

paragraph (4) of this subsection, then under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, such sale or other disposition shall not result in an increase in the aggregate exemptions allowed under this subsection with respect to oil or gas depletion properties held on the date of such transfer by such

business the interest in which is transferred or by the transferor of such interest.

"(F) OIL OR GAS DEPLETION PROPERTY DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'oil or gas depletion property' means any property interest (including an interest in a partnership, trust or estate) with re-

spect to the income from which a deduction for depletion is allowable under section 611 (b) (1) for domestic crude oil or domestic natural gas but only if the underlying mineral property is capable of producing oil or gas in commercial quantities at the date of transfer of such property."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BAKE A BIGGER PIE

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I wish to share with my colleagues a superb editorial statement on inflation which appeared in the November 11, 1974, issue of *Industry Week*. The author is Mr. Walter J. Campbell, consulting editor of this fine magazine and a distinguished citizen of Whispering Pines, N.C.

Our present inflationary crisis, as Mr. Campbell correctly observes, is the result of past mistakes that are being perpetuated into the future. In particular, we are burdened with an antiquated philosophy that is producing fewer goods and services. No matter what area of the economy we examine, we find economic policies that have brought about a decline in the quantity and quality of goods and services.

Much of our fuel shortage can be attributed to our overzealous interest in protectionist considerations that have discouraged production. Our businesses, both large and small, are tied down by Federal regulations and controls that discourage competition, efficiency, and production. Our whole tax system is designed to punish those who invest their assets in savings, thus discouraging capital growth. Our Federal Reserve Board has pursued a monetary policy that has created a situation whereby there is too much money going after too few goods and services. The list of economic policies that have given rise to our current spiral of inflation is seemingly endless.

The solution, of course, does not lie in further reductions of goods and services, but in a total rethinking of our present system of laws. The major point of Mr. Campbell's editorial is clear enough: Not until we return to a general policy of encouraging economic growth and development will the country regain its economic stability.

Mr. President, with this in mind I ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. Campbell be printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

BAKE A BIGGER PIE

(By Walter J. Campbell)

We are hearing a great deal about cutting consumption to combat inflation. About using less. About taxing more to discourage use.

We are hearing too little about producing more. About increasing capacity. About improving productivity. About discovering alternatives for scarce items.

Cutting consumption may be a necessary

step for the immediate term. It holds little promise or hope for the long pull.

It ignores the classic corrective to inflation: produce more goods and services. For as supplies increase, prices tend to decrease in a reasonably free market.

We have been years in building the foundation for our present inflation.

We have transferred too many assets from the productive to the nonproductive sector.

We have discouraged the building of adequate capacity through archaic and inadequate capital recovery policies.

We have worked against increasing productivity by a massive collection of laws and policies that reward the nonproducers just about as well as they reward the producers. We have permitted restrictive work practices. We have encouraged incompetence on the job. We have dictated that vast sums be spent on nonproduction equipment.

Shouldn't we now be thinking about producing more?

To combat inflation?

To correct shortages?

To build strength?

To restore pride?

We have proved that we can do it in past emergencies—when we produced food and fuel and materiel for America and much of the rest of the world.

Needed are better tools—a will to work—and a political philosophy that will give greater rewards to those who produce useful goods and services than to those who only consume.

BUDGET PROPOSALS COULD CRIPPLE ECONOMY OF GENERAL AVIATION

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, President Ford has taken an important and timely step by requesting all Federal agencies to reduce spending, with the help and guidance of the Congress. Further, the President has proposed a course of congressional action that will require legislative restraint to aid and assist in reducing the flow of Federal moneys into the inflation-sensitive economy.

The President's program is for wide reduction and rescissions. I would be less than honest if I did not point out to the President that his desire for prompt enactment in the closing days of the post-election Congress will be almost an impossible task.

The legislative process requires due process in all but the most dire national emergencies, and no matter how increasingly troubled the economic signs become, it would appear unrealistic to expect this outgoing Congress to take actions of the magnitude requested in this worthwhile program.

In addition, the required legislative action includes items that have been

considered by the Congress both in past years and in this year, and have been rejected. It is not likely that a Congress that has thoroughly investigated these items and voted rejections would reverse its findings and enact such taxes or levies without due consideration and overwhelming proven need.

In addition, the President, acting on well-meaning but incomplete advice, would levy taxes and fees on industries that are continuing to perform well in the face of declining national conditions. These taxes could well mean the difference between survival and failure.

I speak specifically to an item of tremendous importance to not only my district in southern California but to the Nation as a whole; namely, aviation—and general aviation in particular.

The President has requested the Congress to permit the levying of double taxes or fees on general aviation. The rationale and method proposed have each been considered, not once, but twice, by the Congress and rejected.

The administration proposes that we repeal the congressional limitation placed in the fiscal 1975 appropriation bill that kept the Department of Transportation from administratively levying fees for such services and licenses that the DOT and FAA had required by virtue of their regulatory powers. There is nothing wrong with charging a nominal fee for administrative costs for Government services where a singular beneficiary can be readily identified and that service is provided for him alone. That is traditional in Government. But to levy fees that are not only exorbitant but are the results of rulemaking and requirements ostensibly dictated by the need for public safety and is deemed improper by the Congress.

The application and fee schedules proposed are arbitrary and aimed directly at recouping costs that are presumably incurred because the safety of the public at large must be protected by permitting only properly designed and constructed aircraft to fly through the Nation's skies; manned by professional airmen who have passed exhaustive training and repetitive flight tests. These design, personnel and operating standards are required to be developed and are required to be enforced by a Federal agency acting on behalf of the public.

Another regulatory agency attempted such arbitrary recoupment and was recently rebuffed in the highest court. Congress has twice thoroughly investigated this possible fee structure and turned it down. I believe that it is unfortunate that the administration would include this method in its proposal when there are other more effective alternatives.

As a member of the Interstate and

Foreign Commerce Committee, which has been charged with responsibility for aviation affairs, I realize that the equitable payment of reasonable fees by the users of our Nation's airports and airway system has long been an important consideration. Like all of our national transportation systems, our airspace system is one of the greatest in the world. It was essentially developed by Federal plan and through financing from the public treasury until 1970 when the system needed substantial modernization to handle the steadily increasing numbers of aircraft. Then a moderate, but still considerable tax levy was enacted that, by congressional plan, resulted in the system.

To insure that these funds were expended for the purposes intended, the Congress in 1970 created an Aviation Trust Fund and limited expenditures from the trust fund to well-defined objectives and projects. The administration within a year attempted to take advantage of what it considered as a loophole in the legislation to expend large sums of money from the trust fund for FAA's operating expenses. After in-depth hearings, Congress reaffirmed its decision that operating expenses were the responsibility of the FAA and subject to the normal budgetary process. The use of trust fund money for maintenance and operations was denied the FAA by legislative action, through amendment in 1971 to the Airports and Airways Act.

Now, the President has, once again, requested the use of trust fund moneys for maintenance and operating expenses. But, it is now 4 years later and much of the modernization that the Congress insisted upon has been accomplished and a surplus of several hundred million dollars is accumulating.

It is entirely possible that some of this money can now be made available but in view of past congressional experience, this should be considered only with the tightest of safeguards and then only after extensive public hearings and assurances from the administration. Here, I believe time will deter the President in terms of action by this Congress.

The great airway system that moves 80 percent of the people who travel more than 300 miles, consists in its simplest form, of a series of airways connecting strategically placed airports. A relative handful of large hub airports are near our larger cities, but more importantly, some 12,000 smaller airports are scattered throughout the country. These airports are not served by commercial air carriers and rely on privately owned aircraft, air taxi service, and some air commuter services.

This is true general aviation. The businessman is carried to the rural factory by the company aircraft. In 1973, almost 40 percent of the flights of the country's 40,000 business aircraft were for the purpose of transporting businessmen to interconnect flights at an airport served by an airline or to pick them up and carry them to a city without air carrier service.

To insure that this amount and kind of air traffic can flow safely and uninterrupted, the FAA has installed control towers at many airports and flight

service stations at others. The decision to install these facilities and man them with Federal employees was and is a Federal decision based on Federal analysis that public safety required governmental control. At some airports, radar is also installed to permit traffic separation in any kind of weather. Such separation standards also result from Government decision. It should be pointed out that since the creation of the Aviation Trust Fund in 1970, the expense of purchase, installation, and construction of these facilities has been paid from the fuel or excise taxes contributed into the trust fund by the passengers of the airlines and owners of the general aviation aircraft.

The administration now proposes that a "departure" tax be levied on general aviation operators only. This tax would be collected for takeoffs from airports having a federally installed and operated control tower. If the airport had radar assist service as well as a tower, the fee would be doubled.

There are, unfortunately, two things basically wrong with this proposal: First, it seeks to charge for a service that a Federal agency decided should be provided and on which it in turn set the price and cost, and second, it proposes a method of discriminatory taxation against only one segment of aviation. This is based on an inadequate study made by the Department of Transportation, on which the Congress has taken no action.

In enacting the Airways Act in 1970, Congress requested the DOT to make a study of the system to determine its contribution to public benefit and value to the Nation, and to determine the nature and amounts of other benefits accruing to the system's users.

This study, called the Aviation Cost Allocation Study, was accomplished largely by contract economists and after countless delays was submitted to the Congress only partially complete. Its findings are patently biased and gross attempts to use it as a basis for raising funds uncontrolled by the Congress are apparent throughout. Perhaps, the most telling description of its inadequacy has been the Department of Transportation's failure to submit any recommendations for the legislation based on the study's findings.

Besides an unbelievable determination that no unique public benefit exists from the Nation's airway system, the study includes various alternate methods to recover from the direct users 100 percent of the FAA's budget. One method is the levying of landing fees on general aviation only at airports having control towers.

The administration has taken that portion—a discriminatory alternative—and offered it as a fund-raising device for emergency consideration by the Congress. In view of the past investigations by the Congress and the existing studies being conducted toward revision of the Airports-Airways Act, I find it difficult to believe that my colleagues will endorse such shallow proposals when there are more substantive alternatives than increasing the taxes on an industry that

provided 250 millions of dollars in balance-of-payment credits from export of aircraft, engines and spare parts to the world's general aviation market.

Airport landing fees levied by the airport operator are normal business procedures and should be supported and should not be accidentally or deliberately negated by ill-timed Federal legislation, no matter how well meaning.

I respectfully submit to my colleagues and to the President that time still permits a thoughtful review of this great industry. It would be improper and incompetent folly, if untimely legislative action would be substituted for good management within our Government.

THE HEALTH SYSTEM NEEDS PHILANTHROPY NOW MORE THAN EVER

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, on November 19, 1974, Dr. Charles C. Edwards, Assistant Secretary for Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, spoke at a dinner honoring the trustees and leaders in philanthropy of the Presbyterian-University of Pennsylvania Medical Center in Philadelphia. His subject was the need to continue private philanthropy in health, even after national health insurance is enacted. As he said:

I think I appreciate, as well as anyone does, the irreplaceable loss that the health care system would suffer if National Health Insurance brought an end to the tremendous rewards that accrue from the voluntary donation of funds and personal energy in the spirit of philanthropy. Such a loss might be calculated in dollars, but it would be reflected in research not carried out, services not provided, and innovations not exploited. In short, the loss of philanthropy would hit hard at the very places where our health care system is in most need of creativity and freedom, in the places where new ideas and new approaches to old problems can lead to needed change.

I agree with that statement. Last year nearly \$4 billion was given to the health field by private philanthropy. The Presbyterian-University of Pennsylvania Medical Center benefited last year from \$1.8 million in private philanthropy and from untold hours in voluntary service to the center. I would like to note that one of the finest citizen leaders was honored that evening for his philanthropic and voluntary efforts. Paul J. Cupp, the chairman of the board of trustees of the center, was given the Ephraim D. Saunders Award for his exceptional service, the highest honor the center can bestow. Mr. Cupp, the retired chairman of American Stores, Inc., has given much time and energy not only to the center, but to Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania.

It is because of such philanthropic and volunteer efforts, and the benefits that come to our Nation as a result, that I support the continuation of private

philanthropy in our health care system. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of reading the excellent statement of Dr. Edwards, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE HEALTH SYSTEM NEEDS PHILANTHROPY
NOW MORE THAN EVER

(By Charles C. Edwards, M.D.)

I am delighted and honored to join with you this evening in recognition of the individuals and organizations whose generosity continues to play a vital part in expanding the Presbyterian Medical Center's service to this community and to the Nation.

I choose the word vital deliberately, knowing quite well that there are those who believe that philanthropy has a very short future in the American health system, that the certain arrival of national health insurance will mark the certain departure of voluntary giving to Presbyterian and to all the other health institutions large and small that have benefited from philanthropy throughout the long history of this country.

Let me just say that while I understand the thinking behind that prognosis, I also understand the major and undiminished need for philanthropy in the health field. And I think I appreciate, as well as anyone does, the irreplaceable loss that the health care system would suffer if national health insurance brought an end to the tremendous rewards that accrue from the voluntary donation of funds and personal energy in the spirit of philanthropy.

Such a loss might be calculated in dollars, but it would be reflected in research not carried out, services not provided, and innovations not exploited.

In short, the loss of philanthropy would hit hard at the very places where our health care system is most in need of creativity and freedom, in the places where new ideas and new approaches to old problems can lead to needed change.

And without the capacity for change, the health care system—a system that has many of its deepest and firmest roots in this city—would be in grave danger.

All of us, of course, recognize that there are profound changes occurring in the health care system—in every facet of the system from fundamental research to the delivery and financing of services. And at every point along that continuum, those of us who have some measure of responsibility—in either the public or the private sector—are faced with countless difficult choices, each of which will have very far-reaching consequences.

For example—

What is the proper and most productive balance between targeted research and research that is not directed toward a specific objective?

Should this country continue to depend on the influx of foreign medical graduates to meet its physician manpower needs?

How can we bring greater competition to the organization and delivery of services without sacrificing quality or freedom of choice?

And perhaps the most crucial question of the moment—how can we control the rising cost of health care through voluntary action without curtailing access to necessary services?

It is tempting for some in the health industry to believe that such questions can and should be answered only by government policy makers.

Certainly, there are a number of spokesmen—in the Congress and elsewhere—who maintain that government is the only possible source of leadership for the American

health enterprise. They believe that the private sector is unable or unwilling realistically to address the major problems facing the health care system and to find reasonable answers to a host of questions like those I mentioned a moment ago.

Unfortunately, I think we all have to admit that there has been a failure of leadership in the American health enterprise. There has been a tendency for the system simply to drift—to expand without a plan for orderly growth, to adopt new techniques and procedures without knowing whether they are effective and beneficial, and to regard virtually unrestrained increases in the cost of health care as inevitable.

I am not suggesting that the problem is entirely the fault of the private sector. On the contrary, I would be the first to admit that the public sector—most especially the Congress and the Federal health enterprise—has had a poor record of leadership, and has been a major contributor to many of the problems that are now of great concern to us all.

We face very serious problems of specialty maldistribution at least partly because Federal support of biomedical research has drawn large numbers of medical students and physicians into highly specialized careers, rather than into the primary care fields. In the pursuit of scientific excellence we have lost sight of the goal of meeting basic health care needs.

We find inadequate attention to preventive health care and inappropriate utilization of hospitals at least partly because programs like Medicare and Medicaid—as well as privately financed health insurance—are designed to pay more generously for inpatient services than for outpatient care.

So if the health care system has suffered from a failure of leadership—and there can be little doubt that it has—then both the public and the private sectors are at fault. And clearly, we will have little success in solving the problems facing the health care system unless and until all of us accept the responsibility to provide quality leadership that the entire system can follow in the best sense of pluralism.

And moreover, I think the very real test of leadership—perhaps the final test for private leadership—will come with the development, enactment, and implementation of a system of national health insurance.

Despite the dubious assertion by some spokesmen for organized medicine that the American people place a rather low priority on national health insurance, it seems obvious that this Nation will shortly establish a financing system that will assure every citizen an opportunity to obtain health insurance coverage.

As I am sure you know, the momentum toward adoption of an insurance scheme is erratic to say the least. At times within the past year even the most cautious observers were predicting enactment of national health insurance within a matter of weeks. At other times the prospects for enactment at this session of Congress were judged to be nil.

Now, I think, it is reasonable to conclude that there is not enough time left for the 93rd Congress to work out the compromises and agree on the specifics of a comprehensive health insurance plan, and I think that this major and sweeping piece of legislation will have to await the arrival of the new Congress in January. Indeed, it may be rather late in the session before final action is taken on a national health insurance bill.

But clearly, health insurance will be very high on the list of priorities for the 94th Congress, just as it is one of the principal domestic initiatives of the Ford administration.

I suppose inevitably discussions about national health insurance tend to focus on a number of key issues—the cost, both to individuals and to the Nation, the kind of

benefits to be covered, the financing scheme, controls on cost and utilization, and other critically important questions the answers to which will shape not just the insurance plan, but the entire health care system for years to come.

But without intending to discount the importance of these issues, I would suggest that there are some other, more subtle, factors that simply must not be overlooked in the rush to devise a health insurance plan that Congress will enact and the President will sign into law.

One of those factors, of course, is the impact of national health insurance on philanthropy, an issue that very deeply concerns both the donors and the recipients of the nearly \$4 billion that is contributed to the health care system by those of you gathered here this evening and countless others throughout the country.

As I said earlier, there is a measure of logic in the rather dire prediction that national health insurance will sharply reduce—if not in fact eliminate—philanthropy in the health field. From a purely economic point of view, the need for philanthropy might seem to disappear when a national health insurance scheme assures institutions like Presbyterian full reimbursement for all activities associated with patient care.

But such reasoning, in my judgment, is both narrow and shortsighted. It equates philanthropy with charity. And it fails to recognize that all great medical centers—and even many hospitals of more modest scope—are able to undertake projects and programs only because generous organizations and individuals are willing and able to provide the necessary funds.

Furthermore, the kind of activities made possible through philanthropic donations and private grants are likely to represent innovations, in both research and services, for which Federal dollars are often not available.

It is well for all of us to remember—and I mean those of us in the public sector as well as in the private sector—that government is seldom at the leading edge of change. On the contrary, government, by tradition if not by necessity, is more likely to reflect than to produce social change.

In my own view, this is as it should be. By and large, I think, the public's money is best used to exploit proven advances in the provision of social services—including health care—and to seek new knowledge in problem areas that have a major impact on individuals and society.

Moreover, at a time when Federal spending is under extremely tight restrictions, it is all the more appropriate that tax dollars be spent where they have the greatest likelihood of yielding tangible results. And this, as I am sure you can appreciate, makes it all the more difficult for Federal health programs to provide support for unproved ventures that necessarily involve a substantial risk of failure.

What this means, of course, is that both national health insurance and tight Federal health budgets tend to make philanthropy an increasingly vital and important source of funds for the health care system—the kind of venture capital than can point the way to significant change in the whole health care system.

I understand that an effort is being made to insure that whatever form national health insurance may take, the law will reflect a desire to preserve the place of philanthropy, rather than diminish it. I support the goal of such efforts, because I think the loss of private philanthropy would work tremendous, and perhaps irreparable, hardships on the health care system and on the people served by it.

The rush to adopt a system of national health insurance unquestionably comes in response to a very real and a very urgent

need. Tens of millions of Americans have either no insurance protection whatever or are covered inadequately by plans that foster expensive and inappropriate use of the Nation's limited health resources.

But in seeking to correct these defects, I think it is imperative that the leadership of the health establishment—public and private—guard against devising a system that might inadvertently create new problems and make old ones worse.

To foreclose private philanthropy would be a grave mistake.

To add materially to the demand for health services without making certain that the system can respond would be a grave mistake.

And to institute an insurance system that had no effective mechanisms for cost containment and quality assurance would be a grave mistake.

