquid metal fast breeder reactor (LMFBR) and high-temperature, gas-cooled reactors (HTGR). Fortunately there is a practical, cost-effective alternative to this rather bleak prognosis for the reactor fuels of the future. The new non-destructive assay (NDA) technology and instrumentation being developed by the AEC and now beginning to be implemented throughout the nuclear industry promise essentially realtime measurement and control of nuclear materials on a unit process basis. For those not familiar with NDA technology, it may be explained that nondestructive assay methods are categorized as (1) active and (2) passive. Active assay involves irradiation with neutrons or photons to induce fissions in the sample, and interpretation of the resulting neutron or gamma-ray "signatures" to determine quantitatively the amount of fissionable material present. Passive assay uses naturally occurring gamma and/or neutron radiations as direct signatures of fissionable material. A variety of passive and/or active assay techniques are required for the wide range of materials-measurement problems found in the nuclear fuel cycle.

Appropriate NDA measurement instrumentation, augmented by surveillance and verification equipment, thus comprise a complete, automated in-plant safeguards system which can meet, on a cost-effective basis, the stringent new federal regulations on security and accountability, and should provide requisite levels of assurance against nuclear

material diversion from all types of nuclear plants. Additional important economic benefits of automated in-plant instrumentation include better process and quality control, criticality safety, and the reduction or elimination of costly shutdown and cleanout procedures.

Needless to say, nondestructive assay techniques are not limited to analysis of fissionable materials alone; they are being applied to assay and diagnostic problems in such diverse fields as bioassay, isotopic tracer techniques, environmental monitoring, and chemical process development. A noteworthy example which embraces both safeguards and laser technology is the use of high-sensitivity NDA instrumentation to study uranium atom and compound gas kinetics, molecular exchange, and dissociation problems arising in the development of a practical process for laser isotope separation.

The foregoing elaboration of the capabilities and promise of automated in-plant measurement technology seems both timely and necessary to fill an obvious gap in popular understanding of this important aspect of safeguards. Typical of misinformed, rash reaction to at-times-illusory popular writings is a reviewer's broadside in the June 29 issue of Business Week: "The book [Curve of Binding Energy] is a serious bomb [sic] indictment of the Atomic Energy Commission and the private nuclear industry." Actually the brief elaboration of technology herein is but a foretaste of a broader effort by the AEC to outline and explain to the public as fully and clearly as possible the thrust of modern safeguards technology and its vital role in achieving clean, safe—and safeguarded—nuclear power.

Finally as regards journalistic merits, both of the subject books (however diverse in individual scope and purpose) are indeed well-written, intellectually stimulating and, for this reader at least, completely engrossing. To those knowledgeable in the field it is readily apparent that the development of such "moving-target" subject material required considerable effort and dedication. Subject to the technical caveats as noted, it seems fair to say that both of these monographs offer a timely and significant contribution to public awareness of an increasingly important and complex national issue.

—G. ROBERT KEEPIN.

[From Nucleonics Week, Oct. 17, 1974]

DYMAC: KEEPING CONTINUOUS TRACK OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL

Los Alamos Scientific Lab (LASL) is developing for AEC an in-plant safeguards system which appears to have considerable promise in the expanding field of special nuclear materials (SNM) safeguards. Called Dymac—Dynamic Materials Control—it is based on instrumented measurement and verification of SNM inside nuclear facilities, whether they are fuel fabrication, reprocessing, enrichment, conversion or recovery plants. When fully developed, Dymac will be thoroughly evaluated and tested in representative types of nuclear facilities; the first in-plant prototype tests of equipment are already under way at the LASL plutonium fabrication and recovery plant. The Dymac program is in the hands of the LASL safeguards R&D group headed by G. Robert Keepin.

Keepin stresses the vital need for timely and detailed knowledge of what, where, and how much SNM is in the various process and storage areas of a nuclear plant. Such a "dynamic" materials accountability system balanced with appropriate verification and physical security measures, can provide a stringent, multiple-layered defense against nuclear diversion, theft, or accidental loss. Although the safeguards focus has recently been almost exclusively on physical security—fences, armed guards, etc.—AEC chair-

man Dixy Lee Ray, in citing the need for a balanced safeguards effort, told a recent meeting: "Perhaps the most important key to proper protection is 'accountability.'" As a major part of AEC safeguards R&D, Keepin and his group are developing nondestructive assay techniques and instrumentation to implement accurate accountability on as automated and current a basis as is technically and economically feasible.

In developing the rationale for the Dymac system, as well as AEC regulatory's counterpart Retimac—Real Time Materials Control system—Keepin cites certain types of materials control problems which do not involve physical security per se. For example, the security guard at a plant gate may make a verification check for presence or absence of nuclear material on a vehicle but he cannot assay on the spot the exact quantity of plutonium or uranium, what enrichment level, etc., is passing through his gate check point. That job requires timely and accurate measurement in the plant, such as at the load-out station. Direct piece counting of fabricated units—fuel pellets, rods, assemblies, etc.—is relatively easy, says Keepin, compared to keeping track of the flow of SNM in process lines. Under Dymac, in-process material could be measured on leaving one unit process (such as a solution tank) and measured again as it enters the next. Detailed comparison of such "double check" measurements could then aid in pinpointing precisely when and where SNM had been removed or lost, and how much. As an illustration of timely accountability, a plant-wide material balance could be struck during each 8-hour operating shift, with the personnel routinely released upon obtaining the requisite level of assurance against material diversion.

Keepin stresses that the whole Dymac concept must be fully evaluated and tested in real-life operating nuclear facilities before its full potential can be accurately gauged. He believes it will ultimately prove cost-effective through improved process and quality control, criticality safety, and the reduction or elimination of costly shut-down and clean-out procedures at inventory time. Such substantial economic benefits would help to ease potential industry concerns about the cost of the Dymac system.

Although Los Alamos is developing and field testing nondestructive assay (NDA) instruments for Dymac, it is also cooperating with nuclear instrument manufacturers to bring proof-tested such instruments onto the commercial market as quickly as possible. To facilitate personnel instruction in use of the nondestructive assay instruments, AEC has established at LASL a formal NDA training program open to industry and government people, both U.S. and foreign.

Keepin deplors the sensationalism and publicity in the popular press on SNM theft and diversion scenarios, and "cook-book" descriptions alleging how easy it is to put together a home-made atom bomb. All this, he feels, is quite unnecessary to drive home the case for safeguards and it could lead to self-fulfillment of dark prophecies of nuclear blackmail, terrorism, etc. In the October issue of *Laser Focus* magazine, Keepin pointedly criticizes Theodore B. Taylor, safeguards authority and board chairman of International Research & Technology Corp., for "going public" with speculations on the design of do-it-yourself nuclear weapons and the various ways that nuclear materials can be stolen. Taylor, Keepin says, asserts that "it seems necessary to be quite specific" about considerations of weapon design and fabrication in order to make the risks of nuclear terrorism credible and to convince the public (and thereby the AEC) of the gravity and urgency of the SNM diversion problem.

Keepin counters that on other national issues involving nuclear weapons—antiballistics missile deployment, civil defense, nu-

clear disarmament, etc.—the informed lay public has traditionally expressed policy views, debated alternatives and, through elected representatives, participated in the national decision-making process *without* knowing, or caring to know, details of weapon design.—Roger Smith

FIFTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, November 18 marks the 56th anniversary of Latvian Independence Day and our distinguished mayor, Hon. Richard J. Daley, has issued a proclamation in commemoration of this significant event in the history of freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

On Sunday, November 17, a commemorative program in observance of Latvian Independence Day was held at Mather High School, 5835 North Lincoln Avenue, by the Chicago Latvian Association which is ably headed by Viktors Viksnins, president, and by the United Latvian Associations of Chicago whose fine and outstanding officers include Ilmars Bergmanis, chairman; Alberts Raidonis, vice-chairman; Aleksandrs Osis, vice-chairman and treasurer; Mara Tomsons, secretary; Karlis Vanags, director of cultural and social activities; and Rev. Vilis Varsbergs, committee member.

The theme of the commemorative program was "Remember Latvia," and the following statement from the United Latvian Associations reflects the deep and special meaning of this anniversary to Latvian-Americans in Chicago:

To the Latvian people living in this community, the 18th of November is a day to remind them of several things. First is the past. The peoples of Latvia proclaimed their independence of Russia on this day in 1918. In 1920 Soviet Russia made peace treaties with them. By these treaties Soviet Russia recognized without reservations, the independence and sovereignty of the Baltic States, declaring that it voluntarily and forever renounced all sovereign rights over these people and territories. United States recognition was extended on July 28, 1922.

For two decades these Nations established a good measure to economic well being and a high standard of social justice. Then, in 1939, the U.S.S.R. pressed so-called pacts of mutual assistance upon the Baltic States for the establishment of Soviet military bases and airfields in each nation, at the same time guaranteeing that there would be no interference with their political structure and social economic systems. In June of 1940, the Soviet Union marched its Red armies into the Baltic territory, set up a puppet government and caused them to apply for admission into the U.S.S.R. by staging mock elections with the support of the invading military forces. Only one list of Handpicked Kremlin Representatives was presented to the voters. The exercise of the secret ballot was denied thereby assuring the results long before the first ballot was cast. By this process the political commissars of the U.S.S.R. installed their puppet parliaments which on July 21-22, 1940, adopted a resolution prepared in Moscow petitioning the Supreme Council of the Soviet Union for recognition as a Soviet

Republic. This action by the puppet parliaments was in violation of the sovereign will of the Baltic people and in violation of the legal constitutions of those nations which required a popular referendum on such issues. These nations were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U.S.S.R. Unhappily, the devious processes as exhibited in this case have been going on until today to more than fifteen once-independent nations.

There to come staggering into History's annals June 14, 1941, when about 60,000 Baltic people were incarcerated by the Communists without a warrant for search and seizure. These people in family groups, but separated from each other, were shipped in cattle cars to the harshest regions of Russia including the northern reaches of Siberia. For many it meant separation forever from their families. For those who died, it is the Baltic peoples' Memorial Day—the day of Deportation, the day of the Baltic "Auschwitz". The total deported and killed Latvians in the first year alone amounted to 1.80% of the population. This means that in the case of a Russian occupation and in proportion to the population, 2,400,000 people would be deported from the United States of America.

Secondly, this day is a very opportune time to thank the community, the city, the state and the country for its charity, tolerance and help in the modern day "Exodus" of the Baltic people. America is the standard-bearer of the premise that without justice there is no dignity accorded the individual. We are especially appreciative to the U.S. Government which has not recognized the enforced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R., still maintaining consular and diplomatic relations with the representatives who served the last governments of these nations. We pray this non-recognition will continue."

The tragic plight of Latvia, as well as the other Baltic nations—Lithuania and Estonia—has long been a matter of deep concern to me and that is the reason I introduced legislation expressing the sense of the Congress against the continued incorporation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. My resolution recommends that the President of the United States take this matter once more to the United Nations to seek a declaration of world opinion demanding that the Soviets withdraw all troops, agents, and controls from the Baltic nations.

In addition, my resolution urges that hundreds of thousands of Baltic exiles who still survive in Russian prisons and slave labor camps be permitted to return to their homeland, and finally recommends that free elections be held in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia in order that the Baltic peoples may choose their own form of government. I do feel that the repeated demonstration of our determination to defend this righteous cause will in the long run help to make Baltic liberty a reality.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltic people know by bitter experience that civil rights and elemental freedoms are the concern of all mankind, and I urge all of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives to "remember Latvia." On this occasion I extend my greetings to the Americans of Latvian descent in my own 11th Congressional District, the city of Chicago, and all over this Nation who are participating in the 56th anniversary celebration of Latvian independence.

My colleagues will be interested to know that the Lithuanian seaman Simas Kudirka met yesterday with Mayor Daley, who has proclaimed him an honorary citizen of Chicago. Kudirka unsuccessfully attempted to escape from Soviet authorities by boarding a U.S. Coast Guard vessel in 1970. For this attempt, he was imprisoned by the Soviet authorities and was only recently released from prison and allowed to immigrate to the United States. I was proud to join with many Members of Congress in urging the release of this courageous man.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to insert the proclamation passed by the City Council of Chicago and signed by Mayor Richard J. Daley regarding Latvian Independence Day in Chicago.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, there exist many historical, cultural and family ties between the people of the Baltic States and the people of the United States and the City of Chicago; and

Whereas, in commemoration of independence proclaimed in 1918, confirmed by a peace treaty in 1920, and later violated by Russian occupation, Chicagoans of Latvian origin will again this year observe the 1918 declaration of liberty; and

Whereas, appropriate services will be held at Mather High School starting at 4 p.m. on November 17:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim Sunday, November 17, 1974, to be Latvian Independence Day in Chicago and urge all citizens to take cognizance of the special events arranged for this time.

JOHN SAWHILL'S REMOVAL

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to disagree with my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) but I believe that the only thing wrong with John Sawhill's removal from office is that it did not occur soon enough. On October 2, 1974, I sent the following telegram to President Ford:

Urge you immediately fire Federal Energy Administrator John Sawhill for advocacy of additional tax or fee on gasoline. Urge you fire any and all your advisors so out of touch with the common man's problems to recommend such abuse of the people. What a damnable reward to give them for their admirable voluntary conservation of fuel. I urge an immediate unequivocal statement by you that no new Federal tax, fee or other charges will be levied on gasoline at any time under your administration. The average American who can't make ends meet now with inflation due to Federal deficit spending expects leadership from you to get out of the hole, not deeper into it.

M. GENE SNYDER,
Member of Congress.

My question is only why did he wait so long.

A CLASSROOM IN ACTION

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is an age in which our educational system and teaching technologies are becoming more sophisticated and complex each day. As a result, it has become increasingly important to keep the members of the community informed about what is going on in the classroom. To accomplish this goal, many schools periodically hold "open houses" or "back-to-school nights."

Unfortunately, many members of the community are often unable to attend these sessions or are simply not aware of these opportunities. However, an effort to overcome these obstacles was made recently by some students and teachers in Teaneck, N.J. In an attempt to offer their community a better look at the school system, about 100 pupils attended class recently in a local supermarket. The purpose of this trip to the market was to afford shoppers a better look at what goes on in the classroom of today.

An interesting article concerning the Teaneck experiment appeared recently in the New York Times. In view of the fact that it gives further insight into an idea which proved beneficial to all involved, I would like to share this article with my colleagues. The article follows:

TEANECK SHOPPERS SEE A CLASSROOM IN ACTION

(By Grace W. Weinstein)

TEANECK.—About 100 pupils from the second, third and sixth grades here went to school in a local supermarket last week.

In observance of American Education Week, Teaneck not only opened its schools to the community but, in an effort to show more residents what education is all about in 1974, also took the schools to the community. Four classes from two elementary schools convened in the Pathmark store on Cedar Lane, Teaneck's main street. One class met each morning and afternoon, Tuesday and Wednesday.

"We traditionally invite the public into the schools for American Education Week," said Lucy Stamilla, Teaneck's director of elementary education, "but it occurred to me that there are many people in the community with no children in the schools at all and parents who only visit a single classroom and don't know what's going on in the district as whole. We decided to bring the schools to them, and chose a supermarket because it gets a good cross-section of the community."

Thus, Mrs. Joyce Dalton's third-graders from Lowell School filed into the store on Tuesday morning. They sat at tables and chairs brought from school and arranged alongside the frozen turkeys; on the other side, between the children and the fresh meat displays, shoppers wheeled their carts and supermarket employes pushed multi-tiered meat-distribution carts.