I am confident that many people within and outside the Federal government are well aware of these considerations. But I am equally sure that it will take the best and most enlightened leadership of the entire health industry to design a responsible health insurance system, and once it is adopted, to make it work.

Clearly, these are times in American life when our institutions and our capacity for wise and purposeful action are being seriously tested.

If the events of recent months show us anything, it is that the American people will not accept leadership that sacrifices the public interest to any other objective, real or imagined. The people of this country are demanding a new quality of leadership, one in which they can put their trust. And they demand it of those of us who are leaders in the health field no less than of those who occupy the highest offices in the land.

All of us will be judged by future generations on our ability to act decisively at a time of great trial and great opportunity.

I would hope that the judgment of history finds that we were able to marshal the will to lead and summon the courage to act, not in the sure and certain knowledge that everything we do will be right, but knowing that if we fail to accept the challenge to lead and the mandate to act, we will have lost the chance to do either.

In our zeal to cope with the great problems facing American society—problems in health, in economics, in the physical environment, and indeed in the ethical environment of our Nation—I earnestly hope that we as a people never lose sight of the tremendous contribution that private individuals are able and willing to make toward the solution of our problems.

It is too easy, I think, to look to government and to conclude that these great national issues can only be met by similarly great and impersonal national endeavors.

Certainly the major and critical problems facing the United States do command the best efforts that government can muster. But they will not be solved unless the American people, and especially those who are willing and able to make substantial contributions of their time and resources, are given every opportunity to contribute to the tasks at hand.

I trust that the dependence on government will never be so great, or the capabilities of government so misunderstood, as to deny the service that individual private citizens can make to the strength and welfare of all the American people.

Thank you very kindly.

UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in recent well-concerted activities by the anti-Vietnam lobby in our Nation's Capital, and in some elements of the media, a number of gross distortions have been advanced. Some of those distortions are related to the nature of governments in Southeast Asia, particularly to the nature of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, a number of so-called political prisoners in Vietnam, censorship, corruption, and persecution of political opposition.

Critics of aid for the Republic of Vietnam refuse to face the realities of their position. They talk of cease-fire violations by both sides and especially place the responsibility for it on the government in Saigon. Yet, the major violations are those committed by the Communist regulars from the north and a few of their supporters from the south. The North Vietnamese Communists have increased their troop strength in the south since the cease-fire. At the time of the Paris peace agreement, they had 160,000 regular troops on the territory of the Republic of Vietnam. Now, they have 210,000 troops. They have attacked South Vietnamese citizens, destroyed schools, hospitals, and whole villages, refused to allow the International Commission for Control and Supervision to investigate treaty violations in Communist zones, and failed to designate points of entry to permit inspection of incoming military supplies. They have deployed 700 Soviet-made tanks, built a pipeline reaching the Saigon environs to keep Hanoi's trucks and tanks refueled.

In addition to 1,600 antiaircraft guns, they have introduced 35 regular North Communist units equipped with SA-2 missile launchers and the hand-held SA-7 missiles.

In his most recent report to the Secretary of Defense, James R. Schlesinger, Maj. John Murray, recently retired U.S. defense attaché in Saigon, states:

North Vietnamese troops have had two years to build up their supply of arms. Their ammunition stockpiles are up. Today, without question, Hanoi has by far the strongest, best-positioned and best-supported military machine it has ever fielded in South Vietnam.

North Vietnamese Communists have 120 tons of supplies stockpiled in the northern half of the Republic of Vietnam and another 40,000 tons stored away in the south of the country.

Each of these violates explicit provisions of the Paris Peace Agreements. No comparable violations can be legitimately charged against the Republic of Vietnam.

Second, critics say that more aid means throwing good money after bad since South Vietnam cannot survive anyway. But, these are the same critics who predicted the Government would collapse as soon as American troops left in March of 1973. If they block aid long enough,

maybe they can force their prophecies to come true.

Third, anti-Vietnam lobbyists say they do not want an anti-democratic regime. While the government of South Vietnam—GVN—is not a model of liberal democracy, it looks very good indeed when compared with North Vietnam, which is a Communist totalitarian dictatorship. Two brief comparisons may illustrate the point.

In South Vietnam, there are 16 Vietnamese language papers of which 13 are classified either as "independent" or "opposition" papers. There is some censorship in the name of national security, which is understandable considering the fact that the country is in a state of war. Nonetheless, reading the Saigon press suggests that newspapers can and do, regularly and sometimes vigorously, criticize the government and its policies.

Opposition candidates can compete and win elections in South Vietnam which are held as constitutionally scheduled. President Thieu's supporters did not control a majority in the Senate from 1967 to 1973. A mere 40 of the 119 candidates seeking reelection to the lower house in 1971 were returned by the voters. The 1971 presidential election was uncontested only because both Nguyen Cao Ky and Duong Van ("Big") Ming chose to withdraw after having qualified for the race. In most recent provincial elections in Quang Tri Province, the opposition was able to obtain majority representation in the local administration.

The contrast in North Vietnam is clear. All newspapers are owned and controlled by the government and are always favorable to it. All candidates for the National Assembly must be approved by the Communist Party. In the four elections that have been held at irregular intervals since 1946, not a single Member of the National Assembly has ever been defeated.

The continued loyalty of the military—at all levels—to the South Vietnamese Government, the increased support by the peasant masses—roughly a million of whom have gained title to their lands since 1970, and the decline of urban opposition testify to the preference of South Vietnamese voters for their limited democracy rather than Communist control by the North.

The most current political moves in the Republic of Vietnam including the demonstration by the opposition and certain leadership among the Catholics certify two important facts.

One, that peaceful demonstration and constitutionally guaranteed political actions can be freely carried out.

Two, the majority of those demonstrating—the Catholic anticorruption movement under the leadership of Father Tran Huu Thanh—is on record that the purpose of their movement is to eliminate elements of corruption in order to improve the efficiency of the nation's anti-Communist struggle.

I would urge my colleagues to resist cuts in aid to South Vietnam. To cut the aid package to South Vietnam is to encourage the aggression and the Communist dictatorship of the North, to support adequate aid is to at least make the

continued development of democracy possible.

At this point, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Des Moines Register of October 16, 1974, regarding American support of SVN and a letter to the editor by John E. Murray, major general, USA, retired, former Attaché in Vietnam, which deal with the current posture of South Vietnam:

PENTAGON "SCARE TALK" HIT

"No matter what happens in South Vietnam now, no matter what the Pentagon says, the United States is not going back into the Vietnam war.

"Yet Deputy Secretary of Defense William Clements returned from an inspection trip to South Vietnam and told a press conference Oct. 8 that U.S. air and naval forces might have to go back if North Vietnam launches a major offensive.

"That would be alarming if anyone took it seriously. Nobody did. President Ford held a press conference the next day and no one asked about it. Editors ran the Clements story small and inconspicuous. Few broadcast news programs mentioned it.

"... If Thieu's million-man forces cannot take care of themselves against a fourth or a third as many North Vietnamese and Viet Cong, 'Vietnamization' has been a flop, as direct U.S. combat action was.

"Going back in would be throwing good money after bad, throwing in more American lives in addition to the 50,000 squandered for nothing in 1961-73, losing new prisoners of war.

"Pentagon talk of going back in is just scare talk, in hope of frightening the North Vietnamese. For the United States is not seriously intended. It would be a political impossibility."

OCTOBER 29, 1974.

The Editor,
Des Moines Register,
Des Moines, Iowa.

SIR: Your editorial of the 16th of October was premature by 15 days. It masked so much it should have been written on Halloween.

It said that no one is taking seriously the conditions in Vietnam because no one in the press corps asked President Ford the next day about Mr. Clements' (Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense) statement on South Vietnam.

They didn't because the day Mr. Clements spoke the press at once asked his boss, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Schlesinger about it.

In a news conference on October 2, the Secretary answered in his usual candid manner, with facts so hard that they may have been too indigestible for others to assimilate.

Also, your statement that "Thieu's million-man forces cannot take care of themselves against a fourth or a third as many North Vietnamese and Viet Cong", is again, entirely wrong.

The forces that North Vietnam now field are stronger, by far, than any that the U.S. Forces faced when we had over half a million men backed by B-52's, F-111's, aircraft carriers, navy gun fire and the field mobility of the U.S. Army and U.S. Marines.

As a fact the combat forces—about 13 Divisions—of the North Vietnamese in South Vietnam, match the total number of Divisions of the South Vietnamese. And what's more, the North Vietnamese have a half-dozen Divisions in Reserve in North Vietnam.

To say that "Vietnamization has been a flop" ... is blatantly unfair. The proof is to the contrary. We pulled out 1/2 million men with all our properly vaunted modern military capability, and the ARVN found with unusual gallantry against the increasingly formidable North Vietnamese who now have

hundreds of more long-range artillery pieces, thousands of more anti-aircraft troops with sophisticated Russian furnished weaponry, and a massively improved logistic base. The South Vietnamese have fought these formidable forces and won.

In the Delta the ARVN cleaned the enemy out of the Seven Mountain area. Something that we did not do. They also took back Tri Phap, a traditional enemy stronghold in the Delta that we did not take. And in enemy division-sized attacks at Quang Duc, north of Saigon in the Iron Triangle and southwest of Danang in the Thuong Duc, they have fought successful bloody division-sized battles.

The question is not what they can do. The question is what we do.

As Secretary Schlesinger has pointed out, all the support they need is less than 2% of what it cost us to support the war when we were over there.

And as Secretary Schlesinger has pointed out, all that the Congress is meagerly furnishing is an amount for the entire year, to support this major war, that was spent in one week on the Yom Kippur fracas. Which we supported quickly with our funds.

Where are our principles? Why, on the one hand, should we selectively support with fervor one small country attacked by communist arms. And drop the support in a country also attacked by communist arms for over two decades. Can it be that our principles are sliced off thinly by a time machine? They don't endure?

Another failure of fact in your editorial. The allegation that the Pentagon talk is "in hope of frightening the North Vietnamese."

As one with some acquaintance with both unrivaled perplexities—the Pentagon and the North Vietnamese—may I say there is not that kind of hope in the Pentagon. Only the certain knowledge that the North Vietnamese, like all Vietnamese, are not frightened easily—least of all by talk.

JOHN E. MURRAY,
Major General, USA (ret.).

**BALDWINVILLE, N.Y., STUDENTS
WIN INTERNATIONAL FILM
AWARD**

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I learned only recently that, on November 21, seven young women from Baldwinsville, N.Y., were honored here in Washington for their outstanding achievements in amateur film production. Receiving an Eagle Award, the highest award given by the Council for International Nontheatrical Events—CINE—were Jane Abbott, Joanne Bultman, Amy Pitcher, Loren Redfoot, Shelly Robinson, Sue Towlson, and Nancy Wood. More than a year ago these girls, all of whom are now 12 years old, formed a film club called Palmer's Filmmakers at Palmer Elementary School in Baldwinsville and produced the film "Black and White." The movie is an animation of a popular song of the same name which has successfully fostered an increased racial understanding among young people throughout the Nation.

Although they made the film for their own pleasure and for the entertainment of their fellow students, it soon won national recognition in Kodak's teenage

award movie contest, winning second place in its field. Kodak in turn entered the film in the CINE award contest, in which it competed with thousands of films made in the United States and Canada. As part of the CINE program, the prize-winning film was then shown in 64 different European and Asian film festivals last summer as representative of the abilities and attitudes of young people in the United States.

I believe that these young women not only deserve the recognition accorded them by CINE; they also deserve the admiration and gratitude of all Americans. We could not ask for better ambassadors than these seven talented girls. In delivering their own unique message of understanding and brotherhood, they spoke simply but very eloquently for all of us.

**RETIRED LABOR LEADER NEW
MAYOR OF YANKEE TOWN**

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, keeping fish from water probably is only slightly more difficult than keeping labor leaders out of politics.

When Pittsburgh area labor leader, Joe Sabel, retired from his post of president of Local 590, Amalgamated Food Employees, and his post as head of the Allegheny County Labor Council, he headed south to Yankee Town, Fla., for a well-deserved rest.

Yet a dispute over blasting by a local developer led him back to the "front lines," representing the interests of citizens who he felt were being abused.

His successful efforts led his neighbors to support Joe Sabel in the recent mayoral race. He won and now is the mayor of Yankee Town, population 1,000.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD at this time a newspaper article discussing the new career of my old and good friend Joe Sabel:

FORMER AREA UNION LEADER—"RETIRED" SABEL
YANKEE TOWN'S NEW MAYOR

PENN. HILLS.—Former Penn Hills labor leader Joseph Sabel didn't forget much of what he learned about politics during his many years of effort in both local and statewide political affairs.

Word reached the community last week that Sabel, the retired president of Local 590, Amalgamated Food Employees Union and former head of the Allegheny County Labor Council, was elected mayor of Yankee Town, Fla., in that community's municipal election on Oct. 29.

Yankee Town is a community of some 1,000 people and Sabel polled 30 percent of the vote. No primary is held in Yankee Town elections, so all candidates run in the general election.

In addition to his own victory, three of Sabel's five running mates for city council were elected and a fourth lost by only a few votes.

The opposition forces have been in office in Yankee Town for the past 50 years.

While he became a fulltime resident of the community only last November, Sabel and his late wife lived there as parttime residents for several years. Soon after he moved there permanently he became involved in a Yankee

Town citizen dispute over a developer who was blasting nearby and allegedly causing damage to home foundations and walls.

Sabel eventually became the leader of the developer's opponents and led a successful court fight. The victory apparently boosted him into the Yankee Town mayoralty race.

While a resident of Penn Hills and head of the Food Employees Union, politics became a constant concern of Sabel's. He served as deputy secretary of labor during the state administrations of Governor George Leader and David Lawrence prior to his election as president of Local 590.

Locally he was instrumental in Pete Flaherty's successful campaign for mayor of Pittsburgh in 1969, but last year he opposed Flaherty's re-election.

Now he is a winner in his own right and apparently launching a new career in politics even though he is retired.

SALUTE TO A GOOD SOLDIER

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Roscoe C. Cartwright, a former Tulsan and second black general in U.S. history, was killed along with his wife, Gloria, in a Trans World Airlines jetliner crash in Virginia Sunday, December 1. We have lost a man who, indeed, had the capacity to act on the problems of minority groups and solve them with distinction.

Having been promoted in August 1971, to brigadier general in the U.S. Army at the age 52, he stated that he was "proud and happy to be a member of the rather exclusive club" of black generals. This being one of the "crowning moments" of his career, General Cartwright, as a leader of black America, stated that "opportunity is there for the black youth who is willing to take the initiative."

Born in Kansas City and raised in Tulsa, General Cartwright was graduated from Washington High School in 1936. While attending Kansas State College of Pittsburg, he was drafted in January 1941, to serve in the Army when America entered World War II. However, with continued effort, he attended San Francisco State College, graduating with a bachelor of arts in social science and business administration. In 1966, he was graduated from the University of Missouri at Kansas City with a master's in business administration. After Vietnam, he was graduated from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Washington, D.C., with honors.

A veteran of three wars, General Cartwright has received numerous decorations which include three Bronze Stars, three Air Medals, and two Legions of Merit. In Vietnam, he received the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with Silver Star and the Vietnamese Honor Medal First Class. On August 12, 1974, the Distinguished Service Medal was bestowed upon him for leadership and analytical ability, as he devised an ingenious supply system to connect civilian support with combat units and Army engineers.

During his tour of duty in Vietnam, as commander of the 106th Artillery Group,

he believed in the value of having direct contact with the soldiers. In addition, General Cartwright originated a library along with college courses taught by accredited teachers.

After having been stationed as controller for the U.S. Army in Europe, General Cartwright retired at the end of August 1974, with 32 years of service. According to him, each decade in which he served reflected different behavior. When he entered, a segregated Army existed followed later by the formation of a separate but equal Army. Upon promotion to brigadier general, an integrated, undiscriminating force prevailed where men and women are judged solely upon their abilities.

Upon retirement, "a span of employment as a civilian and then retirement to a weekend farm on the Eastern Shore of Maryland," was planned. He was employed by the National Petroleum Council in Washington; but his final destination to that Maryland farm was terminated by the will of God, to leave behind the only survivors—his memory and loved ones.

HIGHER NATURAL GAS PRICES DO NOT MEAN MORE SUPPLIES

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on December 4, the Federal Power Commission announced that it was, in essence, decontrolling natural gas prices. New gas will be sold for 50 cents per thousand cubic feet regardless of its cost of production. Old gas, regardless of its cost of production or the number of years it has been producing, will be sold at the new price once the present contracts expire.

This is a devastating blow to the American consumer. This insult, following on the injury of windfall oil profits, will diminish the consumer buying power of all Americans. It will contribute to the deepening recession as additional billions are shifted from consumer markets to the coffers of the oil and natural gas industries.

The Federal Power Commission has betrayed its trust. It should either be abolished and a new regulatory body with a more definite mandate established, or its Commissioners impeached for violation of the law. The Commission has long been infiltrated and subverted by representatives of the energy industry. They are shackled to the industries they are supposed to regulate. They are parrots of the industry line.

The Commission has said it is taking this action in order to encourage more gas production. Mr. Speaker, the FPC has no idea whether this de facto deregulation will bring forth any more gas. In a producers' monopoly, higher prices are more likely to produce higher profits rather than new supplies.

The senior Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee, Mr. HART, has provided data clearly proving that the natural gas industry is dominated by a few large companies. In

his speech of December 2, 1974, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, S37698, the Senator reported that—

As of June 30, 1972, four oil companies controlled 92.3 percent of the uncommitted gas reserves onshore in Southern Louisiana, 100 percent of the Federal and State offshore uncommitted reserves in the Texas Gulf and 80 percent in the Permian Basin.

The Senator also provided a table showing that for the major natural gas producing areas, there was an eight-firm concentration of ownership of uncommitted reserves ranging between 74.9 to 100 percent. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, there is no true competition in this industry. This industry will behave as monopolies always do—restrict supply and keep prices high.

According to a highly critical General Accounting Office report of September 13, 1974, the FPC has had no idea whether its past rate increases have resulted in additional flows of gas. Said the GAO:

The limited evidence available suggests that the estimates of the volumes of gas to be delivered [as a result of emergency higher prices] provided the FPC varies substantially from the volumes of gas actually delivered. The table below compares the estimates received by FPC with the actual volumes delivered under the 180 day emergency sales program. In every case that data was available, the actual volume was less than what had been estimated, as follows [note that the 180-day emergency sales price was approximately the price now established on a regular basis by the FPC's action of December 4th]:

Estimated volume reported to FPC (in million cubic feet)	Actual volume delivered (in million cubic feet)	Difference
1,080,000	716	1,079,284
54,000	4,300	49,700
5,400,000	900,000	4,500,000
54,000	25,000	29,000
270,000	90,000	180,000
540,000	78,242	461,758
270,000	9,149	260,851
7,668,000	1,107,407	8,560,593

Note: On the basis of the volumes presented above and the prices at which the gas was sold, the estimated weighted average price was 53.5 cents per million cubic feet whereas the actual weighted average price was 54.4 cents per million cubic feet.

Another important point for us to keep in mind is the similar deregulation in "old" oil prices of last year. That step was taken to supposedly increase the incentive to produce American oil. It was meant to increase domestic supplies. The actual result was that the oil companies now produce less oil—700,000 barrels per day less—than they did before the oil deregulation.

A very excellent study by the Library of Congress for Congressman JOHN MOSS made several of these facts clear. It says that the new oil price, high enough "to foster oil production on the lunar surface," has not helped us preserve last year's level of output.

This experience, the study concludes: "Tells us that price incentive alone may have very limited impact on gas production."

The report notes that a further argument against deregulation of natural gas comes from the administration's "Project Independence" blueprint, which assumes deregulation and estimates that gas production would rise to 24.5 trillion

cubic feet in 1985—yet there is already over 22 trillion cubic feet of natural gas production now, at current prices.

It is true, of course, that higher prices may bring forth more supplies after 3 or 4 years of increased exploration or drilling. In the interim, the consumer gains nothing and loses billions. We should give consideration to a system of paying companies for exploration and discoveries. The United States might even establish its own TVA-type exploration company. The cost to the consumer would be infinitely less.

Mr. Speaker, if the past emergency price increases did not result in any substantial increases in gas supplies, then we have no reason, no grounds to believe that the new doubling in price will guarantee additional supplies—but the FPC has guaranteed that the cost to the consumer will double.

It is time for the Congress to act to make the FOC do its duty—or mandate someone else to protect the public's interest.

THE ROAD TO RECOVERY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, during the depression of the 1930's, the Democratic administration managed to extend, exacerbate, and spread the suffering and the misery around until 1941, when President Roosevelt was able to arrange for the attack on Pearl Harbor, thus granting himself a reason to inflate the Nation's money supply and create an artificial boom, and to end unemployment by conscription into the Armed Forces. War has been the only solution to economic problems that some people have ever been able to think of. Unfortunately war does not solve problems; its furious and frenzied activity may hide them from view for a while, but the problems remain and are made worse by the waging of war.

There is, however, a way out of economic slumps, and I hope that the way out will be the only way chosen by this Congress and the executive branch. It is simply to reverse the process that has brought us to a recession; cut the budget, cut the Federal payroll, cut taxes, stop printing money; in one word: Economize. A recent editorial in *Industry Week* hit the nail on the head when it suggested Government layoffs. Only if the Government lays off the economy will it be able to recover.

The article follows:

GOVERNMENT LAYOFFS?

Uncle Stash is not an economist. But he has an uncanny way of adding 2 and 2 and invariably coming up with 4. He's a cogitator.

He's worried about inflation and soaring unemployment. However, he's terrified by the rising clamor that the government do something to find solutions to the problems. The idea irks him. "Government's short-sighted actions are what got us into this mess. Maybe what we need is some government inaction," is his sage reaction.

"We keep reading about massive layoffs in

the private sector because of inaction in the marketplace. When are we going to hear about some layoffs in government?" he mused. "With more people without taxable income, there are fewer people to pay the taxes required to maintain the government payroll."

He has a point. With federal taxes paid in all of last year equal to \$1,223 for every man, woman, and child in the U.S., it takes 9.5 times this amount to cover a federal civilian employee's annual average salary of \$11,571.

Unemployment rolls increased by 1.4 million in the last year, from 4.1 million to 5.5 million people.

Uncle Stash is a prudent man who doesn't buy what he can't afford. Using the 9.5 to 1 ratio, he suggests the federal government start by laying off 147,368 employees if it's serious about whipping inflation now.

Curbing inflation means less government spending. This plan would cut the budget by \$1.7 billion, not to mention the savings in paperwork and red tape that the federal government would not have to pay for to keep fewer people busy.

It's not the whole answer, but we think it's a start.

GOUGING "UNCLE SAM"

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, to protect the United States from cartels being formed by exporting countries to get exorbitant prices from us for their commodities and minerals, I recently introduced House Joint Resolution 1169 for a constitutional amendment that would permit us to tax exports. I see this as a defensive measure, pure and simple, to protect the United States from price gouging for commodities essential to our well-being.

In my "Dear Colleague" letter on the subject, I pointed out that exporters of petroleum and natural gas were not the only nations figuring to charge the United States blackmail prices for their products. Also listed were exporters of iron and aluminum—bauxite—ores, mercury—quicksilver, copper, and bananas.

In the few days since I mailed that letter, there has been further escalation by opportunistic foreign nations to tamper with the marketplace and charge our citizens unfairly high prices. As if present sugar prices do not impose enough of a burden on the housewife and industry alike, the *Detroit News* reported that 20 Latin American and Caribbean nations, producing roughly 60 percent of the world's sugar, have created a union to protect sugar prices.

And a few days earlier, the same newspaper carried an announcement that seven Latin American countries had agreed to form a multinational company to push the price of coffee higher on the world market.

Yes, fellow Members, there is a Santa Claus—and more and more nations are acting as though it is their right and privilege to make Uncle Sam play that role. Hopefully, this great Nation will never have to use export taxes. But it becomes increasingly apparent we need

such a deterrent against nations jacking up the prices of products they sell us. We must arm ourselves against embargoes and blackmail prices.

I again invite you to join me in co-introducing this joint resolution calling for constitutional authority to protect ourselves, and invite your attention to the two newspaper items reprinted below, from the *Detroit News* of November 18 and November 28, respectively. The items follow:

LATIN COFFEE NATIONS SEEK PRICE BOOSTS

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—Seven Latin American countries agreed yesterday to form a multinational company in an attempt to obtain higher prices for coffee on the world market.

Brazil and Colombia, the world's two leading coffee producers, participated in the decision to form the company but neither actually will take part, a spokesman said.

Venezuela, Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Costa Rica, Guatemala and Nicaragua will form the company, called *Cafe Suaves Centrales, S.A. de C.V.*

The decision reflects an increasing tendency among nations possessing raw materials to organize efforts to obtain higher prices.

The world's leading oil producers have had great success along these lines through the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, which determines prices for its 13 members.

Fausto Cantu Pena, director of Mexico's coffee institute, said the new company will begin operations next January.

SUGAR PRODUCERS FORM UNION

MEXICO CITY.—Twenty Latin American and Caribbean nations that produce and export sugar have created a union to protect world sugar prices.

Francisco Cano Escalante, president of the Mexican National Sugar Commission, said the organization's ultimate goal will be to coordinate the region's future sugar production and let each producer, instead of buying countries, set its own price.

World sugar prices have skyrocketed in the last few weeks. The world's average price is about 63 cents a pound. In the United States the price is around \$1 a pound, four times what it was a year ago.

The union will be called the Group of Sugar Exporting Countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. It was formed during a three-day meeting in Cozumel, Mexico, that ended yesterday.

Cano said its first formal policy session will be next April in the Dominican Republic.

He said the union includes Mexico, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Trinidad-Tobago and Venezuela.

They annually produce 12 million tons of sugar, or 60 percent of global production.

OPTOMETRIST OF THE YEAR

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to note that Dr. Sheila Z. Wood, who practices optometry in the District of Columbia, was named "Optometrist of the Year" by the Optometric Society of the District of Columbia. This is the first time in the history of the

society that a woman has received this award.

In addition to her practice, Dr. Wood serves as supervising consultant at the Optometric Center of the National Capital. A graduate of the University of California School of Optometry and State University of New York College of Optometry, she is a member of the American Optometric Association; American Optometric Foundation; and International Behavioral Optometrists, and is active in local volunteer school vision screening programs in this area.

Among Dr. Wood's many other professional activities are service as secretary of the Optometric Center; chairman of the Optometric Society of the District of Columbia's Public Health Committee; membership on the Optometric Council of the National Capital Region's Committee on Education and Committee on Vision Screening; consultant on vision to the District of Columbia Crippled Children's School; and consultant to the National Institutes of Health, perinatal study.

I congratulate Dr. Wood for being recognized by her peers and for the work she is doing at the Optometric Center in serving the needy who are in need of vision care.

IN MEMORY OF BILL TAMKIN

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the Fund for Higher Education, an organization founded in the United States to assist institutions of higher learning in both this country and Israel, will hold a dinner honoring the memory of a fine citizen of southern California—William W. "Bill" Tamkin.

At the dinner on December 12, in the Beverly Wilshire Hotel, Beverly Hills, the Flame of Truth Award of the Fund for Higher Education will be presented posthumously to Mr. Tamkin.

Two eminent schools will benefit from funds raised at the dinner. The fund will establish the William W. Tamkin Developmental Biology Laboratories in the Center for Cancer Research at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and an area will be set aside in Tamkin's name at the Biodynamics Institute of the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel.

Bill Tamkin was a young boy when his family moved to Los Angeles, having left Russia a few years earlier to escape persecution. In 1924, he founded Tamkin Towel Service, building it to one of the largest businesses of its kind. His company serviced most of the schools and professional athletic clubs in southern California, and Tamkin was a familiar sight at athletic events of all kinds at every level from high school to professionals. He was a close friend of both athletes and coaches.

In 1960, he became president of Westside Hospital in Los Angeles and a founder of American Medical Enterprises—now known as American Medical

International, Inc. As a member of the board of directors, he helped build this company to an international giant.

Bill Tamkin was a man of compassion. He felt very deeply about the plight of his fellow man.

He was a member of the Diamond Circle City of Hope, King Solomon Lodge and Hollywood Lodge of B'nai B'rith, Menorah Masonic Lodge F and AM No. 623, Gateways Hospital Men's Club, Temple Beth Am, Westwood and Century Shrine Clubs, and a key man of the United Jewish Welfare Fund. As a past president of the Sunair Home for Asthmatic Children, he was honored as Man of the Year in 1963.

His untimely death came just 1 year ago. He and his wife, Thelma, would have celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary this year.

At the dinner, Mr. Tamkin's widow, Thelma, will accept the Flame of Truth Award of the Fund for Higher Education, honoring his memory "for a lifetime of dedication to youth, higher education, and the advancement of the medical arts."

An outstanding group of people from business, medicine, and government will be attending the memorial dinner. Guest speaker will be Dr. Irving S. Bengelsdorf, director of science communications, California Institute of Technology.

Honorary chairmen of the dinner are two well known people—entertainer Art Linkletter, who also will serve as master of ceremonies, and Los Angeles County Sheriff Peter Pitchess.

The dinner chairmen are Al Greensberg and Harry Groman.

Serving on the Memorial Committee are Amnon Barness, and Bill Tamkin's three sons, Jack Tamkin, Robert Tamkin, and Dr. S. Jerome Tamkin.

Members of the dinner committee are: Leon Alschuler, Irwin Atkins, Edward A. Beger, Walter Berkman, Dr. Ellis Berkowitz, Stanley Black, Charles Boxenbaum, Stuart Buchalter, Max Candiotti, Ben Chudnow, Max Chudnow, Michael Cimaron, James Donnerstag, Dr. Albert Fields, Dave Finkle, Emanuel Fisch, Mel Fliegel, William M. Fredericks, Al Glickman, Sol Goldsmith, Charles Goodman, Danny Goodman, Phil Kleiner, Leon Kline, Dr. Gershon Lesser, Alvin M. Levin, Kalman L. Loeb, N. Ogints, Al Markey, Ben Pelter, Dr. Harry Perelman, Dr. Fred Polesky, Rabbi Jacob Pressman, Michael Radlin, Jean Reep, Herb Reznikoff, Dr. Sidney Senter, Dr. Herman Schlossberg, Dr. Archer Sokol, Howard Starr, Howard Sterling, Louis Taubman, Dr. Mark Tobenkin, Irwin Topper, Oscar Topper, Sidney Wallis, Dr. Manuel Wexler, Alfred Wolf, and Louis Zipperman.

NOTES ON THE 1974 ELECTION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Washington report entitled "Notes on the 1974 Election":

NOTES ON THE 1974 ELECTION

With the 1974 elections now several weeks past, several impressions may be worth noting.

The major disappointment of the elections has to be the low voter turnout. Although the final figures are not yet in, it probably was the lowest turnout in a national election in three decades. Less than 40% of the electorate voted, compared with about 44% of the eligible voters in 1970, the last non-presidential election. In Indiana, which usually votes pretty well, the voter turnout dropped 8 percentage points between 1970 and 1974. The election, then, was something less than a big step forward for democracy. One cannot help but wonder when the decline in voter participation will end, and it raises the question of how long a system based on the consent of the governed will work when three out of every five eligible voters do not vote. H. G. Wells called the voting process "Democracy's ceremonial, its feast, its great function." The danger is that this feast for the many is becoming a banquet for the few.

By any measure, the victory of the Democratic party was impressive, building on already substantial majorities in the Congress and states. The Democrats gained five governors, three Senators, forty-three Representatives, and many state legislators. Indiana provided one of the most dramatic swings in House delegations with the Democrats picking up five seats and now controlling nine of the eleven seats in Indiana. With only isolated victories to cheer them (as in the Ohio governorship) the Republicans were, nevertheless, left with the most prized of all political offices, the White House.

Speaking in the tradition of election winners, some Democratic leaders proclaimed a "mandate," but, in my view, the Democrats won, not so much because of their own virtues, but because voters held Republicans responsible for the current troubles. The election was not a blank check for the Democratic party, but a protest of the Republican performance on the two key issues of the campaign: the low state of the economy and political morality. The election told us more about what the voters did not like than about what they want.

The Democrats should be cautious about celebrating their victories. They should not view their swollen majorities as either permanent or an overwhelming endorsement of their programs. As they look to the future they can justify their vote in the elections only if they can develop the discipline as a party to enable them to present a balanced program to meet the economic and other problems of the country. At once the election results presented the Democratic party with an extraordinary responsibility and an extraordinary opportunity, and the question is whether the new Democratic majority will be able to fashion coherent and responsible alternatives to the Republican President's policies.

The campaign did add to my growing discontent with the way political campaigns are conducted, especially with the manner in which the substance of campaigns is communicated to the voter, both by the news media and the candidates. A chief impression that I have about the campaign is that the quality of the campaign debate was just not very good. Most candidates speak in easy slogans and most of the press fails to ask the tough questions. Often the campaign focused, not on the real questions at issue, but on the tactics of the campaign itself, for example, campaign financing.

Many politicians describe the voters as apathetic, just not caring about what happens in the political process. But my experience is that voters do care deeply about a large number of issues and about what happens in this country. But they often feel impotent to bring about solutions, and they

just don't think voting will help very much. The voters are skeptical about the ability of any leaders to solve the intrinsically tough problems, like inflation or the energy shortage. They know that the problems the nation confronts are terribly difficult and that no one knows exactly what to do. This skepticism about the ability of leaders to solve problems may be one of the reasons that the voter turnout was low.

At the beginning of the 1974 campaign, I heard so much about the angry mood of the voter that I thought it might be a rather unpleasant year in which to campaign. But, to my pleasant surprise, I thoroughly enjoyed my contacts with constituents in Southern Indiana. They may have been frustrated about the problems confronting the nation, but they did not take it out on me, and they were unfailingly courteous and friendly.

Finally, all of us ought to appreciate that in a year of the shattering events of 1974, with the resignation of a President, Watergate, and deep economic troubles, our present institutions were strong enough to offer again an electoral choice to any citizen who chose to participate. In spite of it all, the people still had a chance to speak for themselves—if they wanted to—and for that we can be grateful.

COLLEGE COLORING BOOKS?

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, many times on these pages I have called the attention of my colleagues to the declining quality of education in this Nation. Some educators are concerned about the lack of ability to read by many of our high school students. Unfortunately, it appears that they have come up with the wrong answer again—lowering of standards. The Richmond Times-Dispatch of November 12, 1974, recently pointed out in an editorial how remedial reading is going to work in some of our educational institutions. It is sad and I think my colleagues should take greater heed of this trend in dealing with Federal aid to education programs in the Congress ahead. The editorial follows:

COLLEGE COLORING BOOKS?

Now textbook publishers are turning out simplified books for college students who cannot read well.

That's right. College students.

The word from the big publishing houses is that their books have been judged too hard for many students to grasp. And so the rewriting is underway.

Big words are going out and complex sentences are being broken down. Even the content is changing. There will be fewer abstractions to strain brains, and concepts will be repeated. Sort of the collegiate equivalent of the oh-oh-oh, run-run-run Dick and Jane readers, you might say.

Publishing spokesmen told *The New York Times* that most of the pressure for change was coming from community colleges and four-year institutions with "open admissions" policies. These are havens for "C" students who might not have been accepted in college several years ago. "It wouldn't be true to say that students in Harvard or Yale don't read as well as always," one editor said. We wonder.

Community colleges serve a good purpose by admitting some students who have not been academic whizzes and educating them

for productive employment. Remedial reading, unfortunately, is a must for many of these students. But are the publishers on the right track in writing down to this new breed of student? Or would the students and society be better served if the energies spent on revising books were expended instead on bringing the students up to traditionally-high collegiate standards?

And what does it tell us about our elementary and secondary schools that they are passing on to the colleges 18-year-olds who cannot handle an eighth-grade book?

Where does our anti-language trend end? With college sophomores crayoning Batman coloring books for their term projects?

FIRST CLASS POSTAL RATES EXPECTED TO RISE AGAIN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article in the Washington Post it was reported that the cost of mailing a first class letter is likely to rise from 10 cents to 12 or 13 cents beginning in July.

At a time when this Nation is trying to combat inflation, the American public should not be made to bear a third increase in first class postal service in just 4 years. In January 1971, the cost of mailing a letter was 6 cents; by the summer of 1975, it will have doubled.

Postmaster General Elmer Klassen suggests that as an alternative to a rate increase, Congress must boost its subsidies to meet the Postal Service's mounting losses. Yet there is another alternative that I believe merits consideration. It is time that Congress reexamine the wisdom of the monopoly status regarding first class mail given by statute to the Postal Service.

The Postal Service has vigorously enforced its monopoly over first class mail to prevent competition in any form whatsoever. Last Christmas season the Postal Service went so far as to threaten legal action against two 11-year-old competitors in Pennsylvania. It seems that these youngsters were delivering Christmas cards for their neighbors within a five-block radius of their homes much quicker and at less than half the price charged by the Postal Service. The Postal Service's threat of legal action was sufficient to put these youngsters out of business.

In the area of parcel post delivery where the Postal Service has no statutory monopoly, it should be noted that the United Parcel Service last year after paying \$45 million in Federal income taxes had a profit of \$57 million. Although it pays taxes and receives no subsidies, UPS has proven itself to be both faster and cheaper than the Postal Service.

One of the primary aims of the 1970 Postal Reorganization Act was that the Postal Service would be run on an efficient, businesslike basis. Elmer Klassen's exploits as Postmaster General including the paying of large consultant fees to friends, the awarding of contracts on a less than competitive basis, and a consistent pattern of wasteful spending have been well documented by columnist Jack Anderson.

While postal rates have increased dramatically in recent years, there has not been a corresponding increase or improvement in service. It has been said jokingly that in one city the mail delivery is so slow that some residents are still receiving copies of Life magazine in the mail.

Before Congress considers the question of whether to provide any additional subsidies for the Postal Service, we should first examine and investigate the policies and actions of the present management at L'Enfant Plaza to determine if first class mail cannot be delivered faster and less expensively under new management or by private industry.

The Washington Post article dealing with the likelihood of postal rate increases follows:

POSTAL RATES SEEN RISING 2 OR 3 CENTS

(By William H. Jones)

U.S. postal rates probably will rise next summer and the Postal Service expects a deficit in the current fiscal year approaching \$900 million, Postmaster General Elmer T. Klassen said yesterday.

While Klassen and other Postal Service officials said it is too early to predict what would be included in the rate boost, because costs are not certain, an increase in first class service from 10 cents to either 12 or 13 cents is thought likely.

Answering questions after an address at the National Press Club, Klassen said the Postal Service will file a rate increase next March, to take effect in July. "There is no question we'll need a price increase," he asserted, pointing to soaring fuel, materials and labor costs.

"Somebody has to pay for delivering the mail," said Klassen, and if prices aren't to be raised then Congress must boost its subsidies.

In the fiscal year ended last June 30, he noted, the semi-private Postal Service had a net loss of \$438 million, on revenues of \$10.9 billion. "Frankly, for 1975, it will be twice that much," he said. "That doesn't mean we're broke, but meeting unusual requirements" not faced in any other service, he contended.

Under rate provisions of the postal reorganization, which saw a transformation of the former Post Office Department to the Postal Service in 1971, requests for higher mail charges must be approved by the independent Postal Rate Commission and the Postal Service's board of governors. Rate decisions can be appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals, but only by persons taking part in commission hearings on rate proposals.