APPETIZING SURROUNDINGS

The youngsters went about their work undisturbed by the bustle around them.

Eight-year-old Adam Leitner found the experience "fun," but that the surroundings made him hungry. He then tried to see how many words he could make out of the word supermarket.

Marc Manberg, also eight, began writing a story: "Once there was a lady who went

shopping at Pathmark. She found everything she wanted. After she paid for everything, she went home and made supper."

At another table, a pig-tailed youngster in a purple print shirt started a mathematics problem thusly: "Robin went to the store with her mother. They bought one pound of meat, two pounds of chicken, five pounds of tomatoes. How much did they all cost together? How many pounds of food did they get altogether?"

In the corner, next to a display of turkey platters, two boys referred to an encyclopedia, brought from school, to begin a project on the national origins of different foods.

Despite the link-up of work field trip to a supermarket, to location, this was not a field trip to a supermarket. Its purpose was to make school visible to the general public.

A folding table at the end of the meat aisle—the rear of the "classroom"—held booklets about the Teaneck schools and evaluation forms for shoppers to fill out. Mrs. Ethel Brown, a teacher's aide, was prepared to answer their questions.

While some shoppers looked nonplussed at the unusual sight, most reacted favorably. Mrs. Carol Wagner, with two boys in her full shopping cart (the older one starts kindergarten next fall), said:

"It's a nice idea, I'd like to learn more about the school system here. It's so different compared to when we went to school."

A visiting parent, Mrs. Lore Morgenstern, agreed.

"There's a world of difference from when we were in school," she observed. "We sat in rows and folded our hands."

This "world of difference" is exactly what the school administration wanted residents to see.

"A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW"

As Henry Witte, principal of Whittier School, put it:

"Education is very different today than it was 10 or 15 years ago. This gives residents a bird's-eye view, in an uneducational environment, of what school is all about."

Said Sydney Bookstaber, principal of Lowell School: "Residents of the town pay for the education of the children of the town. This will let them see what they're paying for."

Most of the shoppers who filled out evaluation forms agreed that school-in-the-market was a good idea. While one anonymous critic wrote "Although this is probably good public relations, it probably interferes with the normal amount of learning that would go on in school on a given day," most agreed with the shopper who observed:

"The kids can learn anywhere, and this project shows the public what's new and how flexible the kids are and the schools are or should be."

"There should be more public contact with the schoolchildren and the educational program," another shopper wrote. "Maybe, then, people would see what education needs and wouldn't squawk about taxes."

As for the children, Mrs. Dalton said: "They had just hoped that more people would stop and ask about their work. They were so pleased and proud to explain."

ROOM SELECTION PROCESS SHOULD BE CHANGED

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, last Monday I witnessed the ritual room selection process in the Cannon Caucus Room. I

am compelled to say that there is absolutely no excuse for the antiquated, dilatory procedure that is still being used for the selection of Members' offices.

The session began at noon with a packed room of Members and aides, well over 200 persons at one point. It was not until after 7 p.m. that the four termers completed their selection and near midnight when the first termers finished. The 92 new Members have yet to pick rooms. All in all, literally thousands of man-hours were wasted that day by staffers simply waiting their turns to select. I think we can and must find a better way to do this job with less time, more fairness, and greater accuracy.

I, therefore, urge the House Office Building Commission to meet and redesign the selection procedure so as to improve its speed and efficiency. I suggest that the process could be computerized or at least the drawing could be held over several days with only two or three service classes scheduled at a time.

In no way do I intend to fault those who diligently labored to supervise and administer the drawing. They did their best to follow the regulations as they were set down. So it is the regulations which must be changed and I hope I can report back to you the Commission is taking action to prevent a repeat of last week's ridiculous selection procedure.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. AND MRS. ROBERT SIDNEY PHELAN

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Robert Sidney Phelan, of Trenton, Tenn., on being chosen Outstanding Citizens at the Trenton Chamber of Commerce Membership Banquet in late October. At this point, I include in the RECORD for the information of our colleagues. Another representative sample of such opinion is included at this point:

TRENTON.—Automobile dealer Robert Sidney Phelan and his wife, Gayle, were named Trenton's outstanding citizens Monday night at the annual membership banquet of the Chamber of Commerce.

Arnie Anderson, named the city's first outstanding citizen a year ago, surprised the Phelans and the more than 500 in attendance by announcing two winners rather than one.

Phelan, a lifelong Gibson County resident, is a member of the city's industrial board. He also is a Democratic member of the county election commission and is credited by many for the strong showing made in Gibson County by Jake Butcher in the Democratic primary for governor.

Mrs. Phelan has been active since February as chairman of the Concerned Citizens for Better Education, a group that is trying to build a new high school for the city. Her work with the group has included meetings with education leaders in the city, county and Nashville.

The Phelans were married in 1958 and have three children: Sid, Paul and LeAnn.

The outstanding citizens were selected by a committee of the Chamber's directors after nominations were solicited from the public.

Outgoing Chamber President Charles Hill also was presented with an award Monday in honor of his year of service to the civic group.

And country humorist Jerry Clower, who provided the evening's entertainment, was named honorary mayor of Trenton by Mayor Leo Maness.

CONGRESS URGED TO OVERRIDE VETO OF H.R. 12471, FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AMENDMENTS—V

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, truly "open government" is badly needed as an antidote after the Watergate mess in order to restore faith and confidence of the American people in our governmental institutions and leaders. President Ford pledged "open government" when he was sworn into office last August; but by his puzzling veto of H.R. 12471, our bipartisan bill strengthening the Freedom of Information Act, he has turned his pledge into just another political slogan and another broken promise.

If ever any veto deserved to be overridden, Mr. Speaker, it is this one. The veto message itself is filled with misstatements of fact, incoherent inaccuracies, legal mythology, and shows an amazing lack of understanding of the operation of the Federal judicial system and the Freedom of Information Law.

The Nation's editors almost universally agree that the Freedom of Information bill veto should be overridden. Dozens and dozens of editorials from newspapers throughout the country have urged Congress to act promptly to set aside the veto. I have already placed many of them in the RECORD for the information of our colleagues. Another representative sample of such opinion is included at this point:

[From the Washington Star-News, Nov. 1, 1974]

FREEDOM OF MISINFORMATION

(By J. F. terHorst)

The day after his swearing in on Aug. 9, President Ford assembled the Nixon Cabinet and urged the department heads to be "affirmative" in their relations with the news media.

He promised to set a high example at the White House.

Moments later, as he went around the table soliciting the views of the Cabinet on matters of concern to their agencies, Atty. Gen. William Saxbe brought up the amendments to the Freedom of Information Act then moving through Congress. Saxbe termed the amendments "bad legislation" and warned Ford that he might have to veto the bill.

On the way out of the Cabinet room, Counselor Robert T. Hartmann and I, then Ford's press secretary, exchanged grim glances. It was clear that the attorney general had not caught the spirit of Ford's desire to establish an open administration after years of Nixon isolation. We immediately sought out Ford and pointed out to him that a veto of the

Freedom of Information amendments would make his pledge of openness ring hollow.

Ford agreed and, displaying his keen knowledge of Capitol Hill, suggested that the Senate and House chairmen be asked to hold up the FOI amendments so his administration people could work out an acceptable compromise.

Ford knew the Hill chairmen would respond to his plea that the new administration deserved a chance to break the impasse then developing. What Ford didn't know was the depth of the ingrained Nixonian antagonism toward the media that still prevailed among the Cabinet members he had inherited.

Despite the grace period that the congressional managers of the bill extended to Ford as a personal courtesy, no serious efforts to work out a compromise were made by the Justice Department, the FBI, the Domestic Council or other administration agencies whose leaders supposedly were now responsive to Ford.

It amounted to stonewalling, some actually preferring that Congress pass a bill which Ford would veto. At a meeting of the White House Senior Staff several weeks later, William Timmons, the White House congressional liaison chief retained by Ford, urged that the staff recommend to Ford that he veto the FOI legislation. And Ford, assuming Congress and not the administration was being stubborn, finally did that just last week.

In the process, however, Ford offered several new suggestions to Congress which he says will make it possible for him to sign a Freedom of Information measure.

One Ford proposal deals with the right of federal courts to review the merits of disclosing the contents of classified documents if there is no reasonable basis for keeping the information away from the public. Another Ford proposal is that Congress grant federal agencies 15 more days to produce the government information sought by citizens or news media.

The Ford ideas, although coming late in the game, deserve serious consideration. At least they could form the framework for a compromise on Freedom of Information that would be palatable both to Congress and the White House.

Unfortunately, Ford's move may be too late now. The Nixon holdovers in the administration have sandbagged the new President's pledge of new openness in government. And congressional Democrats, emboldened by their assurance of victory in next week's congressional elections, probably will be in a mood to slap at Ford for his harsh campaign rhetoric of recent weeks.

The lesson for Ford is that there still remains an excessive amount of anti-media zeal among the Nixonites in government, despite his own desire that federal agencies make more, not less, information available to the public.

It is yet one more liability Ford will have to live with until he installs his own men in the Cabinet and around the White House.

[From the Vicksburg, Miss., Post, Oct. 22, 1974]

MORE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Soon after the Freedom of Information Act took effect in 1967 it became evident that the law did not guarantee quite as much public access to government documents as had been expected. It is gratifying that Congress has at last completed work on revisions designed to strengthen access.

The law is basically a good one. In general it permits access to information from federal agencies, and also provides the machinery for court appeal of official decisions to withhold data. Exceptions are made in certain areas—trade secrets, investigatory records of law enforcement agencies, and so on.

Problems arose from the start, however. About three years ago Congress began the task of improving the Act. Matters were complicated by a Supreme Court ruling in 1973 which allows the president to screen documents from judicial review.

This ruling will in effect be overturned by the new legislation. It authorizes federal courts to make a determination as to whether a secrecy stamp on any given piece of information is actually justifiable under terms of the law. Nor will the courts have unbridled discretion in classifying questioned documents. They will be obliged to decide whether the criteria of an executive order for classification are met by a document.

All this is in aid of the people's right to know what their government is up to. Let us hope that President Ford, whose earlier objections have largely been met by congressional compromise, will sign the bill.

[From the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch,
October 23, 1974]

THE BETTER ALTERNATIVE

In large measure the preservation of a free and responsive government depends on its openness with the people and in its reliance upon their judgment in the end.

We believe President Ford basically adheres to that principle and that he chose the wrong alternative to improve its workability when he vetoed the 17 amendments adopted by Congress to the Freedom of Information Act of 1966.

The act has not worked particularly well since it went into effect due to the inherent tendencies of federal bureaucracies to over-classify their documents or otherwise obstruct legitimate efforts by citizens and news agencies seeking information.

The President fears the new amendments jeopardize military and diplomatic secrets. He objects, particularly, to a provision which would allow judicial review of government contested efforts to gain governmental information.

Without judicial review, a decision to release or withhold government information would continue to rest with bureaucrats who have themselves and their respective agencies, as well as legitimate government secrets, to protect.

In preparing the amendments, responsible legal, legislative and news media leaders considered their national security implications for three years.

They rightfully exempted criminal investigative records from the amendments.

The margins by which each house of Congress passed the amendments—349 to 2 in the House and a voice vote in the Senate—reflect the Legislative Branch's broad confidence in the checks and balances provided by judicial review.

It is difficult to see any justifiable fears about the amendments' adequacy to protect authentic national secrets.

One should keep in mind, too, that no law is sacred once enacted. If it does not fulfill its intended purpose, it can be amended to do so or be abolished, as need be.

The amendments should be given a chance and for that reason the Congress should override Mr. Ford's veto.

There is a good chance that may happen. But if there is any doubt it may not, it should be done.

Any citizen who believes the government should conduct its business as openly as possible—even including risks which may not be foreseeable—can readily wish the same.

[From the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, Oct. 21,
1974]

PUBLIC BUSINESS

Contrary to expectations, President Ford vetoed Congressionally approved amendments to the 1966 Freedom of Information Act. Congress should overwhelmingly reaffirm its support of the changes by overriding

the veto when it reassembles after the November 5 elections.

The intent of the original Freedom of Information Act—to guarantee access to all Federal documents and records, with certain well-warranted exceptions—was frustrated by bureaucratic delay, the expense of suing to force disclosure, and excessive charges levied by agencies for finding and providing requested information.

After three years of study, Capitol Hill moved to correct the worst deficiencies. President Ford, almost immediately after his inauguration, asked a House-Senate conference committee to make five changes in the bill it produced reconciling differences in amendments passed in each chamber of Congress.

The committee responded by providing that Federal employees who violate Freedom of Information Act strictures should be punished by their own agencies, not by the courts; that time limits for agency answers to petitions for public records should be extended well beyond the 30 days in the original bill; that attorneys' fees and court costs should not be paid for corporations seeking Government records; and that investigative files should not be opened if their disclosure would invade personal privacy. The committee balked at weakening an amendment to permit Federal courts to determine whether so-called classified information should remain secret.

The Senate sped the conference committee bill through on a voice vote. The House approved it 349-2. Mr. Ford vetoed it, demanding that the amendment he proposed but the committee spurned be added to the measure, and that lengthy investigatory records be exempted because, he said, law-enforcement agencies lack competent officers to peruse them.

The bill Mr. Ford vetoed would go a very long way toward exposing to public scrutiny governmental documents relating to public business. Even more salutary, it would restrain bureaucratic high-handedness and the inclination to secrecy. It would encourage responsibility where now there is irresponsibility because of an absence of accountability. Congress should lose no time in seeing that the amendments become law.

OPPOSITION TO APPEARANCE OF PLO AT THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to express my strongest opposition to the recent appearance before the United Nations of Yasir Arafat, the leader of the band of terrorists known as the Palestine Liberation Organization.

I have always respected the ideals for which the U.N. stood and am deeply saddened that that body, which should honor the peacemakers of the world, instead chose to welcome Arafat, whose avowed aim is the destruction of another state through terror. For the first time in its history, the United Nations permitted someone who is not the representative of an established state to address it. This presents grave possibilities for the future. Henceforth, an organization might not be considered a legitimate spokesman on the merits of its standing in international law, but because it blatantly violates that law and feels no qualms over spilling the blood of innocents. Respect

for peace may be trampled by hatred and murder. Mr. Speaker, the world must not permit terrorism to become a legitimate way to gain international recognition.

The Palestinian Arabs have a right to have their voice heard. But the voice of an organization of mass murderers should not be heard.

The PLO does not seek peace between the nations of the Middle East but the destruction of a member state of the U.N. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East must be resolved through negotiation between the parties and I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning the audience given the PLO's unilateral demands backed by the use of violence and bloodshed against women and children.

WAGE-PRICE PLAN NEEDS SELECTIVITY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the article by Arnold R. Weber which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, November 10, outlines an approach to wage-price policies which deserves the attention of all those interested in economic stability in the United States.

The article follows:

WAGE-PRICE PLAN NEEDS SELECTIVITY

(By Arnold R. Weber)

Wage-price policies in the United States have now undergone 30 years of trial and error and it is fair to say that there has been as much of the latter as the former. Even without a systematic assessment of their effectiveness, several deficiencies can be cast in sharp relief.

First, there has been a consistent failure to develop arrangements for defining a national consensus concerning the objectives and rules of the game governing wage-price policies. Unfortunately, there is no evidence that advisory committees or pseudo-parliamentary conclaves achieve anything approaching a durable consensus.

Second, wage-price policies have suffered from an inability to achieve even-handed treatment of wages and prices. The imbalance has not been a matter of conscious design but has been a consequence of the particular administrative arrangements for the implementation of wage-price policies.

Wages have been most severely restrained under formal systems of control and prices have borne the brunt of government actions under informal programs. Each instance of differential treatment comes to be viewed as evidence of class oppression rather than as an effort to deal with economic power or market deficiencies in particular cases.

Third, the quest for a standard that is comprehensive, equitable and sufficiently precise for effective administration has been less than successful. By fastening on productivity as the dominant standard, the administration of wage-price policies has focused on wages, with action on prices as a subsequent step. Aside from problems of measurement, the relevance of productivity as a sensible basis for wage and price decisions in the short run is diminished as you move from the economy as a whole to untidy markets for specific goods and categories of labor.

Fourth, there has never been a sensible theory of coverage of wage-price policies. Presumably, wage-price policies emerged as

an attractive alternative because they could bridge the gap between the macro-economic policies that would sustain high levels of growth and employment for the economy as a whole and wage-price decisions in particular cases. These linkages have never been carefully identified. Consequently, wage-price policy administrators have turned almost reflexively to the same set of industries. If the steel industry didn't exist, it probably would have been invented for the convenience of the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Last, because the objectives, coverage and legal authority associated with wage-price policies have never been clearly established on a continuing basis, the organizational arrangements have had a consistent quality of improvisation.

Where does this analysis leave us and what alternatives may have promise? At the outset, the notion that wage-price policies can be global in nature and employed to control the general level of wages and prices in an effective manner should be rejected. Such an objective is misleading and administratively infeasible within the normal range of governmental activity in peacetime.

Instead, wage-price policies should be viewed as an instrument that can be applied selectively in particular product and labor market situations.

Within this more discriminating framework, selective controls will have two broad functions.

On the wage side, they would be concerned primarily with preventing distortions in the national wage structure. If wage movements have an autonomous inflationary effect, it is usually manifested through structural distortions which leverage the general level of wages as one union attempts to leapfrog another in its wage demands.

On the price side, administrative efforts would be concentrated on situations in which competition is limited by the organization of the market (as in health services), where a firm or industry can exploit temporary imbalances in supply and demand to reap economic rents (as in energy) and large, oligopolistic industries. Continued attention also would be given to those industries in which prices are strongly influenced by government actions and policies. Governmental price policies should not be viewed as an adequate substitute for the vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Selective controls also will relieve policy makers of the necessity for fashioning the consensus or "social compact" that is necessary to sustain a global program. If such a consensus is to be forthcoming, it is unlikely to be the product of advisory committees, summit conferences, or tripartite bodies. The task of defining a consensus is properly the obligation of the Congress and the Executive. The political system, and not some artificial assemblage of economic interest groups, must bear the burden for establishing a consensus, however fragile.

Meanwhile, wage and price policies can be exercised selectively without a supporting national compact because they will not be viewed as part of a strategy for the redistribution of power and income in society at large.

The selective approach also would relieve the sense of inequity arising from the inability to afford evenhanded treatment of labor and business within a global framework. To be sure, specific interests will feel either advantaged or disadvantaged by the imposition of selective wage-price policies. But, as a tactical and political matter, it is easier to deal with special interests than class interests. Experiences with the development of selective wage policies in the food distribution and construction industries in 1972-73 indicate that they can be maintained without arousing hostilities. In addition, by narrowing the focus of wage-price policies to

specific industries, full weight can be given to all relevant economic data rather than fixing on a single criterion such as productivity.

The task of developing a framework for selective wage-price policies and implementing them in specific cases should be given to a permanent Wage-Price Commission, independent of the Council of Economic Advisers. In the past, such a commission has been viewed with distaste.

It is best to recognize that efforts to influence wage and price decisions will be a permanent element in national economic policy making. It is significant that, four months after the Cost of Living Council was quietly laid to rest it was disinterred as the Council of Wage and Price Stability. A permanent commission will have a higher degree of public accountability for its actions, an accountability that often has been blurred or ignored in past exercises of wage-price policies.

Last, to the extent that expertise counts, a permanent Wage-Price Commission would be an institutional depository for expertise in devising and administering these programs. Otherwise, each crisis precipitates a frantic search for the few tired bureaucrats who were involved "the last time around."

The Wage-Price Commission would be established by statute. It would have the authority to review wage and price developments in individual industries, develop procedures for public hearings and, if necessary, apply mandatory controls. It is argued that, if the President has such authority, the political pressures to exercise it on a broad scale would be irresistible. This is especially likely if the Congress could badger the President without any involvement in the decisions.

This problem can be resolved by giving the President the right to impose selective controls subject to approval by the Congress within 15 to 30 days through the process of negative legislation. Also, where the authority exists on a permanent, legal basis, it is less likely to be the subject of promiscuous use. In too many cases, wage-price policies have been applied by employing the economic equivalent of political "dirty tricks."

If these arguments are not persuasive, then an additional proviso may be added limiting the exercise of the commission's authority to impose direct controls in any individual case to one year. The authority would expire after 12 months unless the commission demonstrated to Congress that the wage and price behavior of the units involved posed a continuing threat to economic stability.

All of this is rather unheroic, if not prosaic. But the experience of the past 30 years clearly indicates that the heroic concept of wage-price policies has not been realized. To some extent, our attitude toward such policies is still colored by notions of populist redistribution or Keynesian visions of full employment and price stability. It is time that we placed wage-price policies in a more modest, operational framework where their contributions may be more limited, but their failures less dispiriting.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TROLLEY MUSEUM

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, on August 25, 1974, I had the pleasure of participating in the dedication of Bicentennial car No. 4220 of the National Capital Trolley Museum, Wheaton, Md.

While streetcars may not be the first thing to come to mind when our Nation's Bicentennial is mentioned, car No. 4220 carries a lot of history, American and European.

Car No. 4220 was constructed in the shops of New York's Third Avenue Line in 1939, and gave 10 years of heavy urban service. Then, in 1949, as a part of Marshall plan aid, No. 4220 was sent to Vienna, Austria, to help restore that city's war-ravaged transit system. After another decade's faithful service, the National Capital Trolley Museum brought her back to the United States—streetcars have become almost impossible to obtain in this country—where she continues in active service.

But even here No. 4220's story does not end. For like our national Bicentennial, No. 4220 is an inspiration for the present and, hopefully, a guide for the future. In this era of escalating energy use and costs, and of concern for our environment, a transit system that produces negligible pollution and burns no oil has much to recommend it. Subway and commuter rail systems are expensive and require years for construction. The electric streetcar, once familiar in all of our cities and most of our towns, can provide today a light rail service to supplement heavy commuter facilities and as a primary transit service for smaller metropolitan areas.

In fact, the United States is witnessing a revival of interest in electric streetcars, and in the rehabilitation of those lines which survive. Old No. 4220 is not likely to return to the canyons of Manhattan, but in her Bicentennial livery she remains a working link to America's past, to our era of international involvement, and to our new concern with the quality of our life today.

THE FARM-RETAIL PRICE SPREAD

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have today urged President Gerald R. Ford to expedite the effort of the administration to determine if a conspiracy exists in the farm-retail price spread.

I presented to this Congress evidence that constituted cause for an investigation of the price levels received by producers and paid by consumers on the 17th day of May 1974. Since then a Federal court in California has substantiated my apprehension by a verdict against the A. & P. chain stores in the amount of \$32 million to be repaid to producers.

Today, witnesses from the national retail foodstore chains and the meat-packing industry testified before the Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee of the House Committee on Agriculture. It is interesting to note that these witnesses did not appear before our subcommittee until threatened by subpoena.

It is essential that the Members of this Congress be fully aware of the ever-

increasing spread of prices received by the farmers, feeders, and ranchers and the higher and higher prices paid by the consumers in the retail marketplace if legislation is to be enacted essential to the national conquest of inflation. The cost of living is the barometer that measures the rate of inflation that extends to all items of consumer necessity.

We must have the facts and we must convince the administration that the current situation in the food industry will not be tolerated by the Congress and the people of America.

"FREEDOM" SETBACK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will vote on the question of overriding the President's veto of H.R. 12471, the freedom of information amendments bill. I most strongly urge my colleagues to vote to override and thereby reverse the unwise action by the President. This is a truly bipartisan bill developed over 3 years, which passed the House overwhelmingly. I was deeply dismayed over the veto of this long needed bill to make Government more responsive to the people, and I was pleased to note that the Newark Star-Ledger, in an editorial in the issue of October 26, most effectively stated the case for enactment of the legislation, concluding that "the legislative care with which these amendments were prepared deserved presidential affirmation, not a veto." I include the entire editorial in the RECORD at this point:

"FREEDOM" SETBACK

The Freedom of Information Act passed in 1966 by Congress never achieved the full potential envisioned by its sponsors. It was designed to provide a broader public access to information about operations of government.

It has never worked out that way. The ways of bureaucracy are traditionally oriented toward secrecy and obscurity, an insularity that tragically breeds the seeds of a Watergate.

President Nixon's Administration—and the Johnson Administration to a lesser degree—made excessive use of executive privilege, the shield against needed public scrutiny. In a number of crucial aspects, it was used as a cover to keep the truth from the American people. The bombing of Cambodia stands as a graphic example.

But the bureaucracy itself has remained rigid and unyielding, despite the statutory provision toward a more open government. The easy access to information was thwarted by diversionary methods that resulted in long litigation or frustrating administrative delays.

Congress attempted to deal with these deficiencies with amendments that would make the law reasonably responsive. In sensitive areas such as military or counterintelligence, it would submit information classification to judicial review.

Regrettably, President Ford appears to have been overly influenced by an exaggerated concern on national security grounds, despite the safeguards written into the amendments by the legislative branch. In vetoing the legislation, he took the position

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that the courts should not be "forced to make what amounts to the initial classification in sensitive and complex areas where they have no particular expertise."

That's sheer nonsense. A federal judge would be just as circumspect about national security as a bureaucrat. In fact, the former would tend to be more cautious in sensitive areas.

Congress was similarly concerned. It carefully weighed the public right to information against the need of the government to withhold classified material. The legislative care with which these amendments were prepared deserved presidential affirmation, not a veto.

THE CATTLEMAN'S PLIGHT

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. McSPADEN. Mr. Speaker, quoted below is a letter of November 19, which sums up the situation of the Oklahoma—and the United States—cattle producer. The letter has been sent to Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz with a copy to President Ford. It is not a tale of crocodile tears—it is a brief summation of the facts. It deserves widespread dissemination and comprehension to save a vital factor of our Nation's economy:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: While in Oklahoma over the Recess I talked with countless livestock producers and needless to say the livestock industry is in its most pitiful plight since the early days of the depression in the 1930's.

I think our government's position hit a ridiculous high today when USDA market reports released here in Washington show that we are paying 60 cents a pound for foreign imported boned beef while domestic producers in our own country are getting 59 cents per pound for boned beef.

The recent restrictions on Canadian imported beef sound good but with a ten to \$12 per hundred weight higher priced for live animals in Canada this is only window dressing and will not help the plight of livestock producers.

I urge you to do everything in your power to immediately put a 60 day restriction on all beef imports as the ridiculous situation I pointed out that exists where our taxpayers are giving foreign livestock producers more money for boned beef than our producers are receiving.

I also urge you to instigate a program of:

- (1) A movement to stop importation of all meat into this country. The U.S. Department of Agriculture predicted that one billion, two hundred million pounds, 15 percent of U.S. consumption, would be imported in 1974. However, the USDA figures released this month show that one billion, one hundred and thirty-three million pounds of beef has been imported in the first six months of 1974, which will push the import figure substantially above predictions.

- (2) Create a broader understanding between the USDA, Capitol Hill, and beef producers.

- (3) Relate actual facts of the beef producer to the consuming public through the news media, personal appearances, et cetera.

- (4) Seek for immediate investigation into the prices paid beef producers and retail prices.

- (5) Initiate a canned meat program to use excess of killer cows and grass-fat steers.

- (6) Ask that more beef be used in school lunch programs.

November 19, 1974

(7) Ask for emergency interest rates to be applied to beef loans until market prices reach cost of production.

(8) Seek that all meats used by our armed forces are produced in this country. We have found that there exists numerous contracts with foreign countries.

Again, I urge you to do everything within your power to help this situation.

With warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

CLEM McSPADEN,
Member of Congress,
Oklahoma Second District.

KISSINGER IN INDIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, almost lost in the hectic pace of diplomatic maneuvering during Secretary of State Kissinger's recent swing to over 15 states in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East was a landmark speech delivered in New Delhi, India, before the Indian Council on World Affairs on October 28, 1974.

Two aspects of that speech deserve particular attention. First, Secretary Kissinger stressed in a new and persuasive manner that the United States now accepts nonalignment and that "America sees a world of free, independent, sovereign states as being decidedly in its own national interest." This theme represents a significant departure in American foreign policy and a clear, explicit, and positive acceptance of a longstanding foreign policy principle espoused by many developing states, a principle which was, at various times in the past, actively opposed by some American leaders because it was considered to be against American interests overseas.

Second, Secretary Kissinger provides in his speech important evidence and a reaffirmation of the U.S. continued desire for a more mature relationship with India and closer cooperation in many fields of mutual interest. United States-Indian relations have come a long way since the events surrounding the birth of Bangladesh, some 3 years ago. This speech is an important part of this process of improving the environment in which these two large democracies interact. It is significant that this process has taken its course without, in any way, jeopardizing the U.S. interests in or good relations with many other friendly South Asian states.

Secretary Kissinger's speech in India follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE HENRY A. KISSINGER, SECRETARY OF STATE

Dr. Bharat Ram, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am honored to be invited to address such a distinguished gathering for the basic objective of this Organization—to comprehend, communicate and help shape the state of world affairs—has been the central purpose of my own life since long before I served in Government. And I since have found that the statesman, too, has no more important task.

Former President Radhakrishnan once said, "Life becomes meaningful only when we grasp the character of the age we live in, see its significance, understand the objec-

tives it sets for us and strive to realize them."

The fundamental reality of our age is that we live in a world inextricably linked by interdependent economies and universal aspirations, by the speed of communications and the specter of nuclear war. The political lessons of our age is that the national interest can no longer be defined or attained in isolation from the global interest, and the moral challenge of our age is to free ourselves from the narrow perception of the nation state and to shape a conception of global community.

A NEW WORLD

The three years since I was in New Delhi have seen profound changes in the relationship between India and the United States, in the whole region and in the world.

On my last trip to South Asia I paid my first visit to Peking. On this trip I have visited Moscow. Moving about among capitals only recently considered hostile is a new pattern for the United States. It signified the transition from a bipolar world locked in confrontation and seemingly destined for some final encounter to the new world of dispersed power and reduced tension.

This changed environment is more complex and therefore, for some, less assuring. Yet we see it as a world of hope. For the process of detente among major powers has not made the world more complex; it merely signifies that leaders have recognized its complexity. Those who ought always to have known how serious is man's predicament have learned how little benefit confrontation brings and how absolute is the need for cooperation.

This has not been an effortless transition for the American people. Nor is it without difficulties in other nations of the world, for it requires coming to terms with less simple views of right and wrong, of the possible and the ideal than have permeated political thinking for a generation.

This new American view, it is appropriate to acknowledge, owes much to an old vision of India's national leaders. Jawaharlal Nehru perceived the impermanence of the post-war world—into which India was born—of frozen hostility between the superpowers and their insistent efforts to enlist other nations on one side or the other. Under Nehru and since, India sought to deflect, to moderate and to redirect those forces. This was the origin of the concept of nonalignment.