Since last March, the Postal Service has been charging 10 cents for first class service on a temporary basis and without final authority. First class service cost 6 cents from January, 1963, until May, 1971, when the rate was boosted to 8 cents.

In addition to the first class boost last March, air mail went to 13 cents from 11 cents, and charges were boosted across the board in other categories—all on the temporary basis.

Klassen as much as admitted yesterday that the Postal Service treats air mail and first class in the same fashion—with all service by air except in local areas. Officials said the only possible advantage for air mail would be in coast-to-coast letters—such as from Los Angeles to New York.

Asked if he has considered retirement, the 66-year-old Klassen said he hasn't had time to think about it. He also declined to discuss upcoming labor negotiations, which will have a significant impact on rates and expenses. Postal workers' contracts expire next July 20.

Klassen did note that productivity is up: the Postal Service is handling 300 million

pieces of mail a day with 5 per cent fewer employees than three years ago.

ANTISOCIAL SECURITY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1974, Barron's published an article by Shirley Scheibla entitled "Antisocial Security." I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD in a slightly shortened version, for it presents as lucid an explanation of the fragility of our overworked and bloated social security system as I have seen. For those millions of people who depend on checks received from the Social Security Administration, the facts presented here are of utmost importance. Unfortunately, these social security dependents are not likely to be told of these facts by those who seek to be known as supporters of the social security system.

ANTISOCIAL SECURITY—THE SYSTEM IS INFLATIONARY AND LOADED WITH INEQUITIES

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—Congress seems to believe that by repeatedly increasing Social Security benefits, in order to help offset the impact of inflation, it is showing genuine concern for those living on fixed incomes. What it is really doing, however, is accelerating the upward spiral of wages and prices, undermining the financial soundness of the Social Security system, aggravating longstanding inequities and placing a crushing burden on young workers.

On January 3, President Nixon signed the latest amendment to the Social Security Act. Without waiting for previously legislated automatic cost-of-living increases to go into effect a year from now, the measure boosts benefits 11%, for a total increase of 68.5% since January 1, 1970 (compared with an estimated 24% rise in the cost of living).

The new benefits, which take effect in two stages, 7% in March and 4% in July, involve no increase in the tax rate, just a rise in the wage base from \$10,800 in 1973 to \$13,200 this year. Yet they go to 29.3 million retirees, who have stopped contributing to the system, as well as to those who soon will retire.

IT'S MAGIC

Unless Congress and the Social Security Administration (SSA) have learned to perform magic, the money for all this must come from Social Security taxpayers. The new wage base of \$13,200 is just for openers. According to so-called "dynamic assumptions" now used for the first time in figuring the soundness of the Social Security trust fund, increases in the cost of living will trigger further automatic 3% annual benefit gains, to be financed from ever rising wage bases. As of mid-1972, by the way, the current unfunded liabilities of the Old Age, Survivors and Dependents Insurance program (OASDI) totaled a staggering \$1.8 trillion.

The likelihood that young workers ever will get their money's worth out of Social Security is remote. In voting for the latest round of higher benefits, however, Congress continued to embrace the old fallacy that everyone will come out all right in the end. But it acted without much forethought or debate. It has not studied the "dynamic assumptions" upon which the system's soundness now hinges. Neither the Ways &

Means Committee, where all tax legislation must originate, nor the Senate Finance Committee, held open hearings on the new Social Security measure.

Congress initiated the drastic changes in actuarial methodology in 1972, when (at the Nixon Administration's behest) it directed SSA to use "dynamic assumptions" in figuring the soundness of the Social Security trust fund. This means assuming that the cost of living will increase by 2½%, and wages 5% annually, for the next 75 years. (The wage-price spread is based on the assumption that productivity will go up by 2% a year.) In the past, SSA always assumed no inflation. Then, when inflation followed, it was able to boost benefits to some extent without higher contributions. But with the "dynamic assumptions," SSA grants the higher benefits first and assumes—hopes?—inflation will follow. The former chief actuary of the Social Security Administration, Robert J. Myers, who has more experience with the system than any other living human being and is widely regarded as one of the foremost actuarial experts on Social Security, stated that, "This would be an unsound procedure. . . . What it would mean, in essence, is that actuarial soundness would be wholly dependent on a perpetually continuing inflation of a certain prescribed nature—and a borrowing from the next generation to pay the current generation's benefits, in the hope that inflation of wages would make this possible."

In view of this admonition by a leading expert who has devoted his whole life to the program, the Ways & Means Committee and the House of Representatives should have carefully examined these new assumptions before adopting them in order to provide benefit increases. The Ways & Means Committee last year did not look into the matter at all.

Although President Nixon reportedly is looking for one, the Social Security Administration has had no chief actuary since the resignation of Charles L. Trowbridge last June. Rept. Archer said Francisco Bayo, deputy chief actuary, told him that the dynamic assumptions constitute a fundamental change in methodology and make it more difficult to make estimates, which are "subject to wider variations on the basis of actual experience."

In the past, whenever increases were mandated, SSA computed maximum contributions and benefits for hypothetical workers. For this go-around, however, it has made no such estimates. Mr. Bayo told Barron's that he started to, but gave up because under the "dynamic assumption" the figures became so huge that it was "too scary."

As Barron's—which took on the job—has learned, such calculations are indeed "scary." At first glance, a 3% a year increase in prices, which after all is well below the current 8% rate, does not seem too alarming. Neither does the 5% annual hike in wages, which is less than the Cost-of-Living Council's guideline (5.5%). But when these annual increases continue over a person's full working life, as now assumed, they grow devastating.

FIGURING THE BASE

Believe it or not, under the "dynamic assumptions" with maximum earnings, the wage base (that part of one's income on which Social Security taxes are paid) for an 18-year-old will be \$125,000 at retirement at 65. (A check with SSA revealed that since it is allowing a margin of error of ½% of 1% in the cost-of-living calculation, it is counting on a 3% yearly rise which would trigger increases in benefits and wage bases. We used this same assumption.)

Assuming average mortality based on SSA tables, the 18-year-old's total contributions for Old Age and Survivors Insurance will run to 108,904. Since his employer will pay an

equal sum of money that otherwise could go to the worker, the contribution should be doubled, giving \$217,808. And since the period will be a time of persistent inflation, we figured compound interest at 7% on the combined contributions, to make a total of \$847,368.

We also discounted the worker's benefits by 7% a year after retirement to reflect what the money could have earned if not tied up in Social Security. The calculation shows that the maximum value of benefits which the worker can expect to obtain is \$564,451 for himself, a poor return on \$842,368. However, if he is married, he can expect an additional \$225,988 for his wife and \$212,478 for his widow, for a total of \$1,002,917. Thus married and unmarried workers will fare far differently, even though their contributions are the same. In any case, neither man will live to get his money back.

MARRIAGE SUBSIDY

Although the government repeatedly refers to Social Security as "insurance," under a true insurance plan the insured would have to make higher payments for coverage of his wife as well as himself. Under Social Security, the single worker, in effect, subsidizes the married one.

Doesn't this mean that the married worker will come out ahead if his wife survives him, as average mortality suggests? Not in terms of what his contributions should buy. At retirement at age 65, under "dynamic assumptions," the primary insurance amount for today's young worker will be \$4,950.60 a month, plus one-half of that for his wife and 100% when she becomes a widow.

We asked an insurance company to calculate what annuity the worker's combined contributions would buy at age 65, using SSA's mortality tables for the general population and offering the same benefits, half of the primary amount for the wife and all of it for the widow. The answer was a primary insurance amount of \$7,432 a month, increasing 3% a year. Thus the primary insurance amount under Social Security will be \$2,382 a month less than the worker's contributions should earn. If the policy covered his wife as well, also 65, the primary amount would be \$7,258.

What do SSA's dynamic assumptions mean for the 40-year-old worker? Again assuming maximum contributions and benefits, at retirement at age 65, his wage base will be \$42,600. Combined contributions by him and his employer will be \$61,732 for Old Age and Survivors Insurance. With interest compounded at 7%, that comes to \$195,654.

Assuming average mortality, and that his wife is the same age, the most he can expect to receive in benefits for himself is \$135,301, plus an additional \$54,194 for his wife and \$50,954 for his widow. As in the case of the younger worker, it takes widow's benefits to enable him to get back what he put in.

The primary insurance amount at retirement at 65 would be \$1,187.20 a month. Offering the same benefits as Social Security and using SSA mortality tables, an insurance company could provide \$1,716.10 a month, increasing 3% a year. If the policy covered his wife as well, the primary amount would be \$1,448.75.

As with today's young worker, the middle-aged single worker must pay for Social Security benefits he doesn't receive to enable his married counterpart to come out whole financially after death.

Now for a look at what will happen without inflation. Again assuming maximum earnings and average mortality, when today's 18-year-old worker retires at 65 his wage base will be \$13,200. Combined contributions by him and by his employer on his behalf will come to \$55,256. With interest at a modest 4%, this comes to \$156,084.

BENEFICIAL INTEREST

The value of the benefits for this worker alone will be \$52,963, discounted for the 4% interest the funds could earn if not tied up. They will be \$21,238 for his wife and \$19,810 for his widow, giving a grand total of benefits of \$94,011—a small return on payments of \$180,122. The single worker, of course, will receive only \$52,963.

The young worker's primary insurance amount at retirement at 65 will be \$469 a month. Offering the same benefits as Social Security and using SSA mortality tables, for his contributions an insurance company could provide a primary amount of \$1,396.10.

Without inflation and assuming maximum contributions, today's 40-year-old worker also will have a wage base of \$13,200 at retirement. With average mortality, combined contributions by him and by his employer on his behalf will come to \$36,240. With interest compounded at 4%, this totals \$77,072.

The value of the benefits will be \$49,835 for the worker, \$19,984 for his wife and \$18,640 for his widow, giving a grand total of \$88,459. This worker's primary insurance amount at retirement at 65 will be \$441.30 a month. For those contributions, he should get a primary monthly insurance amount of \$682.50.

We have assumed that the wives of the young and middle-aged men do not work. However, a working woman makes the same contributions as a man. Yet, upon retirement, she is entitled either to her wife's benefits or her benefits from working, whichever is greater. Even though she is a working widow, and knows that the benefits through her deceased husband will be greater than she can ever hope to obtain through her own Social Security, she must continue to pay the tax.

SEX DISCRIMINATION

On the other hand, a husband who would receive greater benefits on his wife's earnings record must prove he is dependent on her to do so. Although a working wife has the same Social Security deductions from her paycheck as a man, her husband doesn't even get death benefits unless he can prove he was her dependent at the time of death.

And according to former SSA Chief Actuary Myers, "when eligible children are present in retirement cases, the wife is eligible for monthly benefits based on the man's earnings record, regardless of her age. But no parallel benefit exists for men, even if dependency on the woman worker was present."

TRIBUTE TO JOE BUSCH

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, dedicated men and women throughout the United States have devoted their lives to furthering the high ideals of their country and their communities. On Sunday evening, December 15, 1974, at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles, Calif., one such man will be recognized for his outstanding service.

Los Angeles County District Attorney Joseph Busch will be honored as Yavneh Hebrew Academy's Man of the Year at the academy's 15th annual scholarship dinner. Los Angeles attorney Eliot B. Feldman will act as chairman of the dinner. Cochairmen includes Helen Mars, Harry Wolkenfeld, and Dorothy

Diller. The distinguished actor, George Hamilton, will serve as master of ceremonies.

In his work as district attorney, Joe Busch has been vitally concerned with the application of equal justice under the law. He has set high standards of quality and honesty for his office. With great dedication he has continually demonstrated a strong interest in education and has actively participated in many events sponsored by the academy.

I would like to join the Yavneh Hebrew Academy in paying tribute to Joseph Busch in recognition of his fine work as district attorney and his continued interest in quality education.

GOLDEN RULE SUPERMARKET IS SIGN OF FAITH IN NORTHWEST URBAN RENEWAL AREA

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1974, the first new supermarket to open in the northwest urban renewal area started to do business in a new \$2 million commercial and housing complex at First and K Streets in Washington, D. C.

The successful efforts of the Bible Way Church and Bishop Smallwood Williams to develop good low- and moderate-cost housing, along with the necessary services, are to be commended. This development and the new Golden Rule Supermarket are within walking distance of the Capitol, and I would urge Members to visit it to see for themselves what can be done with imagination and determination.

The Washington Post article which details the store is attached. I commend it for the reading by those who are searching in their own communities for ways to keep services and housing in their cities for those with low and moderate incomes.

The article follows:

TWO YEARS WITHOUT BIG STORE—NORTHWEST 1 GETS A MARKET

(By Claudia Levy)

The Golden Rule Supermarket, long awaited by residents of the Northwest 1 urban renewal area, has opened in a new \$2 million commercial and housing complex at 1st and K streets NW.

Residents of the urban renewal area, which is bounded by North Capitol and 2d Streets and Massachusetts and New York avenues NW, had been without a major supermarket since a Safeway Store closed two years ago. A small Martin Luther King Jr. Co-op Food Store, opened by community groups at North Capitol and H streets NE in 1971, is slated to be closed to make way for a highway overpass.

The closest chain store for the largely low-income area has been a Safeway at 6th and H streets NE, a long distance for many residents of Northwest 1. The urban renewal area is populated largely by the elderly and by families.

Golden Rule, in a spacious, 18,000-square-foot facility topped by 20 apartments and

flanked by 20 apartments and flanked by 20 townhouses, is the brainchild of Bishop Smallwood Williams, whose nearby Bible Way Church sponsored that project and a 184-apartment highrise across the street.

The supermarket, owned by an independent corporation headed by the bishop's daughter, Yvonne, is a member of the 600-store Richmond Food Stores buying cooperative that also includes the Chevy Chase Market, Magruder's and Memco, Miss Williams said.

Additional members of the Golden Rule corporation include a son and another daughter of the bishop and two other church members.

When Bible Way began shaping its plans to sponsor federally financed low- and moderate-income housing six years ago, Miss Williams said, it was envisioned that the commercial space would be rented by chain stores, whose rent would help pay for the whole project.

"But as we came down to the wire," she said, "no chain was willing to take the space."

(Charles Scott, Northwest 1 project director for the city's Redevelopment Land Agency, said it had been anticipated that Safeway would move back in. But that chain had no interest in reopening another small store, he said.)

Miss Williams said that Bible Way "came within 48 hours of losing the whole project" two years ago. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, which was financing the housing, said that "if there was no viable tenant for the commercial space, then there would be no housing," she said.

The Washington Council for Equal Business Opportunity tried to package group proposals but the groups were turned down for loans by the Small Business Administration, Miss Williams said.

"My father had made the commitment for housing," she said. "The church had put up the front money for planning—\$30,000 would have been lots if the project was abandoned."

"Rather than see the housing lost, he took the initiative and pulled together a group. We literally decided in a matter of hours, 'There has to be a supermarket.'"

Because there was a financial risk involved, it was decided to limit the corporation to a small group, she said. Two loans totaling \$375,000 were secured through the SBA and the corporation put up \$50,000, she said. None of those involved are business people.

Miss Williams, a former Foreign Service officer and executive director of the African-American Scholars Council, is currently trying to help run the business and go to law school at the same time.

The new supermarket, managed by Adam Massey, a former assistant manager at the A&P at 17th Street and Benning Road NE, has 30 employees, some of them residents of Northwest 1. It will be open from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. Monday through Saturday and from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Sunday.

THE OZONE LAYER—PART 1

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, scientific warnings have begun to emerge of a previously unsuspected threat to human beings and other living things on the surface of the Earth.

The Freon which serves as a propellant in spray cans and a coolant in refrigerators now is revealed as a threat to the ozone layer. As the concentration of

ozone decreases, the intensity of ultraviolet radiation reaching the surface increases, with unknown danger to humans, plants, and animals.

Reports of this discovery have appeared in the New York Times and in Science News.

The articles follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 26, 1974]

TESTS SHOW AEROSOL GASES MAY POSE
THREAT TO EARTH

(By Walter Sullivan)

Two scientists have calculated that gases released by aerosol cans have already accumulated sufficiently in the upper air to begin depleting the ozone that protects the earth from lethal ultraviolet radiation.

The calculations, by scientists at Harvard University, follow the recent discovery that these gases, used as aerosol propellants for hair sprays, insecticides and the like, while inert chemically, are highly efficient in promoting ozone breakdown.

The finding has posed a new and ominous threat to stability of the ozone layer that lies primarily between 10 and 30 miles aloft. There has also been concern that the layer would be depleted by exhaust gases from a large fleet of supersonic transport planes or by extensive explosions of nuclear weapons.

On Sept. 5 Dr. Fred C. Ikle, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said that nitric oxides injected into the stratosphere by a nuclear war could wipe out the ozone layer completely.

Because certain wavelengths of ultraviolet light from the sun break down molecules essential to life, it is believed that land life did not emerge until development of the ozone layer in the earth's history. The lethal wavelengths cannot penetrate water.

The most prevalent concern however, is not for total loss of the ozone, which is broken down and restored in a complex sequence of a day and night chemical reaction. Rather, it is a fear of sufficient depletion to cause widespread skin cancer and other effects.

Furthermore, because ultraviolet adsorption by ozone contributes substantially to upper air heating, radical reduction of such heating could alter climates.

Ozone is a gas whose molecules are formed of three oxygen atoms instead of the two that are paired in ordinary oxygen, providing individual atoms that can merge to convert two-atom molecules into the three-atom ozone molecule.

The Harvard calculations were made by Dr. Michael B. McElroy, professor of atmospheric science, and Dr. Steven C. Wofsy, an atmospheric physicist. They found that, even if dispersal of aerosol propellants and other such gases, widely known under the trade name Freon, is halted as soon as practicable, depletion of the ozone layer by 1990 could reach 5 per cent.

They consider a halt by the end of this decade to be the earliest plausible time, in view of political and commercial considerations. As others have pointed out in a number of recent discussions of the danger, the effect will continue for some time after a cutoff because the gas at sea level must work its way up into the stratosphere.

If according to the Harvard scientists, the cutoff is delayed until its effect on the ozone layer, having reached 10 per cent, becomes indisputable, the consequences could be more severe.

Basing their calculations on a relatively conservative estimate of an annual increase of 10 per cent in release of the gases, they predict that the depletion will not level off until the year 2000. By then, they believe, the ozone layer will have been reduced by 14 to 15 per cent.

SLOW RECOVERY FORESEEN

If releases of Freon continues to increase 21 per cent a year, as has recently been the case for the aerosol propellants, the ozone level will be down 7 per cent by 1984 and 30 per cent by 1994. A cutoff in 1987 would modify the effect to a maximum depletion, in 1995, of 21 per cent.

In all cases recovery would be slow since there are no chemical reactions that remove such gases from the air.

In an independent analysis, three University of Michigan scientists have concluded that, by 1985 or 1990, chlorine derived from the atmosphere's Freon content will have become the dominant factor in ozone breakdown.

This report, by Drs. Ralph J. Cicerone, Richard S. Stolarski and Stacy Walters, appears in tomorrow's issue of the journal Science.

The Freon gases in question are chlorofluoromethanes, one of which, marketed as Freon II, is used as the propellant in aerosol cans since it is inert chemically and does not react with the substance being ejected. The other, Freon 12, is used as a refrigerant.

As recently as last year the release of these gases into the atmosphere was considered a boon rather than a hazard. In the British journal Nature on Jan. 19, 1973, it was noted that these gases, being released into the air at a rate growing rapidly, could be used as harmless tracer of air movements.

As of 1971, it was estimated one million tons of each kind of Freon was being released yearly into the atmosphere. Furthermore, almost all such gas produced to date by world industry is still in residence within the air, the report said.

However, wrote the authors, "the presence of these compounds constitutes no conceivable hazard."