It is not necessary to debate now whether the United States should have welcomed the concept at that time in order to agree that in the present world it is not nations such as India an altogether understandable and practical position. The United States accepts nonalignment. In fact, America sees a world of free, independent, sovereign states as being decidedly in its own national interest. Support of national independence and of the diversity that goes with it has become a central theme of American foreign policy.

Nowhere is this clearer than with respect to South Asia, where a fifth of mankind lives. In testimony before the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee six weeks ago, I stated this principle of American foreign policy in explicit terms: "We do not look at the Subcontinent as being composed of some countries that are clients of China, others that are clients of the Soviet Union, others that should be clients of the United States. We believe that we can have productive relationships with all of them. And we believe also, specifically with respect to India, that our relations are in a stage of dramatic improvement."

The warming of our bilateral relations has been increasingly manifest for some time. It began inevitably as the Simla process began, and it has proceeded and strengthened as that process has proceeded and strengthened. For it was conflict with the Subcontinent that brought the involvement of out-

siders in the first place. And correspondingly, the region's political capacity to resolve regional conflict has, to a considerable degree, diminished outside involvement. President Ford has asked me to affirm that the United States strongly supports the efforts of peaceful settlement on the Subcontinent, free of imposition, or pressure or outside interference. We want political stability and economic success for South Asia. That is what we believe South Asians hope for, and what the rest of the world should hope for as well.

The statesmanship of all of South Asia's leaders has been at the heart of this process. It has taken great courage to persevere toward the goal agreed upon by Pakistan and India at the Simla Conference in 1972: "The promotion of friendly and harmonious relationship and the establishment of a durable peace in the Subcontinent."

The size and position of India give it a special role of leadership in South Asian and in world affairs. They confer on it at the same time the special responsibility for accommodation and restraint that strength entails. The United States recognizes both these realities. They are wholly compatible with the close friendships and special bonds we have with all the nations of the region. As we wish South Asia well, we wish India well.

Thus a more mature and durable relationship is emerging between India and the United States—one which leaves behind the peaks and valleys of the past.

Both India and the United States still consider themselves youthful nations. The restlessness, the striving and the ideals of our people attest to the reality of that image. But a basic quality of youth—enthusiasm unseasoned by experience—often caused us to assume or expect too much. We are two great nations of independent judgment and perspective; often our zeal and moral convictions have led us into disagreements with a passion that might not have been present had we not been conscious of similar ideals.

For a quarter of a century our relations tended to oscillate between high expectation and deep suspicion. The low point occurred in 1971 when a basic disagreement flowed from different political judgments. We faced these differences candidly; that crisis is now behind us. We have surmounted past strains and moved ahead with promise. We can now build our relationship free of past distortions and conscious of the interests and values we share.

From the events of the past—from our experience with the world as well as yours—we have both developed a more balanced view. Both of us independently have come to temper our zeal and understand limitations on our ability to bend the world to our expectations. In parallel with this, in our relations with each other we both stress the basic compatibility of our interests. This promises to provide a durable basis for cooperation and friendship.

AMERICA'S PURPOSES

For our new relationship to thrive, a great deal depends on our mutual understanding. Nations face different problems and different opportunities—their perspectives and power inevitably vary. Let me therefore briefly sketch America's broader purposes—especially as they have evolved in recent years in a changing international environment.

Around the world today, the new and the old coexist in uneasy equilibrium. The frozen international landscape of the past quarter century has begun to thaw but we have yet to put a durable structure of cooperation in its place. A new era of stability has begun in Europe and Asia, while chronic disputes in the Middle East and Indochina still endanger regional and global peace. The United States and the Soviet Union have perceived a common interest in avoiding nuclear holocaust, while some potential for conflict per-

sists and the arsenals of the two sides continue to grow. The United States and the People's Republic of China has succeeded in overcoming two decades of estrangement, but important differences in philosophy remain. And as the old blocs among old powers decline, new blocs among new nations threaten to emerge.

The United States sees its central task today as helping the world to shape a new pattern of stability, justice and international cooperation. We have rejected the old extremes of world policeman and isolation. But we recognize that America's principles, strength and resources imposed upon us a special responsibility.

Our goal is to move toward a world where power blocs and balances are not dominant, where justice not stability can be our overriding preoccupation, where countries consider cooperation in the global interest to be in their national interest. For all that has been achieved, we must realize that we have taken only the first hesitant steps on a long and arduous road.

The United States has three principal policy objectives:

First, America has sought to foster a new spirit of responsibility and restraint among all powers.

The cornerstone of our foreign policy is—as it has been for a generation—our partnership with our Atlantic allies and Japan. These bonds have served both the world's peace and its prosperity. Our cooperation provided a solid foundation for efforts to reduce tensions with our adversaries. It has enabled us to contribute to world economic growth. And the nations which provide the industrial, financial and technological sinews of the global economy now share a heavy collective responsibility to concert their efforts in a time of global economic stress.

In the last five years the United States has also sought to put its relations with the Communist powers on a new and steady basis.

Since the dawn of the nuclear age, man's fears of holocaust and his hopes for peace have turned on the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. Never before have two nations had the physical ability to annihilate civilization. Never before has it been so important that the two nuclear giants maintain close contact with one another to avoid conflicts which would menace other nations as much as themselves.

Progress has been achieved in our relationship with the Soviet Union which would have been unthinkable a decade ago. We take the easing of tensions for granted only at the risk of the return of confrontation. In my discussions in Moscow I stated yet again the determination of the American Government to maintain the momentum of the process of detente, and was assured by the Soviet leaders that they shared this intention. The United States will persevere to reduce military competition with the Soviet Union in all its aspects; to ensure that our political competition is guided by principles of restraint especially in moments of crisis; and to move beyond restraint to cooperation in helping find lasting solutions to chronic conflicts.

American's relations with the People's Republic of China are also of fundamental importance. There cannot be a stable peace in Asia—or in the world—without a pattern of peaceful international relationships that includes this powerful and talented nation. It was essential to end a generation of mutual isolation and hostility.

Yet rapprochement with the People's Republic of China is not sought at the expense of any other nations; on the contrary, it attempts to serve a wider purpose. The principles of the Shanghai Communiqué commit our two nations to respect the independence, sovereignty and integrity of all countries as we work to improve our own relationships.

Our relations with the non-aligned countries are another pillar of our foreign policy. No accommodation among countries, however powerful, can be durable if negotiated over the heads of others or if an attempt is made to impose it on others. Our attitude toward the non-aligned will be based on the principles of equality, mutual respect and shared endeavors and on the premise that all countries have a stake in a peaceful world. Condominium, hegemony, spheres of influence are historically obsolete and morally and politically untenable.

It is a corollary of this, however, that bloc diplomacy of any kind is anachronistic and self-defeating. We see a danger of new patterns of alignment that are as artificial, rigid and ritualistic as the old ones.

The issues the world faces are so urgent that they must be considered on their merits, on the basis of their implications for humanity, and for world peace—rather than on some abstract notion of ideological or bloc advantage. In a real sense the world is no longer divided between East and West, North and South, developed and developing, consumer and producer. We will solve our problems together or we will not solve them at all.

Second, America seeks to limit and ultimately to reduce nuclear weapons competition.

The relaxation of international tensions cannot survive an unrestrained arms race by the two strongest nuclear powers. And international stability will be seriously jeopardized by the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This is why the United States has made it a major objective to bring about a more stable nuclear environment.

The Strategic Arms Limitations Talks are among the most crucial negotiations ever conducted. The agreements already signed by the United States and the Soviet Union represent a major step toward strategic stability. They placed a permanent limit on defensive weapons and an interim limit on offensive nuclear weapons. Our task now is to control the qualitative as well as quantitative advance of weapons. We seek a long-term agreement which would establish stable ceilings and other restraints, from which we could begin the long-sought process of arms reductions. Progress in this direction was made during my recent talks in Moscow.

At the same time, a world in which an ever-increasing number of nations possess nuclear weapons vastly magnified the risks of both regional and global conflict. And proliferation complicates—if it does not inhibit—international cooperation in the peaceful uses of the atom.

Last month at the United Nations I proposed a comprehensive global effort. The United States is of the view that countries capable of exporting nuclear technology should agree to common restraints on a multilateral basis which would further the peaceful, but inhibit the military uses of nuclear power. We take seriously India's affirmation that it has no intention to develop nuclear weapons. But India of course has the capability to export nuclear technology; it therefore has an important role in this multilateral endeavor. Needless to say, the United States does not ask other countries for restraint on the export of nuclear materials and technology which it is not prepared to apply to itself. We will work vigorously with others on the practical steps which should be taken to limit the dangers of the atom while furthering its potential for human good.

A third objective of American policy is to build global cooperation to meet unprecedented global problems.

The traditional agenda of international affairs—the balance among major powers, the security of nations—no longer defines our perils or our possibilities. To some extent we have mastered many of the familiar chal-

lenges of diplomacy. Yet suddenly we are witnessing a new threat to the governability of national societies and to the structure of international stability. A crisis threatens the world's economic system. The industrialized nations see decades of prosperity in jeopardy; the developing countries see hopes for development and progress shattered or postponed indefinitely. And even the newly wealthy oil producers are beginning to perceive that their recent gains will be swept away in a global crisis.

The dangers are as self-evident for the United States as they are for India and other countries: rates of inflation unknown in the past quarter century; financial institutions staggering under the most massive and rapid movements of reserves in history; and profoundly disturbing questions about the ability to meet man's most fundamental needs for energy and food.

This is not a conventional political problem, which can be dealt with by conventional diplomacy or on the basis of conventional premises of social and economic theory. It affects all countries and groups. There is no gain for one at the expense of another. Piecemeal solutions offer no hope: a global enterprise is imperative. No nation or bloc of nations can impose its narrow interests without tearing the fabric of international cooperation. Whatever our ideological belief or social structure, we are part of a single international system on which our national objectives depend. Our common destiny is now not a slogan; it is an unmistakable reality.

The United States is prepared to dedicate itself in practical ways to this global effort. At the World Food Conference next week we will offer a comprehensive program as our contribution to freeing mankind from the eternal struggle for sustenance. We recognize that America's agricultural productivity, advanced technology, and tradition of assistance represent a major obligation. We know that we cannot speak of the global responsibility of others without practicing global responsibility ourselves. America pioneered in development assistance, particularly with respect to food; we are determined to step up our past contributions. We will increase our production at home so there will be more food available for shipment abroad. And we will help developing nations increase their own production which is the only long-term solution to the problem.

The magnitude of the world's food needs—and the redistribution of the world's wealth—imply that others must enlist in the fight against famine. The United States will work cooperatively with other exporters, with food importers, and with those countries in a position to help finance increased food production in the developing countries.

But it is an objective fact that we cannot meet man's need for food, much less ensure economic and social advance, without coming to grips with the energy crisis. Higher oil prices directly affect food prices by increasing the costs of fertilizer, of operating agricultural machinery, and of transporting food to deficit areas. This in turn contributes to the more general economic crisis of inflation and stagnation which will surely doom the ability of the economically advanced countries to fulfill their obligations to the less well-endowed. Both consumers and producers have a parallel stake in a global economy that is stable and growing. The economic progress of thirty years has brought the goal of universal well-being closer; today's crisis puts it in jeopardy. This is why the United States has emphasized global interdependence and seeks cooperative global solutions.

THE UNITED STATES AND INDIA

The American purposes I have described are, we believe, consistent with India's purposes. We are nations whose values and aspirations are so similar that our disputes are

often in the nature of a family quarrel. We have no conflict of interest, no basic animosity or disagreement that keeps us apart. And we face a world in crisis and transition, that compels us to work together.

We are both democracies, with all that implies for the kinds of decisions we are able to make. The leaders of a democracy can only sustain policies which their electorate will support. If there are no general rules as to what such policies are likely to be, there are specific limitations as to what they cannot be. It is clear that our relationship cannot be based—in either country—on the dependence of one on the other. Nor can our relationship survive constant criticism of one by the other in all international forums. There must be a sense of common purposes in at least some endeavors. To India-American relations equality and mutual respect are more than doctrines of international law. They are political necessities.

In the past year or two we have removed major obstacles to an improved relationship. Our energies are now focused on the positive content of our relationship. Even more importantly, we find once again that as two great nations we share certain aspirations for the world at large: We share a concern for cooperative solutions to man's fundamental needs.

The present crisis confronting both developed and developing nations reveals all too clearly the world's past failure to address global problems on a truly cooperative basis. India and the United States have much to contribute. The world's best minds must be mobilized, and India has the third largest pool of scientific talent while the United States has the first. We must apply the great economic strength of our two nations; the United States has the largest industrial output in the world and India the tenth largest. Our economies are complementary; the fact that India is only the 26th largest trading partner of the United States reveals what potential is yet untapped.

The joint commission we are establishing—for scientific, cultural and economic cooperation—provides a new means to match our resources with our challenges. It is the symbol of the new area of equality, and the United States stands ready to expand the concept of the joint commission into other areas.

We share a concern for economic development.

It is impossible to visit South Asia without being deeply affected by the plight of so many of the peoples of this region. Individual hopes for survival and national aspirations for development have been dealt a cruel blow by the crises in energy, food and inflation.

The American people want to be helpful, while avoiding the dependence we both reject. Earlier this year, the United States wrote off the largest amount of foreign debt ever cancelled in history. This year the United States will launch a modest bilateral aid program. A substantial portion of our multilateral aid already comes to India. Our new food program, which I will outline at the World Food Conference next week, will be of particular relevance to India.

We share a concern for world peace. Neither India nor the United States will ever be satisfied with a world of chronic conflicts, uneasy truces and offsetting blocs. We have a joint interest in a comprehensive, institutionalized peace, based not merely on a balance of forces but on a sense of justice.

In recent months our dialogue on the entire range of global concerns has assumed a new frequency and depth. Our consultation has defined areas where we agree and narrowed those where we do not. We have found anew the basis for collaboration in many areas.

Tagore wrote with foresight: "During the evolution of the nation the moral culture of

brotherhood was limited by geographic boundaries, because at that time those boundaries were true. Now they have become imaginary lines of tradition divested of the qualities of real obstacles. So the time has come when man's moral nature must deal with this fact with all seriousness or perish.

The time has come for nations to act on this vision. Let there be hope rather than despair, creativity rather than disarray. The recognition and understanding of our problems are clearly emerging; we have the technical means to solve them. And the urgency of our talks impels us.

Half a century ago, Mahatma Gandhi wrote that we must launch "experiments with truth." In this spirit, let us resolve to strengthen the new beginnings between India and America. Let us build a relationship that can endure and serve common ends for a long time. Let us make our contribution to help mankind match its capacity to its challenges for the benefit of our two peoples and of all mankind.

CHAIRMAN OF JOINT CHIEFS SHOULD BE REMOVED

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday it was reported that Gen. George S. Brown, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had claimed at Duke University that American foreign policy in the Middle East was a result of "Jewish influence," influence made possible because the Jews "own the banks in this country, the newspapers."

I was stunned and outraged at the ignorant bigotry displayed by General Brown, and immediately sent the following telegram to President Ford asking him to relieve General Brown of his command:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have just read of General George S. Brown's irrational and appalling remarks on Jews and American policy in the Middle East.