But last June, Drs. Mario J. Molina and F. S. Rowland of the University of California at Irvine reported in Nature that the Freons, far from being innocuous constituents, are six times more efficient in breaking down ozone than the oxides of nitrogen that had been the chief focus of attention.

Supersonic transports and nuclear explosions release oxides of nitrogen into the upper air, and it is of ozone and in "stealing" free oxygen atoms that might otherwise mate with oxygen gas to form new ozone.

Hence, there has been concern regarding the effect of such transports and such explosions on the ozone layer. The Harvard group has calculated that the exhaust from 400 Concorde-type supersonic transports operating seven hours a day would deplete the ozone layer by about 1 per cent.

Now it appears that sunlight breaks down the Freon, releasing chlorine, which has an even more powerful catalytic effect. The Harvard scientists had begun a year ago to look into the possible role of chlorine introduced into the stratosphere by passage of the projected space shuttle, whose exhaust would contain hydrogen chloride.

This enabled them to apply the same calculations to the Freon problem.

CONFIRMED BY OTHER DATA

That the accumulation of Freon in the world's atmosphere is increasing rapidly was confirmed earlier this month by Dr. John W. Swinnerton of the Naval Research Laboratory at a meeting of the American Chemical Society.

In 1972 measurements on a cruise from Los Angeles to Antarctica, he said, showed an average level of 61 parts per trillion. A year later, over the Atlantic, it was 85 parts per trillion, and in January of this year measurements in the Arctic showed it to have reached 120 parts per trillion.

On June 14 of this year A. B. Pittock, a government atmospheric physicist in Australia, reported that balloon measurements

of ozone over Australia showed a general decline in the amount of that gas over the eight years prior to 1973. Whether this was a global effect was uncertain.

As noted yesterday by Dr. McElroy of Harvard, there is a variation of ozone content of about 1 per cent, apparently related to the 11-year sunspot cycle, and a suggestion of a known origin.

While Freon is the trade name of du Pont de Nemours & Co., similar gases are manufactured in this country by Allied Chemical, Union Carbide, Pennwalt, Kaiser Chemical and Raccon. They are extensively used in air-conditioning as well as in refrigeration system.

In response to recent reports of possible ozone effects, the Manufacturing Chemists Association in Washington, on behalf of producers of the bases in various parts of the world, has initiated its own program of laboratory studies.

Last night Charles S. Booz, spokesman for du Pont's Freon products division in Wilmington, Del., termed the assessment of ozone effects "largely hypothesis." He added that "very little is known" of chemical reactions in the special environment of the upper atmosphere.

Dr. McElroy, in a telephone interview, himself emphasized that the analysis, which is being submitted to the journal Science, is obviously theoretical. He expressed the hope and of upper air contamination by hydrogen chloride.

He said he assumed that others would take a hard look at the Harvard calculations. The surest way to assess the predictions would be to wait and see what happens, he added, but that is hardly acceptable.

"It is," he said, "a very unusual situation for science."

FLUOROCARBONS AND OZONE: NEW PREDICTIONS
OMINOUS

A third major prediction about the effects of fluorocarbons on the stratospheric ozone layer, this one more ominous than the previous two, will soon be released. Harvard University atmospheric scientists Michael B. McElroy, Steven C. Wofsy and Nien Dak Sze have submitted to the journal Science computer calculations based on atmospheric data and a proposed model of fluorocarbon breakdown and ozone destruction in the upper atmosphere. The three predictions have caused sufficient concern in the scientific community that the National Academy of Sciences has formed a special study committee.

The first prediction was made in July by physical chemists Frank S. Rowland and Mario J. Molina from the University of California at Irvine. In the July 28 Nature, they proposed a chemical model for the breakdown of ozone in the upper atmosphere by fluorocarbons. Fluorocarbons are used widely as propellants in aerosol spray cans. When inert propellants such as fluorocarbon 11 (CF₃Cl) and fluorocarbon 12 (CF₂Cl₂) float up past the troposphere (the lower seven miles of atmosphere) into the stratosphere, they absorb ultraviolet light in the 1,750 to 2,200 angstrom range. In the proposed sequence of events, chloride atoms liberated by the light energy interact with ozone (O₃) in a chain reaction that changes thousands of ozone molecules into molecular oxygen (O₂).

They predicted that increased worldwide production and use of fluorocarbon aerosol propellants and refrigerants might result in a 10 percent decrease in the stratospheric ozone layer within 50 to 80 years. This decrease, they warned, would allow more of the sun's harmful ultraviolet rays to reach the earth's surface and could cause an increase in the occurrence of human skin cancers.

Using the Rowland and Molina chemical model, Ralph J. Cicerone and Richard S. Stolarski of the University of Michigan published computer calculations in the Sept. 27

Science that predicted a 10 percent decrease by 1985 or 1990 (SN: 9/21/74, p. 181).

Now, the Harvard team has completed its own computer calculations and is making more ominous predictions. McElroy, Wofsy, and Sze studied six conceptual models for future world production of fluorocarbons. Unlike the earlier works, they considered the factors of vertical mixing of fluorocarbons and ozone between atmospheric layers and the effects of fluorocarbons on the slow but finite regeneration of ozone by the action of ultraviolet light on oxygen. The same approach, used in an earlier study on the effects of SST exhaust on the ozone layer, showed "excellent agreement with atmospheric observations."

All of the six models assume that the ozone layer has already been diminished by 1 percent.

The first model (see diagram, line A) assumes that production of fluorocarbons continues indefinitely at 1972 levels, approximately 500,000 metric tons of fluorocarbons 11 and 12 per year. The atmospheric buildup of fluorocarbons over that period and the subsequent breakdown and attack on ozone would result in a five percent decrease in the protective ozone layer by the year 2000. But, McElroy points out, fluorocarbon production has been growing, and this static model is not realistic. Production increased about 22 percent per year from 1960 to 1972. Ray McCarthy, the technical products manager of Dupont's Freon products division, suggests that a 10 percent growth rate would be a reasonable projection for continued worldwide production and use; some skeptics doubt that growth will slow that much.

In models B, C and D, a 10 percent growth rate was assumed. In model B, production is terminated in 1978. Nevertheless a three percent decrease in ozone occurs by 1990. (Effects are delayed by years due to the slow upward drift fluorocarbons.) Full ozone layer regeneration would require more than 100 years, McElroy says.

In model C, production growth continues at 10 percent until 1987, at which time production is halted. Maximum effects would be felt 10 years later, with a 14 percent ozone decrease. Seventy years later, the ozone layer still would be decreased by 5 percent. In model D, production growth continues at 10 percent indefinitely. By the year 2014, the team predicts a disastrous 40 percent decrease in ozone.

Models E and F assume continuation of the present 22 percent industry growth rate. If production is halted in 1995 (line E), they predict a total ozone layer decrease of about 22 percent by the year 2000. If production increases at 22 percent per year and is not halted, a 40 percent decrease in ozone will be realized by about 1995.

Although the precise consequences of ozone layer destruction are unknown, it is known, McElroy says, that life is in a precarious balance with ozone. The ozone layer shields the earth's surface from ultraviolet radiation.

A 1973 National Academy of Sciences study on the biological impact of increased ultraviolet radiation, conducted during the debate over the environmental safety of SST's found that a five percent decrease in ozone could produce at least 8,000 extra cases of skin cancers per year in the U.S. while population. (Skin pigmentation shields many of the harmful rays.) Skin aging in general also would be accelerated by increased ultraviolet exposure. Changes in solar radiation levels could harm phytoplankton in the oceans, which produce much of the earth's oxygen. Insects see in a portion of the ultraviolet spectrum and light intensity changes in this region could affect insects' perception of sky-light, flower colors and sexual markings. And many plants, particularly agricultural species, are damaged by ultraviolet light.

The growing concern over fluorocarbons and the ozone layer has led to the formation of a special NAS study committee. The members include McElroy and Rowland; atmospheric chemist Donald M. Hunten of Kitt Peak National Observatory, chairman; Francis S. Johnson, executive director of the Center for Advanced Studies at the University of Texas at Dallas, and chemist Harold S. Johnson of the University of California at Berkeley. The group will meet later this month to consider the reports and decide whether to recommend the formation of a permanent study group to the governing board of the National Research Council. Another NAS group, the climatic impact committee, is already studying the climatic effects of SST exhaust, fluorocarbons, and other man-made pollutants.

The Manufacturing Chemists Association, a trade group representing members in North America, Europe, Australia and Japan, is currently funding several studies on the environmental effects of fluorocarbons. James E. Lovelock, atmospheric scientist at the University of Reading in England, is making direct measurements on the concentrations. James N. Pitts and O. C. Taylor from the University of California at Riverside are studying the reactivities of fluorocarbons at various altitudes. And Camille Sandorfy from the University of Montreal is making the first experimental measurements of reaction rates under simulated stratospheric conditions.

Although the predictions are strong, industrial spokesmen are quick to point out that little experimental data exists and judgment should be suspended until more information is available. McElroy says he does not recommend taking immediate action to terminate fluorocarbon production or use. "All of these models are just that—models. Although they are based on what we believe to be good work, atmospheric chemistry is very difficult and it is easy to miss something. Direct measurements on a vastly accelerated scale must take place" to test the theoretical models, he says.

But he emphasizes that expanded research on the subject is urgently needed. This situation is different from most kinds of science, he says, where a theoretical paper will "sit on the shelf" until it is confirmed. "We can't afford to wait the normal 10 years," McElroy says, "because if the theories are correct, by that time the effects will be pronounced."

THE GREATEST HATRED IN HUMAN HISTORY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Edward H. Flannery is executive secretary of the Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. A scholar of Jewish-Christian relations he is the author of the *Anguish of the Jews: 23 Centuries of Anti-Semitism*.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the New York Times, November 30, published Father Flannery's comments on the persistence of anti-Semitism in our society. Gen. George Brown's anti-Semitic comments should not simply be minimized, then forgotten. They are a reminder that anti-Semitism, what Father Flannery calls "the greatest stain in the history of Western culture," is still with us. This

must be openly acknowledged and then perhaps we can rid ourselves of it.

The Flannery essay follows:

THE GREATEST HATRED IN HUMAN HISTORY

(By Edward H. Flannery)

WASHINGTON.—The strictures by Gen. George S. Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in which he revived the hoary lie about Jewish ownership of banks and newspapers sent a quiver of embarrassment across most—but not all—of the country.

A recently published tape transcript showed that on June 23, 1972, Richard M. Nixon, as President, warned H. R. Haldeman to eschew the arts: "The arts you know—they're Jews, they're left wing—in other words, stay away."

Last April, Attorney General William B. Saxbe, in a news conference remark that in the McCarthy era "there was a great distrust of the intellectual," added: "One of the changes that's come about is because of the Jewish intellectual, who was in those days very enamored of the Communist party."

The list could be extended back through time indefinitely. There was nothing unusual about these performances. Hardly a day goes by that a stereotyping or attack is not visited upon Jews somewhere. Where is the synagogue on which a swastika has not been daubed?

The only thing somewhat unusual about these performances is the political level of the persons involved. We are not dealing here with guttersnipes but with presumably educated and sophisticated people.

The very level of these personages raises questions. If individuals of some cultivation, or stature, fall prey to the virus of anti-Semitism as readily as anyone else, where are the boundaries of its power? Is anyone beyond its reach? Have we underestimated the dimensions of the phenomenon of anti-Semitism?

The reaction to incidents like those cited is usually minimization and denial. Those involved always deny their anti-Semitism, and most people defend them. It is socially disresponsible today to be overtly anti-Semitic, whence a strong reluctance to own up to it, or accuse another of it.

Our first conclusion must be that anti-Semitism is something strongly repressed, hence always denied.

When there is any sort of acknowledgment, a process of minimization takes over. Reduced to a foible, an anti-Semitic lapse is made light of, even made subject of jest.

Anti-Semitism is the greatest hatred in human history. In duration and intensity, it has no competitor.

What other hatred has lasted some 23 centuries and survived genocide of six million people in its 23d century of existence? I say "survived" because it is very much alive today.

An unexorcisable devil, it has ravaged from age to age, land to land. As one kind wanes, another promptly replaces it.

A rapid pre-Christian kind was followed by a "Christian" variety that became oppressive and murderous. Then in succession came rationalist, pseudo-scientific racist, socialist, rightist varieties. Today there are Soviet, Arab (over and beyond political enmity), black, New Left and "gentle" types.

Anti-Semitism has known every cruelty: social and civic disabilities, insult, ghettoization, torture, exile, murder.

Through the centuries, even great saints and leaders have been infected. Estimates of Jews murdered before Hitler range in the multimillions.

Is there not warrant to view this enormity as the greatest stain in the history of Western culture?

It may, in any case, be seen as a demonic

force, endless and bottomless, that defies analytical powers, indeed eludes our very observation. The Jew, "eternal scapegoat," serves apparently to assuage a deep human need.

Many efforts have been made to understand anti-Semitism, all partly successful. Historical causes center on the "deicide" charge, the old theological myth. Yet history can hardly do full justice to the phenomenon: Profound psychological mechanisms are at play. As one psychoanalyst has stated, "Anti-Semitism is more a conflict within a person than between persons."

Perhaps the most fruitful avenues of explanation explored locates anti-Semitism in the lowest strata of the psyche where savage forces struggle against all restraints and ideals. In the Christian, it would be an unconscious displaced resentment of his own Christianity; in the non-Christian, a revolt against moral conscience.

It was Judaism that brought the concept of a God-given universal moral law into the world. The Jew reminds us of our paganism. For this he has never been forgiven. Willy-nilly, the Jew carries the burden of God in history.

Until anti-Semitism is openly acknowledged and diagnosed along lines as deep as these, the Browns, Nixons and Saxbes will always be with—no, in us.

MALPRACTICE FEES UNDER FIRE: TEAMSTERS AND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE JOINED IN REFORM MOVE

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out on many previous occasions, a real crisis is at hand in the field of health care due to the growing number of malpractice cases. Recently the teamsters in Michigan and the State chamber of commerce felt concerned enough to make a joint effort to solve the problem. I commend this item from the Detroit News of November 20, 1974, to the attention of my colleagues:

MALPRACTICE FEES UNDER FIRE: TEAMSTERS, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE JOINED IN REFORM MOVE

(By Stephen Cain)

The 90,000-member Michigan Teamsters Union Joint Council 43 and the State Chamber of Commerce have joined forces to urge the Michigan Supreme Court to force medical malpractice attorneys and other personal injury lawyers to account for the fees they charge their clients.

The Teamsters, who operate a health insurance program second in size only to Blue Cross-Blue Shield, are concerned with the increased costs of medical care attributed to the medical malpractice situation.

Chamber officials, on the other hand, suspect that malpractice is costing their member businesses more through increased contributions to employee health insurance plans.

Teamsters International Vice-President Robert Holmes already has mailed his letter to Supreme Court Administrator Einar Bohlin asking the court to immediately grant provisions of a petition filed more than a month ago by the Physicians Crisis Committee.

Chamber President Harry R. Hall is still drafting the final version of his letter asking

the court to look into the alleged abuses involving medical malpractice.

The first part of the petition asks for a court rule ordering attorneys to give both their clients and the court a full accounting of all out-of-court settlements and court judgments, including how much they charge.

There is mounting evidence that the typical malpractice attorney in metropolitan Detroit charges his clients a contingency fee of half of any money he wins.

The second part of the petition asks the court, once it gets a picture of the fee structure, to severely limit how much an attorney can charge for a personal injury lawsuit. This includes medical malpractice (treatment injury caused by negligence), products liability and auto negligence.

The crisis committee—a group of more than 600 physicians victimized by skyrocketing malpractice insurance rates—now has three of the most influential pressure groups in the state supporting its reform effort.

The Teamster and Chamber letters come on the heels of a similar letter to the top court from the United Auto Workers' Michigan Community Action Program (UAW-CAP).

Holmes, who is also president of Council 43 and a trustee of the Teamsters huge Central States Health and Welfare (pension) Fund, wrote the court:

"The plaintiff's attorney who takes an unconscionable contingency fee from his injured client in a malpractice case is not only shortchanging his clients, but he is also adding tremendously to the already overburdened cost of medicine today.

"Those of us who serve actively as trustees and administrators of health programs know from personal experience that the cost of medicine for the workingman is already exorbitant.

"The system simply cannot tolerate the additional excesses of an unregulated contingency fee system for lawyers.

"The court must not appear to be placing the interests of a few attorneys before the rights of the public."

ADDED HALL

"While the Chamber is continuing to study the various proposals put forward by the Physicians Crisis Committee, the petition asking for a review of contingency fees seems reasonable, logical and timely.

"We must have the facts to be able to determine if there are, indeed, serious abuses.

"New York and New Jersey have established such disclosure rules which helped correct the types of abuses there which the crisis committee feels is occurring here.

"It doesn't seem reasonable that a plaintiff who has been injured should receive less than 50 percent of the court judgment or settlement. The rules should be better balanced in favor of the individual who has been hurt."

ELECTION POSTER CLEANUP SPONSORED BY RADIO STATION WRC IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, radio station WRC, located in our Nation's Capital, has long prided itself in being a community-minded station dedicated to serving all factions of the Washington, D.C., area. In keeping with this philosophy of service, WRC launched a citywide election poster cleanup campaign fol-

lowing the election on November 5 of the city's first Mayor and City Council in more than 100 years.

The community spirit, which is exemplified in their offer to pay 10 cents per campaign poster, is unprecedented as is the response on the part of residents who delivered more than 58,000 posters to the two poster redemption sites and the station.

As a result of station WRC's efforts, Washington, D.C., is free of posters which often remain for many months after election day.

The news releases of station WRC are attached so that each of us can see how the station responded to this effort:

ELECTION POSTER CLEANUP SPONSORED BY RADIO STATION WRC IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Old posters are worth 10c each to WRC Radio. WRC announced today they will pay a dime for every old campaign post 5" x 7" or larger. The posters are to be taken down from city streets in an effort to rid neighborhoods of the eyesores.

D.C. election laws require candidates to remove all campaign posters from public places by midnight, November 7. However, these laws are not usually enforced and posters often stay up for months after an election. WRC plans to make sure that this year the laws are obeyed.

"This is our first really big election in Washington," says WRC General Manager Harold Green. "I'd like to see it handled well. If candidates don't remove their posters, we will get neighborhood associations, students, and concerned citizens to take them down by offering to buy those posters. We've had an exciting election with lots of interest and that's terrific—but our job isn't done. I think we now owe it to our city to clean it up."

The clean-up campaign will run two weeks. Residents may bring posters to the NBC studios at 4001 Nebraska Avenue, NW at these times:

Saturday, November 16—9:30 am-4:00 pm.

Saturday, November 23—9:30 am-4:00 pm.

In addition, WRC personality Eddie Edwards will drive the WRC prize patrol car to District locations to assist in the exchange of posters for cash receipts. Edwards will be at the YWCA/YMCA, 50th and Haynes, NE on November 16 and at the Raymond Recreation Center, 10th and Spring Road, NW on November 23. Exchange times at those locations are also 9:30 am to 4:00 pm. These are the only times and places WRC can accept and pay for posters.

WRC's goal is the collection of 10,000 posters. The station is being assisted in its efforts by the D.C. Chamber of Commerce. Hertz has donated a van to receive posters and Dunbar Armored Cars is providing an armored vehicle to dispense dimes. WRC invites all D.C. residents and all candidates to help out in this community cleanup effort.

ELECTION POSTER CLEANUP CAMPAIGN

Elections generate drama, excitement, participation in the democratic process—and trash. The garbage is the posters candidates use to further their political causes. Once the elections end, the posters usually remain. Pinned to telephone poles and trees, hung on obliging walls, they are eyesores serving no purpose except the cluttering of a neighborhood.