General Brown's statements about "Jewish influence" over foreign policy through ownership of banks and newspapers are not only utterly false, but smack of vicious and ignorant anti-semitism. They further demonstrate a lack of understanding of this nation's commitment to Israel, a commitment rooted in America's respect for freedom and our need to have a reliable democratic ally in the Middle East. Finally, blaming American Jews for the energy crisis is not only false, stupid and irresponsible, but offensive to the overwhelming majority of Americans who have long supported this country's commitment to Israel.

General Brown's gross ignorance and flagrant bigotry show that he is unfit to serve as this nation's chief military officer. He ought to be relieved of his command forthwith.

Respectfully,

(S) ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN,
Member of Congress.

I must add, Mr. Speaker, that General Brown's subsequent unconvincing disclaimers and inept apologies show no understanding of what made his remarks so offensive to all Americans who have supported U.S. policy in the Middle East. I urge President Ford again to dismiss him.

ABBREVIATIONS IN GOVERNMENT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for years the Congress has been guilty of adding one layer above the other to the extent where we must honestly wonder at the great waste in duplication and counterproduction in Government programs. An added frustration is divisiveness in Government agencies to adopt abbreviations which often defie the occasional student of bureaucracy science.

A column by Mike O'Neal of the Harvey Star-Tribune addresses this subject in a very fascinating fashion. His article of November 10 follows:

CSSMTD, UMTA, IDOT, Etc.

(By Mike O'Neal)

Abbreviations are about to take over the world.

Words are on the way out, there's no doubt about it. In the future, we'll all be talking in capital letters.

This realization crept up on me as I was working on a Chicago South Suburban Mass Transit district (CSSMTD) story. Involved in the discussion at the CSSMTD meeting were the Illinois Central Gulf (ICG) railroad, South Suburban SafeWay lines (SSWL), the Urban Mass Transportation administration (UMTA) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT).

Lurking on the sidelines of any mass transportation discussion nowadays is the Regional Transportation authority (RTA) along with such planning agencies as the Northeastern Illinois Planning commission (NIPC), the Chicago Area Transportation study (CATS) and the Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning commission (NIRPC). NIRPC, by the way, used to be known at the Lake-Porter Counties Regional Transportation and Planning commission (LPCRTPC).

When talking about urban mass transportation in the Chicago area, you naturally have to include the Chicago Transit authority (CTA) and commuter railroads such as the Chicago and Northwestern (C&NW), the Burlington Northern (BN), the Rock Island (RI), the Milwaukee road (MILW), the Chicago South Shore and South Bend (CSS&SB), the Norfolk and Western (N&W) and the Penn Central (PC). In the north suburbs, there's a bus line known as the United Motor Coach company (UMC).

There's also the CSSMTD's sister suburban transit districts, such as the West Suburban Mass Transit district (WSMTD), the North Suburban Mass Transit district (NSMTD) and the Northwest Suburban Mass Transit district (NWSMTD).

If you want to expand the discussion beyond the Chicago metropolitan area, you have to include such transit systems as the Bay Area Transit (BART), the Metropolitan Atlanta Regional Transportation authority (MARTA) and the New York City Metropolitan Transit authority (NYCMTA).

Keeping the discussion down to a local level, perhaps, some freight-carrying railroads would be mentioned such as the Chicago and Eastern Illinois (C&EI), the Louisville and Nashville (L&N), the Indiana Harbor Belt (IHB), the Grand Trunk Western (GTW) and the Baltimore and Ohio Chicago Terminal (B&OCT).

More than likely, a story about the CSSMTD will include mention of the extension of ICG commuter service to Governors State university (GSU) in Park Forest South (PFS). The developer of PFS, New Commu-

nity Enterprises (NCE), is also usually mentioned.

But, let's not put all the blame on the abbreviationization of the English language on transportation units. Education is a big contributor.

In addition to the above mentioned GSU, the local area contains such education institutions as Thornton Community college (TOC), Prairie State college (PSC) and Moraine Valley Community college (MVCC). Of course, there's numerous elementary and high school districts (SD). There's also Thornton Township high school (TTHS).

Special education co-operatives have some of the best abbreviations such as Exceptional Children Have Opportunities (ECHO), Special Education Co-operative of South Cook county (SPEED) and the South Metropolitan Association for Low Incidence Handicapped (SMA).

Teachers organizations have a tendency to be known by their initials, such as the Illinois Education association (IEA) and the Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT). The IFT is affiliated with the AFL-CIO, which almost nobody calls by its full name, the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Local affiliates of the IEA also tend toward abbreviations, such as the Harvey Education association (HEA) in District 152, the District Education association (DEA) in District 151 and the Classroom Teachers association (CTA) in District 149.

Of course, the IEA and the IFT are affiliated on the national level with the National Education association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

When writing about educational matters, title funds under the federal Elementary and Secondary Education association (ESEA) are also mentioned along with such matters as average daily attendance (ADA). Special education stories often mention Educable Mentally Handicapped (EMH) persons.

In District 151, there's an organization called Volunteers in Service to Our Neighborhood (VISION).

Higher education in Illinois includes such institutions as Northern Illinois university (NIU), Southern Illinois university (SIU), Western Illinois university (WIU), Eastern Illinois university (EIU), Illinois State university (ISU), Chicago State university (CSU) and the University of Illinois (U of I).

Local civic action organizations also enjoy identity by abbreviations such as the Human Action Community organization (HACO), Citizens Organized to Protect the Environment (COPE), the Independent Voters of Illinois (IVI) and the League of Women Voters (LWV).

Governmental agencies often have long titles that are better understood when abbreviated such as the Calumet Union Drainage district (CUDD) or the Environmental Protection agency (EPA).

Complicated issues such as the RTA or the Equal Rights amendment (ERA) are also reduced to mere abbreviations in this day and age.

But, enough of this. I have to write a feature story about the ICG's new Passenger Assistance Link (PAL) system, which is part of the railroad's Automatic Revenue Collection system (ARCS).

THE 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 19, 1974

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

fact that November 18 marked the 56th anniversary of the Latvian declaration of independence. While we enjoy our freedom, we must remember that there are many in the world who are denied freedom and self-government.

As a result of centuries long struggle, the Latvian people gained their independence in 1918. The Latvian people then enjoyed a brief respite of freedom in which they enjoyed unparalleled economic and cultural growth. The freedom of this proud people was devastated when the Soviet army invaded and occupied their nation. Today, 24 years later, the Latvian people are still paying the price of their colonization and domination by a foreign government.

The United States has a proud heritage of defending a peoples' right to freedom. We must continue to insist that all people be free to govern themselves and, on this day, we must remember that the Latvian people do not have that right.

THE SO-CALLED ALLEGED DÉTENTE WITH TYRANNICAL COMMUNIST REGIMES AND ATHEISTIC RED LEADERS SUCH AS MAO TSE-TUNG, BREZHNEV, AND GIEREK IS RIDICULOUS

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure our loyal friends, the anti-Communist Chinese, that during the present period of uncertainty they are not being forgotten.

With the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty 63 years ago the people of China began the task of shaping their nation into a republic. Taking the best points from their own heritage, one of the world's richest, they combined them with the concepts of Western democracy. The struggles they endured to build this new republic were, and continued to be, Herculean tasks. Setbacks dealt the Republic of China would have laid low many of their adversaries but only served as stimuli to the Chinese people to strengthen their resolution to make their nation a great republic.

When the Communists took over the mainland of China in 1949 the so-called "China experts" predicted the demise of the Republic of China on Taiwan within a couple of years at the most. The facts of today show how these "experts" had grossly miscalculated the desire of the Chinese people. Since about 1950 the Nationalist Government, the Republic of China, has made considerable progress. From the status of a war-ruined, agricultural society in 1950, Taiwan today stands as one of the most industrially-advanced countries of Asia whose people enjoy a high standard of living. Today, in terms of gross national product and per capita income, it ranks ahead of most Asian countries.

The United States is a major trading partner with the Nationalist Government, the Republic of China, and pri-

vate American firms have invested in that country. Economic predictions are for the Nationalist anti-Communist Republic of China to have another increase in foreign trade this year.

These facts are realities that must be taken into account as consideration is being given to whether or not this Government of ours should increase trade with the red Communists running the alleged People's Republic on the Chinese mainland. Supporters of "unlocking the doors" between the United States and red Communist China should meditate very carefully on what such a policy denotes. Let us take a look at two important points. The first of these points was discussed by our friend Madame Chiang Kai-shek during an interview with a correspondent from the Chinese Central News Agency in August of this year, when she made the following statement:

The "unlocking" of the doors of the mainland would indeed be a very good thing were it true. Unlocking the doors means free egress and ingress. First, let us talk about egress. The pity of it all is that it is only a theoretical "unlocking" for we all know that in egress no compatriots of ours are permitted to leave the country and their enforced serfdom. The only ones that leave the mainland escape by swimming to Hongkong, or Communist functionaries who are sent out as so-called diplomats, trade officials, or those on special tasks or missions and even they move about in threes or more to prevent their decamping and asking for asylum from the "decadent" countries wherever they are stationed or to the "decadent" West.

As to ingress, I can quote from extremely impartial sources. We all have heard of and about the well-known sinologist Lord Michael Lindsay. We also know over the years where his sympathy lies, yet he has become so disenchanted with the Maoist regime after his visit together with his wife to the mainland last summer.

According to Lord Lindsay, (1) All diplomatic missions in Peiping are completely isolated, incapable of obtaining information other than that printed in the "People's Daily"; (2) Only Australians certified by the Australian Communist Party as loyal to the Communist cause would be given visas by the Chinese Communist "Embassy" in Canberra.

Lady Lindsay, herself a Chinese, came to the conclusion that the present-day Peiping regime is "more threatening and ferocious than a tiger." Lord Lindsay further charged that all Chinese people on the mainland are poverty-stricken, except Mao and his cohorts and cadres. And the people do not even have the freedom not to speak.

Keeping in mind Madame Chiang's definition of unlocking the doors, let us now consider title IV of H.R. 10710, the Trade Reform Act. As you remember, Congress was asked to give the President the authority to extend nondiscriminatory—most favored nation—tariff treatment to Communist countries. This House of Representatives provided for such authority but it required that it not be given to a country unless that country permitted freedom of emigration. Moreover, the House of Representatives withdrew existing authority the President had to extend U.S. Government credit or credit guarantees to Communist countries not eligible for most-favored-nation tariff treatment. The relaxing of tensions between nations is a two-way street and

we must decide whether to base our decisions on facts or on the predictions of the so-called China experts who have a very low batting average.

I do not want to leave with you the impression that the only reason we appreciate the friendship of the people of the Nationalist Republic of China is because of the trading aspect. Our friendship and respect for one another go much deeper. During the previously mentioned interview Madame Chiang referred to this friendship. Her comments read as follows:

Could anyone with a modicum of intelligence ever honestly think that establishing formal relations with a repressive regime can mean that the Chinese people on the mainland will turn instantly from being 'enemies' of the United States into 'friends' of the United States? I say categorically that there is no such thing as instant friendship as instant coffee. On the contrary, the Chinese people are friends of the American people of long standing despite the Communist regime. In fact, reason and factual reports from refugees fleeing the Maoist tyranny tell us that the Chinese people resent and are bitter towards the U.S. detent and the establishment of closer liaison between the two governments because the people feel that the U.S. is putting the stamp of approval on their enslavement.

In point of fact they feel that the United States by so doing is helping the Maoist cabal to enchain them with redemption set further away from achievement. They also feel that the United States is dealing a psychologically lethal blow to their emancipation from servitude. This I know is not the purpose nor the wish of the American people but this is how millions upon millions of my compatriots feel. The millions upon millions of refugees who were fortunate enough to flee to safety and are in Hongkong and elsewhere are each and very one a living testament of that cruel tyrannical rule. I can do nothing but to report the facts as they are.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel that Madame Chiang—in her final statement of the hereinbefore mentioned interview—more than adequately summed up the facts in the case when she stated:

The evidence is all there for us to see. Need I say more?

TIME TO CLEAR THE AIR ON BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL EDUCATION

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, there are as many as 5 million children in the schools of America whose chances for success are slight because they have come from homes where Spanish, Italian, Greek, Chinese, or American Indian languages are spoken. It is bad enough that they cannot keep pace with their English-speaking peers because of inability to understand the language of instruction, but worse, in many States it has been illegal until recently to conduct basic education in any other but the English language.

In an attempt to meet the educational needs of these children, we have had a Federal bilingual education authorization since 1968, but only a small fraction of the required funds have been made

available through this authority. Far greater efforts must be made if we are to end the high dropout and failure rates—over 50 percent for Spanish-speaking children alone—that characterize these neglected minorities whose deficiencies in English can become a permanent liability in life.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that to deny children who are not native-English speaking the benefits of bilingual programs is a "mockery of public education." The New York City Board of Education recently agreed in Federal court to provide bilingual classes for all Spanish-speaking students in its schools by September of 1975. And some State legislatures have moved to implement bilingual programs through appropriation of State funds.

It is clear by now that equal educational opportunity cannot be a reality if all children do not at least enter the race from the same starting line. Acceptance is slowly growing for the notion that bilingual/bicultural education is the only fair solution for those youngsters from families in which English is not the native tongue.

Yet despite the overwhelming evidence of the need for the program, attacks on the concept of bilingual education still surface from time to time in the national press. One of the most virulent of these was a column by Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers, in the November 3 New York Times.

Under the guise of supporting bilingual education, Mr. Shanker has leveled charges that could ultimately erode public support for the program. If Shanker's charge is true that teachers are being hired for bilingual programs who speak little English, then the practice must be stopped. If his claim that children are being forced into bilingual classes can be proven, then that too must end. And if, as he states, children are not being taught English in the bilingual curriculum, this too needs to be remedied immediately.

But if these and similar charges are untrue, then that must be made clear and the attacks on an essential educational program must cease. It is my intention to offer Mr. Shanker a forum for his allegations through hearings which I have requested Chairman PERKINS of the Education and Labor Committee to authorize. If there are abuses in the program, that will be the appropriate time to name names and places so that we can take remedial action in the interests of the education of the youngsters in our schools. If the charges are not true, that will be established through the same forum.

Mr. Speaker, I append a copy of my letter to Chairman PERKINS requesting early hearings on this matter. Also attached is a letter from the executive administrator of the New York City Board's office of bilingual education, Mr. Hernan LaFontaine, pointing out that none of Mr. Shanker's allegations have ever been brought to the attention of the appropriate officials and that the board's licensing procedures preclude abuses such as those described in the Times article.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 4, 1974.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and
Labor, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Yesterday's New York Times carried a column prepared by Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers, regarding the bilingual education program. This item describes what Mr. Shanker feels are some shortcomings of the bilingual education program. Further, it contains a number of rather serious charges concerning the manner in which this program is being carried out in New York City. A copy of the column is enclosed for your information.

In view of the statements made by Mr. Shanker I believe it would be most important for the General Education Subcommittee to conduct an investigation into the manner in which the bilingual education program is being conducted in New York City. Such an official inquiry should require testimony from Mr. Shanker as to his various charges. Also, we would be able to receive testimony from Chancellor Irving Anker, Hernan La Fontaine, executive administrator of the Board of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and representatives from groups such as the Public Education Association.

I suggest that these one-days hearings be held as soon as possible, such as the week of November 25. I would be pleased to provide whatever help I can in arranging these hearings. In any event I feel the claims made about bilingual education in the City of New York require the prompt and most thorough examination by the Congress and I hope you will give this recommendation full and careful consideration.

Sincerely,

HERMAN BADILLO,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION,
Brooklyn, N.Y., November 4, 1974.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
Member of Congress, Bronx, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BADILLO: The New York Sunday Times of November 3, 1974 carried a column by Mr. Albert Shanker, President of the United Federation of Teachers, which I consider to be inaccurate and inflammatory. I feel I must bring this matter to your attention since you are a member of the House of Representatives' Education Committee and because of your role as a forceful advocate of bilingual education.

The theme for Mr. Shanker's column purports to reflect a position of favor and support for bilingual education. But, as has occurred in the past, the content of his message serves only to create further fear, resistance, and hostility regarding bilingual education. As usual, no specific data is provided to substantiate the allegations made by Mr. Shanker. Instead, a series of generalities are presented in quasi-factual language with the intention of leaving the impression that the allegations are indeed gospel truth. I am particularly disturbed that Mr. Shanker states that in many cases children participating in bilingual programs are receiving no instruction in English. This is clearly not true. The very nature and definition of bilingual education require that students learn the English language. In the same manner the implementation of bilingual programs is most successfully carried out through the utilization of bilingual teachers. It is simply ridiculous to state that bilingual teachers performing in our bilingual programs do not speak English. No such case has ever been brought to my attention. In fact, licensing procedures for bilingual teachers require that candidates demonstrate proficiency in English as well as in Spanish.

I write this letter not only to refute these

allegations, but to enlist your aid in obligating Mr. Shanker to either substantiate these charges with factual evidence or to cease from publishing any further material which can only lead to an acrimonious polarization of our communities. I certainly am most willing to work in a reasonable and cooperative manner toward the resolution of some of the real problems in the "how" of bilingual education. I will not tolerate, however, the dissemination of unsubstantiated allegations and outright prevarications. I trust all of us involved in promoting quality bilingual programs will have your support in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

HERNAN LA FONTAINE,
Executive Administrator.

TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT AND ENERGY POLICY

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, one of the new tools the Congress has to provide it with expertise and technical information is the Office of Technology Assessment. The assistance provided by this office lessens the dependence of the Congress on the executive branch for information and data, enabling Congress to play a more independent and effective role in developing policy. My distinguished colleague from California, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., has written an article explaining the importance of technology assessment for energy policy, and I would like to share his article with my colleagues:

NEW TECHNOLOGY: LET'S LOOK BEFORE
LEAPING

(By GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.)

Now that the Administration's blueprint for Project Independence has been released, energy policy is being debated once again. That's why the American people ought to know just how little the government has done toward assessing the social, economic, demographic and environmental impacts of the various energy options.

The forthcoming decisions on energy may be the most important our country has made in generations. What we do may have repercussions for decades.

Yet the Project Independence blueprint provides no real estimate of the full range of effects of any of the choices considered. Indeed, the document released this week serves to remind us once again that the United States glaringly lacks an institutionalized means of conducting a thorough assessment before allowing any new technological system to be realized.

We have had many examples of national policy decisions that, once made, have had far-reaching, unsuspected consequences. One relatively recent federal project that might have been radically modified if its full impact had been known or even suspected is the interstate highway program, which Congress enacted in 1954.

Among the unforeseen results of that decision have been the often-wasteful growth patterns of cities and the alarming increases in demand for land, material and energy. As these consequences became apparent, the original scale of the interstate system was reduced, and now there is opposition even to completing it.

While it is easy to look with 20/20 hindsight and see the faults of such a project, it should not have been terribly difficult to foresee many of the ill effects—if only we had had an institutionalized way of doing so. In that event, the possible consequences of the interstate network could have been considered and debated before the decision to proceed was reached.

The potential ramification of a decision on energy policy, of course, are even more hazardous to predict than those of a highway construction program. We have many different energy technologies which, like energy itself, involve many more aspects of the economy than do highways—important as highways are. Some of the side effects of our energy policy are being studied, such as the environmental problems that might be created by expanded offshore drilling, but the government is not carefully considering the full impact of a total energy strategy. Examining a single nuclear power plant or a single strip mine is tantamount to assessing a single stretch of an interstate highway.

The final report of the Ford Foundation's Energy Policy Project, released not long ago, deals with proposals to expand energy production and introduce new technologies. The report concludes that a "thorough assessment of the costs and benefits, and the health, safety and environmental problems associated with the technology, should be undertaken by an independent technology assessment office before any funding for a demonstration project is authorized."

The report went on to urge extensive public debate on whether to proceed with a particular kind of energy technology, based on knowledge gained in the overall assessment. Both the Administration and Congress should follow this recommendation.

Ideally, the Administration should have such an assessment in hand when it proposes any new technological project. The National Environmental Policy Act now requires an "environmental impact statement" for such undertakings. But this is not enough.

What we need are exhaustive assessments, which take environmental factors into account but go far beyond that to analyze the complete social and economic consequences of new technology. Obviously, close study should be made of an energy policy intended, say, to increase the supply of electricity that would, at the same time, decrease food production because of water diversion.

Some other proposal, if put into effect, might cause employment and population shifts, requiring changes in distribution and, perhaps, increases in the cost of social services. We should be aware of ramifications before a particular course of action is chosen.

One way to proceed is for Congress to utilize its own Office of Technology Assessment. Little known but potentially potent, it was mandated in 1972 to secure "competent, unbiased information concerning the physical, biological, economic, social and political effects" of new or existing technology.

Congress should give this office expanded authority to conduct such analyses, for it is Congress, when the chips are down, which is responsible for protecting the public's interest in the energy scramble.

At the same time, we should institutionalize technology assessments in the executive branch as well so that they are available while major policy decisions are being considered.

If this were now the case, President Ford would have a much better grasp of the many options offered by Project Independence, just as he would be in a much better position to make all those difficult choices facing him in the years ahead.

THE VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ACT

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, many veterans in the State of Utah have seen their benefits deteriorate because of inflation. They have asked me to send their views to the President in this regard and have collected numerous petitions which I intend to deliver to the President. These petitions were signed by student veterans at the University of Utah, Brigham Young University, Weber State College, and Utah Technical College.

The veterans' petition to the President is in support of H.R. 12628, the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1974. The veterans of these colleges are deeply concerned with what appears to be a forthcoming Presidential veto of the bill.

I wish to add my support to the desires of these Utah veterans that the bill be allowed to pass into law. The President's concern that the bill will be inflationary is based on good intent, but faulty reasoning. Any immediate inflationary effect will be quickly offset by the increased productivity that well educated veterans would add to our economy. This concept has been proven time and again through reasonable benefits to veterans following our past wars.

Moreover, who is more deserving of decent Federal benefits than the veterans of our country? These are the men who willingly distinguished themselves for their country. Yet, while the President is gracious in pardoning those who chose not to sacrifice, he refuses to honor in the most basic way the truly heroic men of our past military conflicts. I strongly urge President Ford to consider the requests of the Utah veterans and veterans throughout America.

The petitions follow:

VETERANS AFFAIRS OFFICE,
November 1, 1974.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD: Enclosed are the signatures of some of the veterans attending the University of Utah. These signatures represent some of the men who served their country in time of need. These signatures also represent those men who are asking their country to help them in their time of need.

We are asking for your help in passage of H.R. 12628, the Vietnam Era Veteran's Readjustment Act of 1974, by your signing of this much needed piece of legislation when presented to you by Congress.

Thank You,

TERRY SWANER,
Legislative Relations, University of Utah
Veterans Association.

NOVEMBER 1, 1974.

Mr. FORD: Upon resumption of this session of Congress, Nov. 18, we understand that you will be presented with H.R. 12628, The Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1974, for your signature.

We have also been led to believe, through Congressional offices and media sources here in Utah, that you have given consideration to vetoing the bill, because it would tend to be inflationary.

Having heard numerous rationalizations, both for and against, for more than a year now, concerning the bill, we believe this bill

not to be inflationary primarily on the basis of the revenue returned to our country, past and present, will continue in the future.

We also believe that this is a much needed piece of legislation, on a non-partisan political basis, and the rhetorical befriending and actual defrauding of those men who served has gone on too long.

We believe that the government of the people should serve those people that served the government in time of need.

This petition is on behalf of the student veterans of Utah.

SIGNED BY 575 UTAH VETERANS.

OPENING THE FILES

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we face one of the most important votes that shall take place in this body during the remaining weeks of the 93d Congress. I know that many of our colleagues are still undecided as to how they will vote on the veto override attempt on the Freedom of Information Act amendments, and it is for the benefit of those uncommitted Members that I wish to insert in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared on October 24 in the Riverside, Calif. Press. It reads as follows:

[From the Riverside (Calif.) Press, Oct. 24, 1974]

OPENING THE FILES

When President Ford vetoed proposed amendments to the Freedom of Information Act last week, he cited his fear that national security information could too easily be declassified. But experience tells us that there is far more to fear from excessive secrecy in government than from unwarranted disclosure.

The act's good intentions have been largely thwarted by a federal bureaucracy intent on protecting itself from criticism and unwanted intrusion. Those seeking informational material under the act's provisions have been subject to, among other things, long delays and exorbitant copying fees.

They have also had to contend with the Secret stamp, and with a 1973 Supreme Court ruling which held that once information was so classified, the classification was not subject to review in court.

Congress this month approved several amendments to strengthen the 1966 act. Among the most important was a provision giving federal judges the authority to review, in chambers, classified documents whose classification was being challenged.

It was this provision to which the President took the strongest exception. He said it would give judges too much power in areas in which they weren't expert, and thus could weaken the nation's security and defenses.

This is hard to accept. The amended act seems to provide plenty of protection for legitimately classified information. Judges have shown no inclination to treat casually the necessity of such classifications—witness the courts' willingness to impose, however temporarily, prior censorship in the Pentagon Papers case—and there is no indication they would start now.

For too long too much information has been routinely kept from the public. That trend may be changing, but it has not changed nearly enough, and Congress should

make override of the veto an early order of business when it returns from the election recess.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our colleagues will keep in mind the points raised by the Press as they make their decisions on how they will vote tomorrow.

FORD ADMINISTRATION DELAY IN ACTION ON URANIUM ENRICHMENT THREATENS A NEW KIND OF ENERGY SHORTAGE

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, nuclear power reactors burn a special kind of uranium which is enriched in the fissionable isotope U²³⁵ by an industrial process. Presently the U.S. Government owns and operates most of the Free World's uranium enriching capacity. But demand soon will exceed supply and only prompt and intelligent action by the President and his subordinates can create the conditions necessary to bolster supply.

Unfortunately, President Ford's budget advisers are in the saddle on this issue. Revenues the Atomic Energy Commission receives from carrying on the enriching activity run into the hundreds of millions of dollars and have come in quite handy for Roy Ash and his predecessors as the Directors of OBM to make quick-fixes on their annual deficits. They view the matter of enriching uranium from the "now" standpoint of this year's budget.

Yet, if money is to be available to do the thing necessary to induce people to build new uranium enriching capacity in the country, a longer range view must be taken which will devote these revenues to those things which are prerequisite to the establishment of an enriching industry. Siphoning them off to perform fiscal cosmetic jobs must cease. It will simply mean that soon, instead of private investment handling this chore, the U.S. Treasury will suddenly have to pony up billions to build the capacity as the alternative to suffering a severe and long lasting nationwide electricity shortage due to a lack of nuclear fuel.

In the November 7 issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly, writer Gerald Casbolt discusses this situation under the title "Deadline Approaching for Construction of New Uranium Enrichment Facilities; Power Shortfall Feared." The article follows:

[From the Public Utilities Fortnightly magazine, Nov. 7, 1974]

DEADLINE APPROACHING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW URANIUM ENRICHMENT FACILITIES; POWER SHORTFALL FEARED

(By Gerald Casbolt)

Some leadership, beyond "jawboning", is needed for the uranium enrichment industry; someone, whether in the White House or Congress, will have to make financial and planning decisions quickly, before the end of this fiscal year, to avoid a serious shortfall of enriched uranium by 1982, in the opinion of many nuclear power authorities.

According to all parties concerned—the Atomic Energy Commission, congressmen, private industry, miners and power plant officials—there will be enough enriched uranium in the United States in future years to supply the nuclear reactors that will have to come on line to supply the nation's electricity needs. But all concerned also say they do not know where the fuel will come from.

In the past few months, darkness has appeared on the already-cloudy fuel enrichment scene. General Electric said it was dropping out of its venture with Exxon Nuclear; Union Carbide left Uranium Enrichment Associates, then Westinghouse exited, leaving only Bechtel Corporation to carry the load. This means, basically, that except for Bechtel and Exxon, working on separate projects, there is no private industry working on the massive project that the Nixon administration and AEC Chairman Dixy Lee Ray have said must be handled by private industry. There has been no change in this view expressed by the Ford White House, despite Ford's avowed heavy reliance on nuclear power to save the country from an expected electricity shortage. Literally billions of dollars will have to be committed to ensure enrichment plants will be operative in the Eighties, and with today a tight money market, no one knows where the cash will come from.

One proposed solution is for AEC to continue to operate and expand its enrichment facilities, eventually operating them on a commercial basis. Officials of AEC privately say they expect that to happen, and they expect Congress will approve the necessary massive cash outlay when the time comes, because, after all, enriching is a money-making proposition. But that, too, apparently, is the rub. It is believed that many law makers will balk, mightily, when it comes to a government agency operating any thing other than a non-profit agency. But officials at AEC contended there is nothing else for them to do, because selling the enriched uranium to private power plants on a cost basis would not encourage private industries to develop their own facilities.

Nevertheless, AEC is the last resort in the search for a uranium enricher; there is still time, officials said, for private industry to "get it together."

Needed for private industry to move on enrichment are two major elements: an assurance for utilities that they will receive contracted-for supplies of nuclear fuel; and an assurance of money for prospective operators of enrichment facilities. The utilities want contracts to assure supply, come "hell or high water", before they make down payments which would in turn be used by enrichers as seed money to obtain the necessary capital. On the other hand, constructors want assurance of money before they start building huge enrichment plants.

One of those working hard on these problems is retiring Representative Hosmer (Republican, California), the ranking minority member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. Hosmer at one point was pushing for some kind of permanent government corporation (a tentative name was the United States Enrichment Corporation, or USEC) to handle the enriching process for private industry. This would keep radioactive material in the hands of the government, where many legislators feel it belongs, and there would be an assurance of cash. Hosmer still wants USEC; he recently called it "the only game in town" for enriching uranium. But he said recently also, "I do not want it to be forever a government operation: I want it to be a private operation, but the difficulties of getting into the business are enormous." He said there are huge financial problems in getting "from here to there."

Hosmer has worked out two "Essays on Enrichment" which together detail an elaborate plan for AEC to provide a stockpile of

Separative Work Units* (SWU's) at a cost of about 82 cents a SWU. (It should be recognized that the Energy Research and Development Administration, recently formed by Congress, will take over many of the duties of AEC, which will fade into non-existence. This, however, should have a minor effect on Hosmer's plan, which refers to "government" rather than AEC.)

In his papers, Hosmer estimated some 27.5 million SWU's will be needed by 1982; there presently are none available from private industry in the U.S. One of the things this means with AEC plants putting out just over 27.5 million SWU's by 1982, is that new plants will have to be built to supply SWU's to new nuclear power plants that will come on line after 1982. At a recent financing meeting between utility representatives and UEA in New York, Hosmer's plans were discussed in depth as a possibility.

The problems of getting "from here to there" are indeed enormous. Enriching plants cannot be built on a practical basis unless there is some assurance there will be a need for the enriched uranium. This means, although it may appear very obvious, that nuclear power plants must be built in conjunction with enriching facilities.