This predicament is especially acute in Washington, D.C., where this year, the District held its first major election ever. The acquisition of home rule allows for many more public offices. And more posters. Though D.C. election laws require that all posters be removed from public places no later than two days after the polls close, these rules are

rarely enforced. So WRC decided to do something about it.

On November 6, D.C. Councilman-elect Marion Barry kicked off WRC's poster cleanup campaign. The director of special projects for PRIDE, Inc. brought some of his own posters to the WRC studios at 4001 Nebraska Avenue, NW and started one of the most successful community involvement projects in Washington broadcasting history.

The idea was simple. WRC would pay 10¢ for every used campaign poster, 5"x7" or larger, returned to their studios on two consecutive Saturdays (November 16 and 23). That was it. No contests, no clever gimmicks, just straight community involvement. WRC had nothing to gain but a clean neighborhood and the respect of a suddenly poster-free Washington, D.C.

The response was overwhelming. Candidates, school groups, civic organizations, concerned citizens, religious organizations all took up the cause.

To make things easier, a WRC personality drove to outer city locations on each of the Saturdays to help in the collection of posters. But the bulk were returned to the WRC studios. The final figures: 58,758 posters collected, \$5,875.80 in cash given out. There was much more to be proud of.

What had been a poster-choked community only a week before was nearly spotless. Election laws had been scrupulously followed for the first time in memory. And the community worked together for a common cause. The sense of camaraderie at the exchange points was contagious and the poster campaign may well have been a catalyst for other group efforts.

WRC was happy to be the force behind such a constructive community drive.

Ratings and listener demographics were set aside for more important considerations. Every department of WRC pitched in. Promotional spots ran every hour, 24 hours a day, for the campaign's full two-week duration. WRC News ran vignettes urging people to help in the cleanup drive. And WRC personalities lent their time and support.

Enclosed are the materials which WRC used in its poster cleanup campaign drive. After examining them, we are sure you will agree that WRC did a magnificent job making the conclusion of this year's local political campaigns the success of a community cleanup campaign.

NATIONAL PARKS FOR THE CITIES: BACKING AWAY FROM A SUCCESS

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, today the House took action on legislation to authorize the establishment of the Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area in the State of Ohio. Because of its timeliness and the importance of the issue, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article by George C. Wilson which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, December 1, 1974:

NATIONAL PARKS FOR THE CITIES: BACKING AWAY FROM A SUCCESS

(By George C. Wilson)

BROOKLYN, N.Y.—The helicopter hanging in the wind over Jamaica Bay shows what Congress and the Ford administration are arguing about as they struggle to set different courses for the national park system.

The outcome will determine how much the federal government does with its power and money to set aside open spaces close to city people. It is, in one sense, Rockway's Ribs beach for the subway riders vs. Wyoming's Yellowstone Park for the station wagon set.

President Ford, before this argument is over, may well have to veto Mr. Nixon's "parks to the people" program—the loudly touted initiative which turned the land below the helicopter into one giant park for the New York-New Jersey megalopolis.

Ironically, this new kind of national park has proved so successful that White House budget chiefs insist the government cannot afford to establish any more of them, even though the need is greater than ever.

Now is no time to quit putting national parks where the people are, counter urban politicians who dominate Congress. The cities and suburbs are getting more crowded all the time, they argue, and the fuel shortage makes it in the national interest to provide recreation near home rather than far away.

A VARIED PLAYGROUND

Former President Nixon, perhaps to the grief of his successor in the White House, demonstrated the popularity of urban parks with the Gateway East National Recreation Area for New York and New Jersey.

Directly under the helicopter is Gateway's dull-looking marsh in the middle of Jamaica Bay. But to New York's school children who go there to study it, the marsh is alive with fascinating creatures they never see in their everyday world of concrete, cars and crowds.

To the south, clearly visible this bright day out the Plexiglas nose of the helicopter, lies another part of Gateway East—the Rockaway Peninsula on the Atlantic Ocean, home of Ribs Park, with golfs-on which bring winces to the Smokey Bears of the Park Service who believe the wide open spaces, not urban areas, are the domain of their organization.

Rock jetties divide the mile-long Ribs beach into sections, called bays by the natives. And by some kind of agreement, each bay has its own clientele: homosexuals on one, lesbians on another and so on down the beach. There will be 100,000 people jammed on that short stretch on a summer day.

Inspector Hugh A. Groves, the U.S. Park Police officer who got the Gateway East security job on the strength of his cool handling of demonstrations in Washington, admits to being stunned by the sight of homosexuals forming a circle and holding hands out in the water after taking off their bathing suits. But Groves, showing judgment that his bosses in the Interior Department applaud, passed the word that his new kind of cops would not arrest homosexuals or lesbians on the beach "as long as they did not display their private parts to people on the beach."

A less congested beach, but still part of Gateway East, is Sandy Hook—the curved peninsula on New Jersey's side of the New York harbor entrance. The Army kept most of the beach in a primitive state.

As the helicopter thwack-thwacks over Sandy Hook, a bunch of kids are running out of yellow buses and onto the beach for an ecology lesson. A surf fisherman is trying his luck in the solitude cold weather brings. He will feel pressed come summer by bathers and sun worshippers who need no pass nor property rights to get on the beach of Sandy Hook.

On the homeward leg back to Floyd Bennett Field, the former Navy airfield which is headquarters for the National Park Service at Gateway East, the helicopter flew over other types of playgrounds for megalopolis: the Army Air Corps' (there used

to be one) Miller Field on Staten Island's coast, which the Park Service intends to transform from a green expanse of sod to a complex of playing fields; historic forts which had the mission of guarding the New York harbor entrance before the days of The Bomb, Balance of Terror and nuclear incineration within 30 minutes. Those old forts have a story to tell, and the Park Service hopes to tell it once it gets organized for public tours.

PEOPLE "POURING IN"

Gateway East's superintendent, Joseph N. Atosca, has some other ideas for his own backyard—the 1,100 acres the Park Service owns at Floyd Bennett Field. Maybe, he says, a drag strip for the hot-rodders in the neighborhood would be a good idea. Some contrast to his counterpart at Yellowstone who must worry about the bear population.

"We have enough to do," says Atosca of the challenge of developing the complex of former military and city property that went into Gateway, "to keep us busy for 20 years."

Inspector Groves—who has one lieutenant, six sergeants and 38 privates to police the whole of Gateway East—says he was astounded by the enthusiasm city dwellers displayed for open space:

"We'd take down a fence around a swamp, put up signs that the water was not fit for human contact, and yet mothers with babies in their arms would come in there and stand in mud up to their ankles just to get into the open. New Yorkers are starving for recreational outlet."

Groves' words dramatize the dilemma facing policy makers as they try to make up for years in which city planners and builders left too little breathing room for people.

"Everything we open," he says, "the people come pouring in. It is just like water running into the empty space."

In the 1974 summer season, 4.5 million people visited some part of the 26,712-acre Gateway East national park. This is triple the 1.5 million visitors who journeyed to the 2.2 million-acre Yellowstone National Park. Gateway's budget for fiscal 1975 is \$6.7 million; Yellowstone's, \$6.4 million. Gateway takes 132 permanent employees to man; Yellowstone, 100.

After the House and Senate passed the legislation authorizing Gateway by overwhelming margins, President Nixon signed the measure into law on Oct. 28, 1972, with a message that indicated more metropolitan parks would follow:

"The need for open space and recreational opportunities is especially pressing in our great metropolitan centers... I plan to continue my emphasis on bringing 'parks to the people' through the donation of federal lands to state and local authorities for the development of parks and recreation areas near population centers."

Congress authorized Interior to spend \$12.1 million to acquire land for the park (most of it was land donated by federal and state government) and another \$92.8 million to develop it.

BACKING OFF

President Nixon also had a political reason for putting national parks where the people were: The concept promised to gain him votes. Nathaniel P. Reed, assistant secretary of interior for fish, wildlife and parks, confirmed this political impetus in an interview. He was the Interior Department executive the White House directed to carry out Mr. Nixon's "parks to the people" program.

Says Reed: "We didn't know what 'parks to the people' meant. We didn't have a fixed plan. I was promised everything from the White House in the way of manpower and money. It was acknowledged that if this administration made some very strong moves where people were, there would be strong political rewards."

Back in 1971, Reed, in urging the House

Interior Committee to authorize Gateway, had said "a commitment of federal resources for this purpose and unified administration by the National Park Service will make possible the achievement of a goal now beyond the reach of any other single political subdivision."

Three years later he is making an opposite argument: that the federal government should get out of the urban park business and confine itself to helping states and cities do that job for themselves.

Reed says that this retreat—which he prefers to term a "complete retrenchment"—does not mean that Gateway East and its San Francisco counterpart, Gateway West, have failed. On the contrary, he says, Gateway East "has been a perfectly extraordinary success," thanks largely to a massive federal investment.

"We spent money there like it was going out of style. We had the money and we had the manpower to do the job. Gateway East got a massive infusion of talent, money and police protection.

"But by our boundless success in New York, we're faced with a crisis. We've got a lit firecracker in our hand. Any big city mayor faced with a tight budget is going to demand that we come in there and give him a park. He's a damn fool unless he does. 'Quick, Uncle,' he will say, 'come in.'

"Like in Ohio: we're owed a national park—quote unquote. Come in, National Park Service, and do your thing. But where is it going to end?"

A PARK FOR OHIO

As far as chairman Roy A. Taylor (D-N.C.) of the House Interior National Parks subcommittee is concerned, this federal "parks to the people" program is not going to end with Gateways East and West. Only the federal government has the resources, he says, to assemble large parcels of land, including military bases, for parks to serve metropolitan areas.

Taylor says Reed and others are responding to pressure from White House budget cutters. In Taylor's view, President Ford should ask for more money for the National Park Service (which has a current operating budget of \$200 million a year) and should go along with Congress in the effort to put more money in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. That fund, which gets its money for the leasing of offshore tracts in federal waters to oil companies, is used in part to help states buy land for parks. The Ford administration is opposing bills in Congress to raise that fund from \$300 million to \$800 million.

Before this year is out, Taylor says, he expects to win congressional approval of the bill to establish a 20,000-acre national park (16,000 acres federally owned) in the Cuyahoga Valley running between the Ohio cities of Akron and Cleveland.

Rep. John F. Seiberling (D-Ohio), a member of the National Parks subcommittee, is a leading advocate of the Cuyahoga legislation, which the administration opposes. He says only the federal government can put the park together:

"Put yourself in my position as a politician. I've voted for national parks year after year. Yet Ohio is the sixth most populous state and doesn't have a single national park.

"Even if the governor did have a big budget for parks, he would have to spread the money around to several areas of the state. Only the federal government can assemble these big parcels.

"I'm not suggesting that every urban area have a federal recreation area such as the proposed Cuyahoga Valley park. Not every urban area has such a unique and well-preserved large open space available. And the federal government cannot afford to make itself the sole custodian of all our natural and historic resources or to become the manager of small neighborhood parks

and playgrounds. But the federal government cannot afford to ignore the recreation needs of people who live around our major urban centers, where the need is greatest."

Interior's Reed asserts that the Park Service is straining to run the recreation areas it already has, what with the shortage of money and manpower during this inflationary period. But if Congress goes ahead anyway and authorizes \$34.5 million to put together a Cuyahoga National Park, can President Ford risk vetoing such popular legislation? The administration's statements of opposition to Cuyahoga preceded his taking over the presidency, so he is not formally committed to them.

"Presidents don't veto public parks," says one congressional veteran in predicting that Congress will keep the national park system on the new course set by Mr. Nixon—whether his successor likes it or not.

A WAY OUT OF IRELAND'S DILEMMA?

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the continuing hostilities in Ireland. I submit the following article which appeared in the August 30, 1974, issue of the *National Review* as a lucid and accurate account for the benefit of my colleagues:

A WAY OUT OF IRELAND'S DILEMMA?

By James Fitzpatrick

(One plan for peace in Ireland is that of the Provos who, this author claims, are getting a raw deal. It even preserves, he says, the Protestant majority in Ulster gerrymandered up in 1921.)

It is not easy for an Irish American to take the long step backward, away from the Telstar-transmitted combat zone in the six occupied counties of Northern Ireland, in order to make a fair evaluation of the current military campaign of the Provisional IRA. For most Irish Americans, the words "Irish Republican Army" summon up memories of almost mythic heroes, deeds, scenes—the Republican tricolor being raised through the fire and smoke over the General Post Office in Dublin in 1916; the IRA gunmen saying the rosary before going into combat against the Black and Tans; the torchlight processions and rallies with which the Sinn Féiners were greeted after being released from the British prisons in 1917; thousands of Dubliners lining the docks, singing Peadar Kearney's rebel hymn (now Ireland's national anthem) "The Soldier's Song" in the firelight as Eamon de Valera and the Irish Volunteers set foot on Irish soil for the first time since the uprising... It is not easy—but let me make a stab at it.

Because, objectively, the Provisional IRA is getting a raw deal, especially from many Americans of Irish descent who have become so much a part of the American conservative movement. It is ironic that Irish Americans should criticize the IRA Provos so harshly as a result of reading accounts in the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*—the same newspapers American conservatives distrust on so many other matters. Conservatives seem not to have heard that the Provos (Green IRA) have broken with the Marxist Officials (Red IRA), and that the Provos refer disparagingly to the Officials as the "National Liberation Front." Likewise, everybody seems to know that the Provos' "atrocities" include the bombing of that bus carrying English soldiers and

two children—and everybody seems to have missed the followup story a few days later (buried, it is true, in the back pages of the newspapers) in which an Irish Trotskyite group—definitely not associated with the Provos—admitted that it was responsible.

What other revolutionary anticolonial group in recent memory have the *Post* and the *Times* treated as "indiscriminate killers" and "vicious and cruel terrorists"? Before equating the Provos with Vietcong and Castroite types, conservatives should consider that the American Left does not see it that way at all. Reviewing Jimmy Breslin's *World without End, Amen* in *The New York Review of Books*, Conor Cruise O'Brien recently assured his left wing audience that they had nothing to worry about: Breslin was implausible in having his right wing New York cop fraternizing easily, during his visit to Ireland, with Irish Marxists of the Official IRA breed. American right wing types O'Brien noted, would feel much more at home with the Provos, whom he calls "plain, old-fashioned, nationalist, Catholic killers."

PROVOS AND SDLP

A good explanation of the nature and purposes of the Provos appears in a short, direct, hard-hitting, yet temperate pamphlet called simply "Ulster." (It is available at any of the American offices of Irish Northern Aid.) Its author is Frank McManus, an ex-member of the British Parliament from the Fermanagh/South Tyrone section of Northern Ireland. Like Bernadette Devlin and other candidates associated with a strong Republican stance, McManus had a rough go of it in the last election, since the SDLP (Social Democratic Labor Party) decided to run candidates against them, thus splitting the Catholic vote.

The SDLP is a predominantly Catholic party, which basically agrees with the Provos' long range goal of a United Ireland, but does not feel that military force can achieve anything constructive at this point in Irish history. Unlike the IRA, they were willing to go along with the recently aborted "Sunningdale Plan" (worked out between SDLP-type Catholics and moderate Protestants under the direction of British Secretary William Whitelaw) for a Council of Ireland whose ultimate purpose was the unification of the country. It would be wrong to suppose the SDLP supporters in the last election were anti-IRA; in fact, most observers would agree that they are the sea in which the IRA fish swim. They backed off from full support of the Provo combat teams principally because they are exhausted by violence, not because they favor indefinite association with Britain. Had Sunningdale worked, the SDLP would have been pictured in history as wise and cautious moderates who saw the possibility of working for unification through a slow, but steady, evolution. The Protestant workers' strike of this spring, however, has relegated the Sunningdale agreement to the footnotes of Irish history. The Council of Ireland is a dead issue.

If all of England's 1974 "deals" meet with this fate, and result in no more progress than the 1921 "deal," and if bands of Orangeshed Protestants are still parading through Derry in 1994 shouting "No Surrender!" the SDLP will be seen as timid dupes—while the Provos will take their place in legend and song with the "Bold Fenian Men" of old.

THE SIX COUNTIES

Frank McManus is not a member of the Provisional IRA. The Provos are still an illegal, underground organization in both the North and South of Ireland. But he is close to Provisional Sinn Féin, the legal, political arm of the Provos, and to its *uachtaran* (president), Ruairi O'Bradaigh; his line of argument runs parallel to that found in *Eire Nau* (New Ireland), Sinn Féin's current social and political program for Ireland. McManus does not apologize for the current

military campaign. He, unlike the *New York Times*, does not find it "terrorist."

In order to understand why the Provos resort to "terrorism," and why McNamara, in turn, writes suspiciously of so-called democratic procedures in Northern Ireland, a brief review of some Irish history is necessary. First of all, the section of Ireland that the world calls Ulster is not really Ulster at all. When the rest of Ireland won home rule in 1921, England insisted on keeping six—but only six—of the ancient nine counties of Ulster within the British Empire.

These six counties were "partitioned" by careful gerrymandering to ensure that the Protestant population would never have to fear that their Catholic neighbors would form a majority and democratically move Ulster into the Republic of Ireland to the South. The three counties of Ulster that were solidly Catholic, and solidly in favor of union—Donegal, Cavan, and Monaghan—were thus excluded from this new British territory of Northern Ireland. As Sir James Craig, first prime minister of the Six Counties, put it so well, the inclusion of these counties would "reduce our majority to such a level that no sane man would undertake to carry on Parliament with it." Gerrymandering within the Six Counties further reduced the power of the Catholic minority.

Consequently, the cards are stacked, as McNamara puts it, "to perpetuate the eternal present of Orange Supremacy. It is antidemocratic. . . . The state [Ulster] was designed to give permanent power to the Unionist Party. Where there is such an artificially built-in majority, normal democracy can never function. We cannot accept a 'democratic right' to perpetuate this antidemocratic state."

In 1918, in the only election in which the question of a united and sovereign Ireland was put before the Irish people, 80 per cent voted for unification. The partitioning of the country made the 20 per cent minority a majority in one of the two states thus created. That minority had the strength—about 2 to 1—to prevent the unification clearly mandated by the people of the country.

It would not be surprising, then, and not very condemnable by earthly standards, if Irish nationalists, demanding an end to the foreign control of their country, insisted that a 20 per cent minority, professing loyalty to that same foreign power, submit themselves to the wishes—without qualification on this issue—of the 80 per cent. But, as a matter of fact, those unreasonable IRA terrorists do not. And even if they did, they would not compare unfavorably with Abraham Lincoln, who chose bloody civil war rather than allow a much larger minority to divide America into two states.

REGIONALISM

McNamara's proposals for Ireland, the Provos' *Eire Nua*, call instead for an answer based on "regionalism." He advocates not a Dublin-based, Irish Catholic domination of Ulster, but a solution designed to provide for the diversity of backgrounds in Ireland, including Scots-heritage Protestantism. "The only system with which Republicanism is not compatible is a system of domination. No Republican could consent to be dominated by London. But, and Unionists should think deeply about this, no Ulster Republican could ever consent to be dominated by Dublin." He goes on: "Republicans are suggesting a regional government for the whole of Ireland. There would be four (maybe more, maybe less) regional parliaments and a central parliament. The regional parliament would enjoy great autonomy in the administration of regional affairs." Donegal, Cavan, and Monaghan would be returned to Ulster under this system (and this can hardly be thought to be Dublin's desire).

This new Ulster (which is really historic Ulster) would then make decisions by majority rule for its own development, as would the other regional governments.

What is most interesting about this proposal is that Ulster Protestants would still be a majority by 2 to 1 in the new Ulster. And the new, nine-county Ulster would have nearly 40 per cent of the population of all Ireland. When you keep this in mind, it seems more realistic for Dublin to fear the South's domination by industrialized Ulster than for the Orangemen to go on cringing at some phony nightmare of "Rome rule." In *Eire Nua* Ulster Protestants, as the majority in Ulster, would be fully entitled to be the ruling party there and thus a truly formidable voice in Ireland as a whole. The only qualification would be that they must exert this influence as citizens of Ireland, not as a foreign power's army of occupation, not as conquerors.