Presently, AEC is working feverishly on completing improvement programs for its three enriching plants, which will increase the plants' combined capacity to about 27.7 million SWU's by 1981, with the construction costing an estimated \$907 million (in 1974 dollars). This, according to Hosmer's figures, would supply enough enriched uranium for projected plants. But the improvement programs might not work, might not be completed in time, and might very well fall short of needs if total nuclear capacity increases. Another potential problem is with foreign contracts, which could cause a rather severe drain on this nation's supply of enriched uranium, if foreign demand gets out of hand.

There are other possibilities for improvement, aside from AEC picking up the ball. Breeder reactors may eventually obviate the need for separate enrichment facilities because the breeder supplies its own fuel. And there is the fusion process which, again, will virtually take away the need for additional enriching services. Even after breeders and fusion processes become realities, however, present reactors will not be scrapped. Thus, enrichment services will be needed for a period probably stretching well into the next century, although the new technologies might lessen demand.

AEC used to talk in terms of a "window", 1980 to 1985, when 27 million SWU's would be needed to supply nuclear plants. That date has now been fixed at 1982, (though some debate it). Coupled with this, AEC is striving to reduce lead time for enrichment plant construction from ten years to six years. Such a speedup would no doubt encourage industry to make realistic plans to build, but still the question remains: Will there be enough enriched uranium after 1982?

There clearly will not be enough enriched uranium from private industry unless several things happen, and they all involve money. An enrichment operation must be made an attractive financial package for investors. It would help the situation, some say, if government would guarantee loans. At least one official said government subsidiaries

* Separate Work Units, known as SWU's, are arbitrarily defined units that measure the amount of work needed by an enriching plant to separate quantity of uranium of a given assay into two components, one having a higher percentage of uranium-235 and one having a lower percentage. Normally, enriching plants charge power plants by the SWU, and this measure is also used to describe an enrichment plant's capacity or a nuclear plant's needs, in terms of enriched uranium.

are in order. But AEC said so far as subsidies are concerned, private industry is already getting some of those now, in a sense. Technology is being "practically given away" (at some cost to the receiver), but this is necessary because much of the technology private industry needs for enrichment development is still classified and may be dispensed only by the federal government. Also, some federal money has been budgeted for a demonstration centrifuge, but even that (according to present plans) will be repaid to the government. One obvious proposal is for some sort of tax break to firms that develop enrichment processes; this has been and is being discussed in some government circles.

All of which brings the problem full cycle: some leadership, beyond "jawboning", is needed from Washington to ensure there will be enough enriched uranium to fuel nuclear reactors and avoid a serious electricity short-fall.

WILLIAM SUMMERS JOHNSON

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a respected former professional staff member of the House, William Summers Johnson, died September 19 in Hawaii.

I knew Bill as both staff director of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and as executive director of the Joint Economic Committee. He was a valuable Government employee.

After leaving the legislative branch of the Federal Government, he served the State of Hawaii as an economic advisor. All who knew him will miss his advice.

The Honolulu Star Bulletin, on September 19, 1974, briefly summarized his career in the following article:

FORMER FINANCE DIRECTOR JOHNSON DIES

Former City Finance Director William Summers Johnson, an outspoken, tough-minded economist respected as a "pro" by others in his profession, died today in the Convalescent Center of Honolulu, 1900 Bachelot St. He was 61.

Mr. Johnson suffered a stroke July 30, 1972, and was in Kaiser Hospital until Oct. 10 that year, when he was moved to the Convalescent Center. He died of complications resulting from the stroke.

He had been able to sit in a wheelchair, and attended a political rally at the center Sept. 4, according to a nurse there. Although he was unable to speak, she said "he was quite aware of what was going on."

Mrs. Ruth Johnson said her husband's body will be cremated and the ashes scattered at Waimanalo Beach "because he loved that beach so much."

Borthwick Mortuary has charge of funeral arrangements, to be announced later.

Mrs. Johnson asked that flowers be omitted, but said contributions may be made to the American Cancer Society or the Heart Association.

City Budget Director James Sakai took over Mr. Johnson's duties as City finance director when he was stricken two years ago.

Johnson came to Hawaii in 1965 to become State economist in the Department of Planning and Economic Development, and the department director, Shelley Mark, called him a "pro."

He served in that \$16,800-a-year position on a contract through October 1968, surveying the State's economy and its trends.

He never hesitated to say what he saw in the future, despite the fact that bank and university economists, as well as businessmen and government officials, often refused to believe him.

He resigned the State post in 1968 when Mayor Frank F. Fasi appointed him City finance director. On June 10 last year, he submitted his resignation from the \$23,500-a-year post over apparent disagreements with the Mayor. He changed his mind and rejoined the City the next day.

Despite the fact that his economic views were often discounted, time proved him correct or led others to agree with him. For example:

In 1967 when tourism was riding the waves of prosperity, Johnson said that increased tourism would create a serious strain on revenues to pay for such capital improvements as expansion at the airport, streets and sewers.

He told a 1967 meeting of the Hawaii State Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, that labor should work for the reinstatement of wage and price guideposts because labor has great power. With this great power came the responsibility for curbing inflation, Johnson said.

Again in 1967, he told residents that they ought to buy insurance policies from companies which invest the premiums in Hawaii industry rather than on the Mainland.

In January 1967, he said hotel room taxes, a control of land through zoning and limiting unrestricted resort growth by imposing permit controls could achieve selectivity in resort development and on the kinds of tourist coming here. He warned against the "cracker-and-cheese" tourists as opposed to the middle and upper income visitors, the "carriage trade."

In February 1968, he suggested tax reforms which would encourage the use of open space and good urban design.

Johnson was born in Thomasville, Ga. He was a graduate of the University of Georgia. From 1956 until he came to Hawaii, he was frequently a lecturer in graduate economics at George Washington University.

His career was based in the nation's capital until he moved to Hawaii. From 1940 to 1944, he was an economist and statistician for the War Production Board. He was staff economist for the Federal Trade Commission for seven years. During the Korean War, he was on loan for five months to the Small Defense Plants Administration as acting deputy administrator.

From 1955 to 1959, he was chief economist of the House Select Committee on Small Business. During the 1961-62 congressional sessions, he was executive director of the U.S. House-Senate Joint Economic Committee—Congress' chief economic adviser. Then he was staff director of the House Committee on Banking and Currency where he directed a nationwide survey of commercial banking problems.

Always active in Democratic party politics, Johnson advised then-Sen. John F. Kennedy on economic matters during the latter's successful presidential campaign in 1960.

In 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson sent the economist to Pennsylvania to coordinate the presidential campaign in that key state.

Because of his years in Congress, Johnson was on a first-name basis with the Democratic leaders in both the House and the Senate.

Although long associated with the Democratic party's establishment, in 1972 he backed Sen. George S. McGovern for the presidential nomination.

Johnson is survived by his widow, his mother of Atlanta, Ga., and three brothers, all living on the Mainland.

RENEGADE PATRICIAN

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the October 4 issue of the Harvard Crimson contained a well-written review of Corliss Lamont's recently published book. Mr. Lamont's work, entitled "Voice in the Wilderness: Collected Essays of Fifty Years," has definite autobiographical overtones. It gives a poignant insight into a somewhat "deviant" delegate of America's upper socioeconomic echelons.

Robert T. Garrett, in reviewing the work, was impressed by the numerous parallels between Lamont and another member of a renowned patrician clan—Nelson Rockefeller. However, as the Crimson article portrays, the harmony of their upbringing faded into discord as the years passed.

Corliss Lamont sought activist remedies to abate the world's many ills. His actions have been those of a dedicated humanist, civil libertarian, and world pacifist. As an educator and political activist, this "renegade patrician" has dedicated his life to maxims quite alien to his peers.

At this time I would like to commend Mr. Garrett's thought-provoking article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Harvard Crimson, Oct. 4, 1974]

RENEGADE PATRICIAN

("Voice in the Wilderness: Collected Essays of Fifty Years," by Corliss Lamont, Prometheus Books, \$10, 327 pp.)

(Reviewed by Robert T. Garrett)

In 1974, two of the most famous, and in some quarters, most infamous, scions of two of America's most famous and infamous patrician clans have bared it all. Or at least, all they feel like baring. By fate, coincidence, or contingency Nelson Rockefeller and Corliss Lamont, nabobs of Standard Oil and the House of Morgan, respectively, have hung heaps of autobiographical linen out to dry at the same time. Modern detergents and public relations notwithstanding, only one man comes out clean in the wash.

Rockefeller and Lamont both come from uptown, East Coast, forever philanthropic, library-building families that take great stock in printing private genealogies and producing model citizens. Rockefeller and Lamont are both closing in on that age when reminiscing becomes more than attending the occasional Ivy League alumni gathering. One is 66, the other 72. And, as their initial golden-days forays into reminiscence and self-accounting reveal, Rockefeller's in 72 pages and four days before the white-hot television lights of the Senate Rules Committee, Lamont's in a little-noticed collection of essays entitled *Voice in the Wilderness*, it's harder than the average communist thinks to bite the trust fund that feeds you.

Still, if Lamont hasn't bitten too brazenly (and it goes without saying that patrician parents demand oral gratification) Rockefeller nonetheless exceeded all previously known limits for filial sucking-up. The vice-presidential nominee delivered a maudlin soliloquy on the "Influence of My Mother." By contrast, Lamont's introductory, right-up-front candor is inviting indeed:

"Various people, especially newspaper columnists, have habitually tried to make a mystery out of my beliefs and actions owing to the fact that my father, Thomas W. Lamont, was a successful banker. But both my father and mother were warm, sympathetic, generous individuals who were liberals on most issues of importance and shared with me the aim of seeking the greatest good for the greatest number. . . . In a real sense, I have carried on in the spirit of my parents, though thinking their goals would be more likely achieved through leftist solutions."

Lamont goes on to deny that an Oedipal complex, arising from hate of a father who hobnobbed with J. P. Morgan and James J. Hill, was "operative" in his decision to become a socialist, Humanist, civil libertarian and world pacifist. True to form, just as throughout this compendium of essays Lamont attacks determinism in any name, shape and form (Christian theistic, Marxist economic, Skinnerian behaviorist, even shades he sights in Dewey's naturalistic), he dismisses Freudian psychology as the explanation for his very un-patrician life choices. Rather, Lamont places a premium on just such choices—life choice, free will, individual accountability. From there, he spins a personal philosophy of "naturalistic humanism," scientific, rational, ethical, democratic, and internationalist, in order of presentation.

The 44 essays in *Voice in the Wilderness* are divided into three parts, detailing the chronological framework of Lamont's three weightiest concerns: humanist philosophy, civil liberties, and world peace and socialism. Although it was as an undergraduate at Harvard, Lamont ('24) says in the essay "It All Began in the Yard," that he fought his first skirmishes for the First Amendment and the League of Nations, his philosophic studies at Oxford and at Columbia under Dewey and F. J. E. Woodbridge pointed to his consuming passion.

Unlike his Rockefeller counterpart, who metamorphosed unnoticeably from the strict Baptist faith of his grandfather to the tepid gently-theistic civil religion so at home recently in the White House, Lamont turned into a shrill, at times evangelical Humanist. Not just a fly in the smooth ointment of his family's liberal Protestantism, but a gadfly among the "New Philosophers," correcting Dewey's semantics and grammar here, rescuing George Santayana from an ignominious Vatican tomb-marker there, always, always proselytizing for the American Humanist Association, the Ethical Union of America, and other similar religious-philosophical organizations.

To his credit, Lamont spurned the narrowly academic tendencies of his own personality and the universities where he taught in favor of an activist role in healing U.S.-Soviet relations, in fighting the red-baiters of both post-war eras, in protesting the Hiroshimas, the Bays of Pigs, the Vietnams. And, as certain of his essays in *Voice in the Wilderness* drive home, the reader should be grateful. For Lamont, had he written the books requisite to obtain a tenured position more revered than the "lecturer in philosophy" job he worked at intermittently for almost two decades at Columbia, Cornell, the New School and Harvard's Graduate School of Education, would surely have wallowed in the nipping pedantry that some of the lesser essays in *Voice in the Wilderness* border on.

The best pieces in this collection are good not because they are "relevant," though they hit upon every solid issue the American left has argued in the 20th century. They are worth reading because Lamont is authentic—he is there on the courtroom floor, on the picket line, at the teach-in sessions when his colleagues of the cloister are silent. Lamont fought Harding and isolationism from

his typewriter as an editor of *The Crimson*, fought for the right to bring dissenting speakers such as Eugene V. Debs, William Z. Foster and Scott Nearing to Harvard as chairman of the Union Undergraduate Committee. And Lamont continued to take on the Goliaths of reaction—Attorney-General A. Mitchell Palmer, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and Joe McCarthy.

In fact, Corliss Lamont has taken such admirable stances for half a century it is hard to be rough with him. A biography might have established the distance needed between the man and his actions to evaluate his philosophical and ideological stances. Yet one does wonder whether such a work on such an untended maverick would sell with the committees that parcel out tenure to the sort of people who would write such a book. Despite such problems of point of view, Lamont emerges as "warm and agreeable" as the Humanism he dotes upon. And most of all, he comes clean.

Reading Lamont's essays grates against all the modern sensibilities. Samples from one year, 1973, range from an interview with Chile's president Salvador Allende to a humanist pamphlet titled "How to Be Happy—Though Married." Who is this latter-day Ben Franklin, anyway? Why is he trying to take a stance on every conceivable aspect of life in this world? How can anyone be "conversant," "critical," and "definitive" in more than the appointed intellectual niche? Corliss Lamont, yea even a Corliss Widener, who does he think he is?

The questions still stand after finishing *Voice in the Wilderness*. Perhaps Lamont's chronicling of his quiet, underexposed work for humanism, civil liberties and socialism is a desperate attempt for recognition from a retired fellow-traveler standing a half-skip, jump or foot away from the grave. Lamont wrote obsessively on the subject of death as a young man—philosophic studies, poetry anthologies, scientific debates on reincarnation and psychic phenomena. His thanatology concluded in a "higher hedonism" doctrine, which stressed living vitally, though ethically, since man is always a heartbeat away from nonentity.

Lamont's autobiographical venture came at a time when he saw Dartmouth's "Most Likely to Succeed" of 1930, Nelson Rockefeller, a heartbeat away from the temporal world's highest office. Maybe the inherent injustice in an ordering of the world in which Nelson Rockefeller can be president prodded Lamont to grasp, finally, at immortality. If so, *Voice in the Wilderness* represents his most thoroughly human act to date.

CHARLES E. COLLINS

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week an old friend and a distinguished citizen of Frederick County and the State of Maryland, Charles E. Collins, passed away. Charlie Collins was a man who had dedicated most of his life to public service, and he was pursuing that service at the time of his death.

Charlie Collins served in the Maryland House of Delegates for 6 years. He then served as president of the Frederick County Board of County Commissioners for 4 years from 1966 to 1970. He combined his active role in public affairs with

a career in farming. His last position was perhaps his favorite—that of public affairs director of the Maryland Farm Bureau Federation.