Orangemen who claim to be incensed by the antidemocratic methods of the IRA simply cannot go on basing their own claim to power in Ireland on the forced submission of the Irish people to English armies over 300 years ago. If living in Ireland for four centuries does not make an Orangeman an Irishman, then Orangemen are, by self-definition, a military garrison of a foreign power and aggressors, and are, by all legal and moral standards, subject to the defensive use of military force by the victims of that aggression. The Orangemen's slogan of "No Surrender!" is an ongoing declaration of war on the Irish people.

The key factor in all these proposals, then, is the end of the British presence in Ireland. To be sure, the nightmare of a vast and bloody civil war, often invoked to discredit such a demand, cannot be dismissed as an impossibility. (No healthy nation, of course, has ever surrendered its nationhood rather than face such a challenge—certainly not the U.S.) It is possible—but not inevitable, or even likely. The IRA does not want the British troops removed tomorrow. They demand only a declaration of intention to withdraw at some specified future date. UN forces could replace them if sectarian violence erupted. And the Provos welcome the idea that disputes arising after the British withdrawal be submitted to the authority of the European Court at Strasbourg. The hope is, however, that the specified withdrawal date will force the Protestants to see that they must begin to work with their fellow Irish citizens in a spirit of compromise and conciliation—will force them to see that it is possible to shout "No Surrender!" only if they know that the British army is waiting in the wings.

MODERATE VOICES

This regionalist plan represents an extreme compromise on the part of the IRA. You can bet your last dollar that many old IRA diehards did not give in willingly to a proposal which would allow the Protestant minority in Ireland to remain in control of Ulster. If the Protestants had been willing to bend even half as much as the IRA, genuine reconciliation rather than apparently endless violence would be the order of the day in Ulster.

But, until the British army withdraws, there is no reason for the Protestants to compromise. As long as they can count on British troops being around to handle Catholic-Nationalist demands, there is just no reason for them to look inward, away from England and toward their fellow Irish citizens, in order to define their nationhood. Instead of keeping the peace, the continued British presence creates a political situation so unnatural as to ensure continued hostility.

Irish nationalists have been rebelling against English control of Ireland as long as England has been in Ireland. The IRA has

assumed the leadership in this ancient struggle during the last 50 years, and they have vowed, in the words of their first president, Padraic Pearse, that "Ireland unfree shall never be at peace." Frank McNamara and the Provos are asking for the right of Irishmen to rule Ireland, and offer their assurance that "we are in no way opposed to the Unionist Party as a party of Ulstermen, governing Ulster. . . . In a new Ulster, the Provisionals would accept majority government controlled by the present Unionist Party."

"Ireland unfree shall never be at peace." The current proposal of the Provos for "regionalism" goes about as far as Irishmen can go without conceding to Britain control of their country, without surrendering their national freedom to a foreign power. If Protestant Unionists do not respond openly and soon to this offer, the responsibility for continued—and probably increased—warfare must be placed on their shoulders. Moderate voices, like that of Frank McNamara, find support only from a people that does not feel that all-out war is its only recourse. "We want to create a new Ireland, free from domination, exploitation, discrimination. Without the consent of the Unionist people we cannot succeed." The man who writes that deserves from his Protestant co-citizens of Northern Ireland something better than another cry of "No Surrender!"

And, in fact, there has been some sign of movement in that direction. Desmond Boal, an ex-associate of Ian Paisley, recently offered a proposal for a federal Ireland which has been accepted by the Provos as close enough to their own *Eire Nua* to be the basis of a lasting peace. It just could be the light at the end of the tunnel—in contrast to further well-meaning British suggestions, which only add fuel to the fire.

PRESIDENT'S THOUGHTS ON FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider a highly important piece of legislation—H.R. 17234, the 1975 foreign aid authorization bill.

In today's mail I received a letter from the President, setting forth his thoughts on the importance of this measure and reasons why it is in our best national interests that it be approved by the Congress without delay.

The President's comments are worthy of careful study by all Members of this body regardless of party and, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, Mr. Ford's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 9, 1974.

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LES: Recently, I completed my first visit abroad as President of the United States. In my talks with the leaders of each country visited, I was again impressed with the vital responsibility which the United States carries for building peace in the world and with the need for a strong, active American diplomacy to achieve this objective. It is clear that the continuity and strength of our political, economic, and social policies depends upon our purposeful and wise involvement in the international community. More than that, it is clear to me that we must fashion

a role of leadership—in our own interest and that of others—if the possibilities for conflict between nations are not to preempt the possibilities of cooperation.

In dealing with the urgent needs of our world—security needs, economic needs, emergency relief, development needs—we have a proven and highly flexible tool, namely foreign assistance. More than any other device, it can help to shape peaceful relationships in a world still plagued by hostilities, social unrest, critical shortages and turmoil. United States assistance is identified with humanitarian goals, with commonality of security interests and with the moral obligation of our democracy to support the political and economic interests of many of the world's peoples.

Foreign assistance can be a means of assuring not only stability but also progress. In both cases it can help assure peace. We risk much in reducing or restricting foreign assistance. We risk the moderation of our adversaries and the self-reliance of our friends. We risk a world which others shape to their own liking and to the possible detriment of our interests.

Two areas illustrate our dilemma and our opportunity very clearly: the Middle East and Southeast Asia.

In both areas our assistance programs support our peacemaking role. In both our aid will help keep alive the hope for negotiation. In both our aid will contribute to the security of countries whose needs are great and friendship firm. In both our past commitments are being tested in the eyes of a world which is gauging our reliability for the future. In both we are looking not just for a temporary truce but for reassuring social and economic progress.

In a broader context, nothing has demonstrated our interdependence with other countries and their reliance on American leadership and cooperation more than the shortages we are facing in food and energy. For many countries, without the help of our foreign assistance programs, there would be starvation and sickness.

We must not neglect the needs of the very poor. We must not ignore the victims of famine and disasters. We must not slow the building of institutions of development in which cooperation—rather than rivalry—can spur planning and development.

This does not mean that we can be extravagant; quite the opposite is true. We must measure the resources which we apply to the attainment of foreign policy and national security objectives with the greatest care. We must not be generous at the expense of our own economy, or our critical domestic programs. But we must have legislation which will provide adequate resources to insure that United States interests abroad are protected, and which will also provide the President with sufficient flexibility to use those resources to the best advantage for America. To tie the hands of the President in countering unforeseen circumstances or in dealing with emergencies would thwart the Constitution we are all sworn to uphold.

I believe a continuing battle between the Executive and the Legislative Branches over the direction of our efforts in foreign policy and national security would be very detrimental to the national good. We must again look at our role as Americans, and work together to solve the problems that threaten our interests throughout the world and at home.

I know we share a deep concern for the protection of our national interests and our national security, and working closely together we can provide the tools in the Foreign Assistance Act to meet the challenges we face throughout the world.

I wanted you to have these thoughts as you prepare to consider this year's foreign aid authorization.

I hope that I can count on your support

and that of your colleagues in moving toward early enactment of this most vital piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

JERRY FORD.

INFORMATION AND THE GOVERNMENT

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday during debate on the Holt amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill, the gentlewoman from New York made a remark that confirms my longstanding suspicion that the enemies of a free society understand the issues better than some of the friends of a free society. Mrs. Abzug said, and I quote:

Without reliable data, it will be virtually impossible to determine whether discrimination does exist, or to what extent. It will be virtually impossible to establish whether schools or school systems are, in fact, complying with the provisions of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. It will be virtually impossible to enforce these provisions or to accomplish any of the goals that the gentlewoman and I have worked for together.

The gentlewoman from New York is quite correct. Information is the basis of all action, and if the Government can be prohibited from obtaining needed information, then it can be prohibited from acting, or at least acting in a sensible manner. Over 10 years ago the Foundation for Economic Education published a book entitled "Clichés of Socialism." That book contained an essay by Dr. Murray Rothbard in which he punctured the socialist cliché that "fact-finding is a proper function of Government." I urge all my colleagues to read this essay, particularly my colleagues who like to think of themselves as defending a free society, and then follow the lead of Mrs. Holt and stymie the designs of the omnipotent state of preventing its omniscience:

CLICHÉS OF SOCIALISM

Ours is truly an Age of Statistics. In a country and an era that worships statistical data as super "scientific," as offering us the keys to all knowledge, a vast supply of data of all shapes and sizes pours forth upon us. Mostly, it pours forth from government. While private agencies and trade associations do gather and issue some statistics, they are limited to specific wants of specific industries. The vast bulk of statistics is gathered and disseminated by government. The overall statistics of the economy, the popular "gross national product" data that permit every economist to be a soothsayer of business conditions, come from government. Furthermore, many statistics are by-products of other governmental activities: from the Internal Revenue Bureau come tax data, from unemployment insurance departments come estimates of the unemployed, from customs offices come data on foreign trade, from the Federal Reserve flow statistics on banking, and so on. And as new statistical techniques are developed, new divisions of government departments are created to refine and use them.

The burgeoning of government statistics

offers several obvious evils to the libertarian. In the first place, it is clear that too many resources are being channeled into statistics-gathering and statistics-production. Given a wholly free market, the amount of labor, land, and capital resources devoted to statistics would dwindle to a small fraction of the present total. It has been estimated that the Federal government alone spends \$43,000,000 on statistics, and that statistical work employs the services of over 10,000 full-time civilian employees of the government.¹

Secondly, the great bulk of statistics is gathered by government coercion. This not only means that they are products of unwelcome activities; it also means that the true cost of these statistics to the American public is much greater than the mere amount of tax money spent by the government agencies. Private industry, and the private consumer, must bear the burdensome cost of record-keeping, filing, and the like, that these statistics demand. Not only that; these fixed costs impose a relatively great burden on small business firms, which are ill-equipped to handle the mountains of red tape. Hence, these seemingly innocent statistics cripple small business enterprise and help to rigidify the American business system. A Hoover Commission task force found, for example, that:

No one knows how much it costs American industry to compile the statistics that the Government demands. The chemical industry alone reports that each year it spends \$8,850,000 to supply statistical reports demanded by three departments of the Government. The utility industry spends \$32,000,000 a year in preparing reports for Government agencies. . . .

All industrial users of peanuts must report their consumption to the Department of Agriculture. . . . Upon the intervention of the Task Force, the Department of Agriculture agreed that henceforth only those that consume more than ten thousand pounds a year need report. . . .

If small alterations are made in two reports, the Task Force says, one industry alone can save \$800,000 a year in statistical reporting.

Many employees of private industry are occupied with the collection of Government statistics. This is especially burdensome to small businesses. A small hardware store owner in Ohio estimated that 29 per cent of his time is absorbed in filling out such reports. Not infrequently people dealing with the Government have to keep several sets of books to fit the diverse and dissimilar requirements of Federal agencies.²

But there are other important, and not so obvious, reasons for the libertarian to regard government statistics with dismay. Not only do statistics-gathering and producing go beyond the governmental function of defense of persons and property; not only are economic resources wasted and misallocated, and the taxpayers, industry, small business, and the consumer burdened. But, furthermore, statistics are, in a crucial sense, critical to all interventionist and socialistic activities of government. The individual consumer, in his daily rounds, has little need of statistics; through advertising, through the information of friends, and through his own experience, he finds out what is going on in the markets around him. The same is true of the business firm. The businessman must also size up his particular market, determine the prices he has to pay for what he buys and charge for what he sells, engage in cost accounting to estimate his costs, and so on. But none of this activity is really dependent upon the omnium-gatherum of statistical facts about the economy ingested by the Federal government. The businessman, like the consumer, knows and learns about his particular market through his daily experience.

Bureaucrats as well as statist reformers, however, are in a completely different state

of affairs. They are decidedly *outside* the market. Therefore, in order to get "into" the situation that they are trying to plan and reform, they must obtain knowledge that is *not* personal, day-to-day experience; the only form that such knowledge can take is statistics.³ Statistics are the eyes and ears of the bureaucrat, the politician, the socialistic reformer.

Only by statistics can they know, or at least have any idea about, what is going on in the economy.⁴ Only by statistics can they find out how many old people have rickets, or how many young people have cavities, or how many Eskimos have defective sealskins—and therefore only by statistics can these interventionists discover who "needs" what throughout the economy, and how much Federal money should be channeled in what directions. And certainly, only by statistics, can the Federal government make even a fitful attempt to plan, regulate, control, or reform various industries—or impose central planning and socialization on the entire economic system. If the government received no railroad statistics, for example, how in the world could it even start to regulate railroad rates, finances, and other affairs? How could the government impose price controls if it didn't even know *what* goods have been sold on the market, and what prices were prevailing? Statistics, to repeat, are the eyes and ears of the interventionists: of the intellectual reformer, the politician, and the government bureaucrat. Cut off those eyes and ears, destroy those crucial guidelines to knowledge, and the whole threat of government intervention is almost completely eliminated.⁵

It is true, of course, that even deprived of all statistical knowledge of the nation's affairs, the government could still *try* to intervene, to tax and subsidize, to regulate and control. It could try to subsidize the aged even without having the slightest idea of how many aged there are and where they are located; it could try to regulate an industry without even knowing how many firms there are or any other basic facts of the industry; it could try to regulate the business cycle without even knowing whether prices or business activity are going up or down. It could try, but it would not get very far. The utter chaos would be too patent and too evident even for the bureaucracy, and certainly for the citizen. And this is especially true since one of the major reasons put forth for government intervention is that it "corrects" the markets, and makes the market and the economy more rational. Obviously, if the government were deprived of all knowledge whatever of economic affairs, there could not even be a *pretense* of rationality in government intervention. Surely, the absence of statistics would absolutely and immediately wreck any attempt at socialistic planning. It is difficult to see what, for example, the central planners at the Kremlin could do to plan the lives of Soviet citizens if the planners were deprived of all information, of all statistical data, about these citizens. The government would not even know to *whom* to give orders, much less how to try to plan an intricate economy.

Thus, in all the host of measures that have been proposed over the years to check and limit government or to repeal its interventions, the simple and unspectacular abolition of government statistics would probably be the most thorough and the most effective. Statistics, so vital to statism, its namesake, is also the State's Achilles' heel.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Cf. Neil MacNeil and Harold W. Metz, *The Hoover Report 1953-1955* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 90-91; Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Task Force Report on Paperwork Management* (Washington: June, 1955); and *idem*, *Report on Budgeting and Accounting* (Washington: February, 1949).

² MacNeil and Betz, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-91.

³ On the deficiencies of statistics as compared to the personal knowledge of all participants utilized on the free market, see the illuminating discussion in F. A. Hayek, *Individualism and the Economic Order* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), Chapter 4. Also see Geoffrey Dobbs, *On Planning the Earth* (Liverpool: K.R.P. Pubs., 1951), pp. 77-86.

⁴ As early as 1863, Samuel B. Ruggles, American delegate to the International Statistical Congress in Berlin, declared: "Statistics are the very eyes of the statesman, enabling him to survey and scan with clear and comprehensive vision the whole structure and economy of the body politic." For more on the interrelation of statistics—and statisticians—and the government, see Murray N. Rothbard, "The Politics of Political Economists: Comment," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* (November, 1960), pp. 659-65. Also see Dobbs, *op. cit.*

⁵ Government policy depends upon much detailed knowledge about the Nation's employment, production, and purchasing power. The formulation of legislation and administrative progress... Supervision... regulation... and control... must be guided by knowledge of a wide range of relevant facts. Today as never before, statistical data play a major role in the supervision of Government activities. Administrators not only make plans in the light of known facts in their field of interest, but also they must have reports on the actual progress achieved in accomplishing their goals." *Report on Budgeting and Accounting*, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-92.

HONORING A CIVIL RIGHTS ADVOCATE

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, sometimes Americans are amazed at how effective they can be, when a job needs doing. A great fighter for the rights of the downtrodden and weary, and a longtime newspaperman in my district, by the name of Col. Leon Washington, Jr., passed away recently. But his name will not soon be forgotten, and mainly due to a struggle he engaged in over the building of a new post office in the 21st Congressional District. He fought hard and long for this facility, because he felt that the community needed it and because it would reflect Government's concern over their citizen's well-being.

The post office was finally built and assigned a name.

Upon Colonel Washington's death, the local citizens felt that a prideful monument to his great dedication to community pursuits needed rewarding. A move was developed to rename the post office—the Leon Washington Post Office. On Saturday, October 12, 1974, the post office was officially renamed in honor of Colonel Washington.

At the dedication ceremonies, Colonel Washington's wife, Mrs. Ruth Washington, delivered a fine speech for the occasion. I would like to enter her presentation into the Record:

"WASH" WOULD BE PROUD

(NOTE.—The following is the complete text of the speech Mrs. Ruth Washington made at the dedication of the post office at 43rd

Place and Central Ave. in the name of her late husband, Col. Leon H. Washington Jr., founder and publisher of *The Sentinel*). Mayor Thomas Bradley, District Manager/Postmaster, James J. Symbol, Honored Guests and Friends.

It was more than 40 years ago that my late husband, Mr. Leon H. Washington Jr., came to Los Angeles to make this city his home and to build a career as a newspaper publisher.

Shortly after he arrived here in Los Angeles, he headed for Central Ave. and the "East Side," the area, this area, which is better known today perhaps as "Southeast Los Angeles."

It was here that he made roots. It was here that he founded the *Los Angeles Sentinel*. It was here that he carried on a romance with a community of people whom he loved dearly.

LOVED THE AREA

Yes, Mr. Washington loved this area where we sit and stand today. He loved this community more than any other.

Mr. Washington was to become a widely-traveled man. But this was his turf. He never stayed away for long. He always returned.

During his career as Publisher of the *Los Angeles Sentinel*, Mr. Washington launched many successful campaigns on behalf of his beloved people. Two of them, I believe, gave him more satisfaction than the others.

One was his famous campaign, "Don't Spend Your Money Where You Can't Work." The other was his campaign for a new "Kearney Station Post Office."

Both ideas, both campaigns, were born out of an obvious need.

Once he began the Post Office Campaign, there was no way in which he could be denied. He was totally committed to the project. Cong. Augustus Hawkins, Cong. Edward R. Roybal, Councilman Gilbert Lindsay, local, regional, and national Post Office officials, and many others can tell you that Mr. Washington simply wouldn't take "NO" on the Post Office.

CONCRETE EVIDENCE

The old post office was totally inadequate for this community, he said. A new Post Office, he said, would help to restore the community. It would be concrete evidence that the federal government, as well as local political leaders and Post Office officials, were interested in the well-being of this community.

Mr. Washington not only campaigned for the new Post Office here, he actually crusaded for it. Many of you here know that... because he enlisted you in his crusade.

I have a photograph which vividly reveals how much this New Post Office meant to Mr. Washington.

The photograph was made during a time when Mr. Washington felt that the federal government was responding too slowly to his campaign. In the photograph, he is sitting in a chair on this very site. He is wearing an overcoat and he is holding a picket sign.

The picket sign asks a question: "WHERE IS THE POST OFFICE?"

GOT THE WORD

Well, finally, Mr. Washington received word that the new Post Office would be built on this site where we are today. When he received that news from Cong. Hawkins, Mr. Washington was a very happy man.

He was happy and he was proud. Literally, he beamed for days. And when actual construction began, he closely watched every facet of it. In a manner of speaking, the New Post Office was his baby, and he wanted to see it grow.

Mr. Washington wasn't thinking in terms of building a monument to himself here. As I have said, he saw a need for a new, modern

Post Office here, one which would serve the people better, one in which they could take community pride, one which reassured them that theirs was still a great community.

That's what the new Post Office meant to Mr. Washington.