Charlie was a frequent visitor to my office and to the Halls of the Capitol. He was an effective spokesman for the farm industry and individual farmers from throughout the State of Maryland. His achievements in all areas will long be remembered, and his dedication to the public welfare, his family, and his friends will long remain in the memories of those who knew him and worked with him.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND INFLATION

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, Prof. Francis Bator submitted a memo to the Senate Budget Committee on our economic prospects and the direction of economic policy. Events since that time tend to confirm his analysis of the present situation. We would be well advised to take seriously his prescriptions. I hope all Members will take the time to read this excellent memorandum:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND INFLATION

(By Francis M. Bator, Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University)

1. THE OUTLOOK FOR THE NEXT 6-9 MONTHS

The most likely story is that told by the now "standard" forecast:

Real output marginally down;

Unemployment up to 6½-7% and still rising;

The gap between actual output and "potential output", conservatively defined but ignoring some awkward bottlenecks, up to an annual \$100-110 billion (a rough measure of the annual rate of forever-lost wages/profits/taxes and output due to unemployed people and idle machines);

The rate of inflation slowing but only slowly, to perhaps 8-8½% by next summer measured by the GNP deflator, with wages replacing commodity prices as the driving force.

That is the most likely outcome if the Fed promptly eases up on money, and the government does not take restrictive fiscal action. Continuation of very tight money (the Federal funds rate at 11% plus, the money stock growing at only a fraction of the rate of inflation) or a large cut in Federal spending below the estimate built into the standard forecast, or a significant tax increase would probably produce a further decline in output and real income, more unemployment, and an only slightly better price performance. It would be a poor bargain.

It bears emphasizing that the most likely outcome is only that. Forecasts are based on "regularities" found in the record of the past. The U.S. record doesn't contain much direct evidence on the spending behavior of households and business in an environment of two-digit inflation. It's the only "past" we've got; the most likely story drawn from it by the use of good economics, good sense, and knowledge of the economic history of other countries, is the most likely story. But we should be prepared for surprise, especially unpleasant surprise. Specifically:

I do not think it is likely that inflation during the next year will accelerate: demand will be sluggish; "wage-push" is not yet out of hand despite some large settlements recently and a recession-caused fall in productivity; while the poor U.S. harvest will drive food prices higher, other commodity prices might even decline. Nevertheless, it is right to be nervous about the coal negotiations this autumn, the weather next year, OPEC (though I don't think they'll try to increase the real price any further), and most of all, after two years of falling real wages, the shape of wage-price politics in the 40-50% of the economy where competition exerts at most a feeble discipline. (The worry-list concerns the source of the next big push. For the next few months, the figures will continue to be affected by the past increase in oil prices and the decontrol bulge in other prices working their way through to the price indices for final output.)

While a proper depression is not in the cards, an economy even more sluggish than that sketched above is all too possible. Inventory investment (precariously swollen during the past year), plant-and-equipment spending, and net exports could all fall short. (Many countries are counting on exports in amounts that are inconsistent with their partners' projections of imports.) Last, personal consumption is a large question mark. Households have taken such an economic beating in the last two years (even the stock market matters), that one cannot rule out unusual belt-tightening. (Those who worry about hyper-inflation of the South American sort, conjure up the opposite nightmare: an accelerating attempt by people to shift out of money and into goods. Unless inflation accelerates for other reasons, I think that unlikely. It is, after all, 8-11% money, or only slightly less than 0% in real terms. At any rate, up till now the evidence on personal saving runs the other way.)

2. THE CAUSES OF INFLATION DURING THE PAST 18 MONTHS

Going into '73, we inherited a 3½-5% wage-price-wage inflation, conventionally labeled cost-push (cost-push/price-pull would be more accurate), which was stimulated if not ignited by the old-fashioned aggregate demand-pull inflation of '66-68. (Mr. Nixon's decision in January 1969 to abandon any effort directly to influence wage-price bargains didn't help any. He opted out just when the economy was about to turn soft enough to give energetic jaw-boning a chance to do some good.) But judging by its macro-performance, the economy in January '73 seemed to be in pretty good shape: demand was gradually gaining on potential output, reducing the excess slack of '71; unemployment at 5% was falling; John Dunlop was about to begin his "social contract" experiment on the wage-price front. Then came the great acceleration: a commodity inflation that drove the rate of price increase from 3-5% to the current 10-12%.

Sorting out and assigning weights to complementary causes is a delicate analytic task. The best work with which I am familiar has been done by Professors Nordhaus and Shoven (they published a report for the lay reader in *Challenge*, May-June 1974.) It only covers the nine months through August 1973, but the results confirm the impression one gets from an informal examination of the evidence for the entire period until mid-1974.

The great acceleration cannot be explained, except in the trivial sense I'll get to it in a moment, by an excess of aggregate demand in the U.S., i.e., by unduly expansionary fiscal and monetary policy. It cannot be explained by an acceleration of wage-push (although, since the spring, that has become the most serious danger we face from here on out.) Rather, the major proximate

cause is to be found in the combined effect on the dollar price of commodities, notably of food and oil, of

- (1) The world-wide food-supply shortfall of 1972 and the incomplete catch-up in 1973;
- (2) The 14-16% depreciation in the foreign exchange value of the dollar relative to pre-Smithsonian exchange rates;
- (3) Simultaneous acceleration of economic growth, and hence demand for commodities, in the rest of the world (world-wide, real output grew by an unusually hefty 7% between mid-'72 and mid-'73);
- (4) Imposition by the oil cartel of what amounts to an excise tax of some \$13-\$15 billion per year on American consumers of imported oil.

We have been plagued since late '72 by some massive micro-economic events involving large once-for-all changes in relative prices. Monetarists would argue that such increases in the relative prices of commodities could have been achieved in part by large absolute decreases in other prices and hence much less inflation—if, that is, the government had not expanded the supply of money to accommodate the spurt in the price level and in total spending.

True; in theory one can envisage a tight money squeeze on total spending sufficiently drastic to keep the lid on prices in the aggregate, with a lot of prices falling to help achieve the appropriate relative increase in food prices and the cartel's target for oil. But that is sheer fantasy. In a modern industrial economy that medicine works, if it works at all, by creating and sustaining massive unemployment and excess capacity, a "reserve army of unemployed". To keep the price indices from taking a large jump in the face of what happened in the markets for food and oil, we would have had to suffer draconian deflation and a far larger reduction in real income than that imposed on us by the adverse change in our terms of trade. Better the disease than the medicine.

3. HAS EXCESSIVE FEDERAL SPENDING . . . BEEN ONE OF THE MAJOR CAUSES OF HIGH INFLATION OVER THE PAST 18 MONTHS?

It's clear that I don't think so. First, I don't think so. First, I don't think that in the past 18 months we have erred on the side of too much aggregate demand, though a weak contrary case could be made out for the early months of '73 by someone who cares mainly about stopping inflation and very little about the cost in unemployment and lost real income. But even if it were otherwise—if aggregate spending had been excessive—exclusive emphasis on public or Federal spending would be a red herring.

Second-order qualifications aside, what matters for old-fashioned demand inflation is total spending, private plus public. Whether the public or Federal component of total spending is excessive is not a question that can be settled as a matter of demand management alone. One has to compare the value of such spending on particular public programs with the value of competing private use of resources, and adjust both public spending and, by changing taxes and monetary policy, private spending, accordingly.

I am among those who believe that, as a community, we are not devoting a large enough portion of our resources to public tasks. In the end, that's a matter for political argument. But it's an argument that cannot be settled by talking about inflation. We are ill-served by people in authority who claim otherwise.

4. SHOULD CONGRESS REDUCE FISCAL YEAR 1975 SPENDING TO \$295 BILLION?

I fear I answered the question before I got to it. Good demand management and inflation control do not call, in my judgment, for a Congressional effort to get closer to the budget ceiling (or for higher taxes.) A tightening of fiscal policy at this juncture would

gain us little in the fight against inflation, and could cost us much in worsening the recession. This is not an argument against cutting out waste and substituting good things instead. But it's much too late for much of that in this year's budget. The items that can be cut on short notice are not generally those that should be cut.

5. IMPACT OF A \$5, \$10, \$20 BILLION CUT IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1975 BUDGET

It would be foolish to pretend to a precision that we don't possess. On the basis of some back-of-the-envelope arithmetic, I think that a spending cut of \$5-\$10 billion, measured against the standard forecast estimates, would be large enough to shorten the odds on an appreciable further decline in output. A cut of the order of \$15-\$20 billion would I think produce the worst recession we have suffered since the war. It might even produce enough unemployment and idle capacity to squeeze out inflation—if we kept the screws on for 2-4 years. It's the sort of radical surgery that can cure or kill, and no one knows the odds.

6. THE BUDGET PROCESS AND PRIORITIES

I think the new Budget Committee should try something that has never been tried in this country—national economic budgeting. And it should prod the Executive Branch into doing the same.

Except during World War II, we have never properly addressed the large questions of "priority" that confront us as a community: how each year we should divide, to take a conservative, incremental formulation, the \$50-\$60 billion worth of extra output available to us between private use and various public tasks, and between consumption by the very poor and by the rest of us. The question may seem grandiose. It really isn't. We make those choices, year in and year out, when we decide about government purchases, transfers and taxes, and monetary policy. But we do so blindly, barely aware of what we are doing. Perhaps the paramount objective of the Budget Committee should be to remedy that.

It won't be easy. In the face of justified anxiety about inflation, widespread confusion about the connection between government spending and inflation, preoccupation with waste in government, and the like, it will be much easier for the committee to focus on bits and pieces of the problem in isolation: deficits, spending ceilings, or at best, trade-offs among various public programs, thereby failing to place things in their larger frame. In light of the problems of the next few years, it would be a costly failure.

FIFTY YEARS AT CONGREGATION B'NAI YITZHOK

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, our country, no matter how large it has grown, has always been a nation of small communities. Our cities have populations which number in the millions but the people always think of themselves as residents of particular neighborhoods. These neighborhoods have distinctive characters and identities.

One of the reasons for these distinct personalities is the institutions located in these particular areas. In my own district in northeast Philadelphia our synagogues and churches play a very strong role in the life of the community. One of them,

Congregation B'Nai Yitzhok, has served the people of the northeast for 50 years. At this time I enter into the RECORD a history of this synagogue written by its Rabbi, Sholem J. Horowitz:

FIFTY YEARS AT CONGREGATION B'NAI YITZHOK

Not many more than the required quorum of ten men gathered together in a dimly lit store front on Ella and Ruscomb Streets. They assembled to pray on the High Holidays and according to the best memories they were ushering in the year 5686. The date was September 9, 1926. They must have been very worthy men and prayed with great devotion because their prayers were heard and the fruits of their labor blossomed into Congregation B'Nai Yitzhok.

For a year and a half that humble beginning served the needs of our community and in the following year the building at 254 E. Roosevelt Blvd. was acquired. The depression was spent in that building and although the country was suffering terrible hardship a synagogue was maintained and there was a place for a Jew to come and find solace.

When the fury of war broke out upon the land with all its horror the synagogue, still at the same place, this time however with the aid of Rabbi Felix Freifelder. After the war Rabbi Irving Ebert accepted our pulpit and it was then that the synagogue grew substantially. A building fund drive was initiated in 1948 and in 1951 a new synagogue was ready. It was in 1952 that the property at 256 E. Roosevelt Blvd. was acquired and with some renovations and alterations became substantially the same then as they are now.

The decade of the fifties became the zenith for our congregation both in terms of growth

and membership. There were at one time about 100 children in our Hebrew School and more than enough members to fill the sanctuary to overflowing. A great contributing factor to our growth was the arrival of Rabbi Arnold Feldman to our community in 1956. His able and dedicated leadership served as an impetus to our development as a responsible Orthodox Synagogue. There are some fascinating vignettes from that decade. In 1953 our budget was \$15,323.82 and on April 27, 1953 we had a bank balance of \$35.00. The Silver Anniversary Journal in 1953 netted \$2635.50 and the average time that Board meetings were over was past 11:00 P.M.

At the end of 1959 and beginning 1960 we really became very exclusive. It was then the Main Sanctuary got a new coat of paint, plans were made for the stained glass windows, and the Board began thinking of air-conditioning the entire building. It was also during this time that we had very capable leaders. No names are being mentioned for fear of offending someone by omission. But suffice it to say that no small measure of credit is due to those people who labored so valiantly on our behalf.

On June 14, 1960 there was a general Congregation meeting and a motion was passed by a vote of 34 to 13 to institute separate seating during services in the Main Sanctuary and to include a "Michtitz". The only exception would be the High Holiday services.

It was late in 1962 that Rabbi Feldman sent in his letter of resignation which of course saddened everyone; but without rancor he was wished well in his career and given a Testimonial Dinner. It was with typical foresight that almost immediately the congregation began seeking a new

spiritual leader and it wasn't long before Rabbi Saul I. Aranov accepted the Pulpit at B'Nai Yitzhok in 1965.

The synagogue is most beautifully adorned with its stained glass windows, and we sit in air-conditioned comfort, but these projects didn't occur with the ease of writing. Many were the arguments, long were the hours and dedicated were the workers who carried through these tasks to completion. It took from 1959 to 1965 and beyond to complete them. It was in October 1967 that Bingo got started and after much hesitation became a solid source of support. In 1969 Rabbi Aranov left our congregation for the halls of study in Israel and beginning September 1970 Rabbi Sholem J. Horowitz came to serve as religious leader.

The past four years have also seen remarkable progress despite the general decline in the community. The mortgage was paid off for the first time in forty-five years, the buildings were renovated and a sense of community spirit became a part of Congregation B'Nai Yitzhok.

In reading through the minutes of Board Meetings of the past two and a half decades I've become intimately aware of the difficulties overcome and of the great dedication that so many people have shown. At times I felt as if I were resurrecting many memories, some even bitter and sad. There were arguments and squabbles to be read between the lines and even bitter animosities. But through it all I sensed that great spirit which animates the Jew and makes him strive the way he does. We stand upon the labor and toil of love of all those that have worked before us. I hope we will be worthy to have people say the same of us fifty years from now.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, November 20, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, offered the following prayer:

I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.—John 15: 5.

O God, our Father, in whom there is strength, wisdom, and love, come Thou anew into the hearts of the Members of this body to whom our people have committed the welfare of our Nation. As we pray may there come to us light for our way, life along the way, and love all the way.

Give to us responsive minds and receptive hearts that we may receive Thy word for this day and then grant us the will and the wisdom to work for the highest good of our beloved land.

Guide Thou our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress that with strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands they may lead our Nation into a brighter day radiant with promise and resplendent with hope, with liberty and justice for all.

In the spirit of Him who is the Way we pray. 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 agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 386) entitled "An act to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes."

The message also 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. 11929. An act to amend section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that expenditures for pollution control facilities will be credited against required power investment return payments and repayments.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3057. An act to amend section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to provide that expenditures for pollution control facilities will be credited against required power investment return payments and repayments; and

S.J. Res. 258. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating November 29, 1974, as "National Student Government Day."

PROPOSAL TO EXTEND DATE ON TRADING IN GOLD

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to remind the colleagues in the House that I am introducing a proposal that will extend the effective date permitting Americans to trade in gold and speculate in gold and gold bullion today to an additional 6 months, to give us a chance to do what neither the Congress nor the money managers of the Nation have done thus far, and that is to protect the American public from being fleeced, from being defrauded, from being robbed by the expert speculators in gold of London, Zurich, Bonn, Paris, and other centers.

This country is about to witness a wholesale fleecing of the American people. We are going to see our banking structure weakened and endangered. We are on the threshold of a real monetary crisis and there seems to be an oblivious indifference on the part of Members of Congress and the monetary managers of our country, both of whom are responsible for the irresponsible manner of repealing the gold prohibition that we have had since 1932.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1