HIGH HONOR

And, now, through the grace and goodness of Postmaster General Klassen, our beloved Congressman Hawkins and Roybal, and others, Mr. Washington is being paid the high honor of having the new Post Office named for him.

I stand in for Mr. Washington here today. And I can tell you that I am humbled by the honor, the tribute, you are paying my husband. But I can also tell you this: I feel very proud today, too.

I shall be eternally grateful to you.

On behalf of Mr. Washington, and for myself, I say . . . thank you. Thank you very, very much.

AIR POLLUTION

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague GEORGE BROWN of California has presented in his usual lucid and persuasive fashion a paper on air pollution which treats the subject in the perspective it deserves. I urge the members to read it if they wish to understand the subject.

AIR POLLUTION IS A SOCIAL DISEASE

(By Congressman GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.)

(NOTE.—Presented at the American Medical Association Air Pollution Medical Research Conference, Noon, December 5, 1974, San Francisco, California. Mr. Brown is a Member of Congress from the 36th Congressional District of California.)

I have chosen the title "Air Pollution Is a Social Disease" in order to stress several points. Air pollution really is a disease—a disease of the biosphere in which we all live. In a more than symbolic sense we are a part of the biosphere. We help to sustain it, and it helps to nurture us, and all other living things. Pollution of that biosphere is as much a disease, in the broadest sense, as are the virulent manifestations of that pollution in the human body, which may include the pollution of emphysema or the pollution of cancer.

Air pollution resembles a social disease—that euphemistic expression for a variety of venereal diseases—because it is generally caused by human beings doing something they really enjoy, without considering all of the consequences. That something that causes air pollution is generally excessive consumption, excessive waste, excessive use of high-powered, highly polluting automobiles, and a variety of other excesses in the use of physical products and energy. Just as careless and irresponsible sexual activity can result in venereal disease, careless and irresponsible attitudes toward the use and consumption of nature's material bounty causes air pollution. There is an analogy also between VD and air pollution in our common attitude of refusing to face up to the two problems publicly, to talk about them rationally, to recognize the difficult steps we must take to eradicate them. With VD, shame and embarrassment inhibit us. With air pollution, conventional attitudes about economic growth, the good life, and other valued social goals, inhibit our thoughts and actions.

What are some of these difficult steps we

must take to eradicate air pollution, and how difficult are they?

A few facts will help us understand this problem.

Since the passage of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, the major reduction in pollutants has resulted from the conversion from coal as a fuel to low-sulfur oil and natural gas as a fuel.

Air quality projections for the Los Angeles Air Basin show that even if all automobiles met the original Clean Air Act emission standards, air quality would begin to deteriorate again in the early 1980's simply because of the continued growth in automobile use.

Research on air pollution has continued to discover new pollutants and new and higher margin of safety levels for pollutants in order to protect the public health, which in turn demand higher levels of pollution control.

The cost, in dollars and in energy, of air pollution control technology increases exponentially as we approach zero emissions.

Energy demand projections by government and non-government sources predict that without sharp restrictions on energy use or supply, energy consumption will increase by another 50% by 1985 and 150% by the year 2000.

Coal use is expected to increase by nearly 100% by 1985, and 300% by the year 2000.

Oil consumption is also expected to increase by some 50% by 1985, although the amount of imported oil is expected, hopefully, to be less than that used today.

Rainfall patterns near urban centers have changed dramatically, due to the rain-inducing particulates far down-wind of cities.

Precursors of ozone, the agent most responsible for damage to agricultural products, are so widely dispersed in the lower atmosphere that high ozone levels are now detected in purely rural areas.

While we may hope for breakthroughs in new, clean sources of energy, or in effective and inexpensive pollution control technologies, I do not believe it is wise to count on such technological fixes. The national dilemma is that we are faced with a variety of proposals for continued growth in the use of fossil fuels to produce energy for the next several generations, with apparently the inevitable byproduct of hazardous air pollution. As we increase the use of energy, we are most likely to further the spread of the disease of air pollution. Thus energy policy is related to environmental policy.

Because air pollution plays a central role in establishing limits to energy use, and because this conference is concerned with air pollution primarily, I think it is appropriate to review some of the background to air pollution controls.

While air pollution has been a matter of scientific and social concern for several hundred years, and laws regulating the location and type of fuel burners have been in effect for decades, serious, systematic air pollution control technologies have only been applied very recently. The early air pollution control laws were not based upon any rigorous scientific criteria of emission limitations or ambient air quality standards. Nor were they applied equally throughout the industry or the country. The most stringent controls were, naturally enough, required in the areas that had the most active citizen interest, such as Los Angeles County. In most cases, these areas also had the most severe cases of pollution. Public involvement spread, the areas of control spread, and the basis for those controls became more firmly established in science, law and administrative practice. Every step of this process involved a long and difficult struggle.

An often unspoken underlying difference of viewpoint in this struggle has been the question of on whom lay the burden of proof in establishing pollution-control standards. Those with an economic stake in on-going

practices naturally assume that new regulations should apply only when levels of pollutants are unequivocally demonstrated to have serious harmful effects. Those focusing on the health of the ecosystem believe laws should be drawn with the philosophy that no man-made contaminants should be permitted unless proven in detail to be truly harmless.

Much of the legislation in this field has been written with the relatively narrow view that our technological, market-oriented society would, given the proper stimulus, develop the technology to control pollution without any major change in values. The specific legislative approaches to accomplish this end have varied. The Federal law alone has undergone several major revisions, beginning with the Clean Air Act of 1963, which mandated a Federal role in this field, and climaxing with the primary law in the field of air pollution control, the "Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970" (P.L. 91-604; Dec. 31, 1970).

The changes in the Clean Air Act paralleled changes in public attitudes as a whole. For example, there developed increasing recognition that air pollution was not a local problem. This was not only because air pollution crossed state lines, but because the products of our industrialized society were part of a national economy, and pollution was therefore a national product.

Another key development in the 1970 amendments was the resolution of the argument over whether controls should be based on health standards, or on the basis of economic and technological feasibility. The legislative history is instructive here. The report that accompanied the bill when it was sent to the U.S. Senate floor stated: "In the Committee discussions, considerable concern was expressed regarding the use of the concept of technical feasibility as the basis of ambient air standards. The Committee determined that (1) the health of people is more important than the question of whether the early achievement of ambient air quality standards protective of health is technically feasible; and (2) the growth of pollution load in many areas, even with applications of available technology, would still be deleterious to public health. Therefore, the Committee determined that existing sources of pollutants either should meet the standard of the law or be closed down, and in addition that new sources should be controlled to the maximum extent possible to prevent atmospheric emissions." This statement of legislative intent provides no room for ambiguity.

We are now at the point in air pollution control in the United States where the laws are strict enough to accomplish the goal, but because the enforcement of these laws may force drastic changes, and conflict with other social values, enforcement agencies are balking at making this effort.

Despite that brave language of the Clean Air Act, we have not eliminated air pollution, nor have we even reduced air pollution to the level required to protect the public health. The final date to attain the ambient air quality standards is 1977, but few, if any, regions of the country appear likely to meet them for all pollutants. The existing law is not perfect, but very few of the attacks on the Clean Air Act have been inspired by those who wish to strengthen it.

The easiest form of attack on the implementation of the Clean Air Act is to criticize the ambient air quality standards as being "too stringent". This approach does not attack the existence of "goals", but instead attempts to "correct" those goals. This attack is usually based on the assumption that the burden of scientific proof in enforcing environmental law, especially in the face of economic dislocation, is to show that a given level of a pollutant is without a doubt harmful to health or property. Because much of society agrees that the burden does in fact

rest with those who want to regulate pollution, as opposed to those who wish to pollute, this has been a relatively effective line of criticism. The resulting controversy has caused the Senate Public Works Committee, which authored the original act, to commission a National Academy of Sciences study on the Federal ambient air quality standards. Despite the implicit acceptance of the heavy burden of proof, the Executive Summary of that report stated "In general, the evidence that has accumulated since the promulgation of the Federal ambient air quality standards by the EPA Administrator on April 30, 1971, support those standards. Hence, on balance, the panels found no substantial basis for changing the standards." Presumably this line of attack on the air pollution control strategies mandated by the Clean Air Act will now be weakened.

The second most frequent form of attack is to criticize the emission standards of both mobile and stationary sources. These criticisms are also based on scientific arguments, and they have been most vehemently raised by the automobile manufacturers, who believed that the auto emission standards were more restrictive than necessary (especially the NOx standard) in order to achieve the ambient air quality standards. The National Academy of Sciences also looked into this question, and while their findings were somewhat more ambiguous for this study, they still would not recommend changing the auto emission standards for NOx or hydrocarbons. The effort to relax the NOx standard is not over, but it is unlikely that it will be justified on the basis of any sound, scientific arguments. Both of these challenges to the Clean Air Act were more examples of clashing values than of simple disagreements over scientific facts. The determination and interpretation of the standards, is, and will continue to be, an area where value judgments enter in. People who have different priorities will give the benefit of the doubt to different sides of the same question. This is a limitation with legislation that is frequently ignored.

This leads us to the most common criticism of the Clean Air Act, and of all environmental controls, for that matter. This is the debate over technological and economic feasibility. These two subjects are usually lumped together, with the implication that if the technology to control a particular pollutant is not economical under a given set of circumstances, then it is not available. However, pollution control technologies can usually be made economical by changes in the tax law, or the pricing mechanism, provided that the changes are applied to all similar industries. As we approach the need for "zero" emissions in certain industries that use extremely toxic substances, such as radioactive materials, or carcinogens, the claim that the standards may be economically or technologically impossible to obtain, and still maintain production, may be true. In situations such as these, we should look very carefully at the industry in question. The question of technical feasibility then becomes the question of whether we can live without the product, and whether we can cope with the dislocations caused by ending production.

The most frequent recommendation of reformers to make a technology economical is to have a "pollution tax" that would begin the process of "internalizing the externalities." If this is done uniformly across the country, it is argued, the control of pollution would be accomplished naturally within the market system.

The attractiveness of this approach is obvious. The industry that produces a pollutant would have to absorb the costs of controlling it. While I cannot disagree with the intent, nor even the logic of this argument, I believe it will, once again, only give us an illusion of a solution. This approach will not solve the root problem, which is the need to accept limits as to what can or should be

done with science and technology. Another author described it this way: "The inherent danger of technological solutions to environmental problems is that they give the impression that the problem is being tackled and, in a society geared to growth, this allows the system to continue its headlong rush." The "pollution taxes" will only be truly effective to the extent that they begin to regulate material growth itself.

A very real limit to most environmental legislation, then, is its lack of comprehensiveness, and its inherently narrow approach to the problem. While the claims that pollution controls will cause industry to close down are usually overdrawn, this possibility is not always out of the question, as mentioned above. This is a situation in which values, not scientific facts, are in conflict, and this conflict in values must be recognized.

The environmental movement did embrace the view that growth in production and consumption of material goods is not as important as the quality of life, and that common economic indicators, such as the Gross National Product, did not reflect the quality of life. The Congress, when it passed environmental legislation, voiced some of these same views. However, this was no more than rhetoric until the hard facts of application arose. Now we are faced with the reality that our style of life will really have to change, and that social and economic structures will have to be modified. This prospect has given many former environmental advocates second thoughts. Lewis Mumford, in his monumental book, *The Pentagon of Power*, said "Reformers who would treat the campaign against environmental and human degradation solely in terms of improved technological facilities, like the reduction of gasoline exhaust in motor cars, see only a small part of the problem. Nothing less than a profound re-orientation of our vaunted technological 'way of life' will save this planet from becoming a lifeless desert. . . . For its effective salvation mankind will need to undergo something like a spontaneous religious conversion: one that will replace the mechanical world picture with an organic world picture, and give to the human personality, as the highest known manifestation of life, the precedence it now gives to its machines and computers. This order of change is as hard for most people to conceive as was the change from the classic power complex of Imperial Rome to that of Christianity, or, later, from supernatural medieval Christianity to the machine-modeled ideology of the seventeenth century. But such changes have repeatedly occurred all through history; and under catastrophic pressure they may occur again."

This analysis of the magnitude of change required to shift from the present material growth oriented society to the material steady-state can be depressing. Most of you may doubt that it is necessary, or that if such a change is necessary, doubt that it will be as difficult as Mumford describes. But even if Mumford exaggerates, he does provide us with some interesting areas to explore.

What will a steady-state society that embraces "an organic world picture" be like? First of all, we can be sure that it will be different. We can also be sure that opportunities for non-material growth will be increasingly available. Nevertheless, the implications of the material steady-state are tremendous, and they have not been very thoroughly examined. Given the power of the status-quo to enforce its will, it is doubtful that any such revolutionary change will occur without a "catastrophe" to force that change. Even so, some of the policies we are now pursuing do move us in this direction. The pollution standards we have are likely to be followed by pollution taxes. This will probably be followed in short order by a depletion tax (versus the present depletion al-

lowance). These efforts are incremental steps toward the steady-state.

The hard questions associated with these policies are already confronting us. The major question is one of equity. Amory Lovins said of the steady-state, "Perhaps most difficult will be the need to face the issue of distribution rather than following the 'let them eat growth' theory; physical stabilization will entail much moral growth, and the recycling of such nearly-extinct society values as thrift, neighborliness, craftsmanship, and simplicity." If we do not confront this issue now, in the non-steady state world, it will only loom larger in the steady-state.

The economy of the material steady-state would differ from that economy which we now have. With a constant or only slowly increasing level of production of physical goods, economic growth could be expected in the non-physical areas of services and leisure. In addition, the physical goods that are produced could be expected to be of a greater quality and have a longer life time of use.

Beyond the physical distribution of goods in the steady-state, there are other questions that we should examine, even in the present society. The steady-state will require a great deal of restraint, which will require more planning for the future than practiced in the growth state, and this will require a great deal of moral growth on the part of government and people. There will be increasing emphasis on opportunity for continued artistic, intellectual, scientific and spiritual growth. The place of the individual in society could be expected to be elevated in the steady-state. It could be a place where "creative simplicity" would flourish.

The concept of the steady-state is not truly new. John Stuart Mill wrote in 1857 that the "stationary condition of capital and population" was an inevitable condition that should not be feared because "there would be as much scope as ever for all kinds of mental culture, and moral and social progress."

It might also be added that science and technology would play a major role in achieving and maintaining the steady-state. The transition will require the use of the sophisticated tools of society, and our survival will depend on it. However, in the steady-state, technology would remain as a tool that would be carefully used, and controlled.

The material steady-state then, may be an inevitable condition because of the physical limits to growth, including technological growth, but it does not necessarily have to be a condition to be feared or struggled against.

I have attempted, in these brief remarks, to describe the flaw of the "technological fix" to the social disease of air pollution. I have not meant to leave the impression that the "fixes" which technology can generate are not worth the effort. Instead, technological controls should be applied along with other controls, and all controls should be improved, as should the research that establishes the need for those controls. But we must realize that more remains to be done.

The limits imposed by pollution and other deleterious consequences of growth are real, and must be confronted. This confrontation has led me to conclude that our current way of life must change to one with greatly diminished emphasis on material growth. This recognition is spreading, and it is gradually being reflected in new laws at the local, State and Federal level.

These laws are creating new conflicts, and new demands. The people at this conference, representing government, universities, and the medical profession, are among the most aware individuals in the country on this problem, and by virtue of your superior knowledge, you have information that is needed by the entire society. You best un-

derstand your own findings, and the implications of those findings, as they involve human health and if you spoke out on this issue, and the related issue of growth, you would be listened to. The public has great respect for your professional positions, and your motives are generally above reproach. We politicians are not so fortunate.

In my own congressional district there is an excellent example of how members of the medical profession can successfully influence public policy. Representatives of the Riverside County Medical Association have given their time and expertise to public hearings, and to serving on public boards and commissions, directly advising politicians and administrators about air pollution and related issues. This has led them to discuss land use questions, mass public transportation, automotive emission controls, public education and other major public issues, all related to the causes of air pollution. The doctors in my areas have been the most effective speakers on air pollution within the community. Similar actions have occurred at the State and Federal level, but these efforts have been much more diffuse and therefore much less effective.

Your keynote speaker this morning, Dr. Herschel Griffin, participated in one of the major efforts to provide scientific information for use in determining public policy. The Health Effects panel of the National Academy of Sciences study on air pollutants did not extrapolate their findings out to their logical conclusions. I realize that this was not their purpose, but at this time of public confusion, health experts would do the Nation a great service if they would defend the existing environmental laws in a convincing manner before public forums. Without such efforts by members of the medical and scientific professions, it is left to politicians such as myself to use and explain the findings and the implications of those findings to the public. I, and most other elected public officials, need your help. Between us we can cure the social disease of air pollution. Let's get on with the job.

P.S.: THERE IS SOME GOOD NEWS, TOO

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, while we are all only too well aware of the many serious problems that face us individually and as a nation, I believe the recent essay in Time magazine makes a very important point that we must, for our own benefit, keep our present problems in the proper perspective.

The essay follows:

P.S.: THERE'S SOME GOOD NEWS, TOO

One has two duties—to be worried and not to be worried.—E. M. Forster

It is the first of these two duties that seems these days to consume America's waking—and sleeping—hours. The nightmare fantasies have become tangible. An undertow of hopelessness and helplessness tugs at every conversation. The colors of recession, the possibility of a Middle East holocaust, the random violence erupting in crimes against people, and indeed against civilization—the awful litany grows longer by the hour until the West seems to be sinking under its own weight, as if programmed by Oswald Spengler.

In such a season of despair, it seems idle to poke through the rubble looking for flow-

ers, or even weeds. Pollyanna is dead, her grave long since vandalized and sprayed with graffiti. Dr. Pangloss's euphoria has given way to the Club of Rome's tocsins. Good news is an irretrievable ghost, like convertibles and safe streets. And peace.

Or is it? Americans have a peculiar appetite for superlatives, even negative superlatives. It is not enough for traffic to be bad; it must be the worst. Weather cannot be wet; it must be the rainiest fall on record. Times cannot be merely depressing; they must be devastating. But this attitude is at odds with the evidence. Certainly the items of cheer are sparse. But to ignore them is to lose all sense of proportion, just as a penny held too close to the eye can blot out the sky.

It is no surprise that Americans eat well, but just how well is an astonishment (some would call it a disgrace). It took the worst weather in a generation to keep the country from enjoying a record food output this year. As it was, the U.S. produced the fourth largest grain harvest in history. In addition, farmers this year will bring nearly 23 billion lbs. of beef to market, an average of some 100 lbs. per citizen. Pork production is up over last year; turkey production has set a record—135 million birds, causing a refreshing drop in prices. The fish supply will total about 12.5 lbs. per person, nearly equal to last year's record consumer purchase. Hunger has not been eliminated in America, but 15 million people supplement their diet with food stamps, and 9 million children receive free or reduced-price school lunches. And with all this, the nation has sent abroad more than 80% of the world's total food aid—some 70 million lbs. a day.

If the economy is unhealthy, the American consumer has never been healthier—medically speaking. Americans are free of many diseases that not long ago ravaged the country. Vaccines are available that can send polio and measles the way of diphtheria and whooping cough. Synthetics are used to replace many worn-out body parts, and even organ transplants have become relatively commonplace. Machines routinely supplement the function of failing kidneys. There are new methods of detecting and treating genetic defects. Hypertension is becoming more manageable; the coronary-bypass operation has made productive citizens of invalids. Even certain cancers, notably Hodgkin's disease and leukemia, have shown remarkable remissions under treatment. Infant mortality is less than 19 per thousand, and the contemporary child can expect to live four years longer than his parents. This may be a mixed blessing, considering our bafflement about how to use those bonus years, but it is still impressive that adults today may be expected to enjoy the greatest longevity of any Americans in history.

Politics is not celebrated for the manufacture of good news—except in campaign promises. Yet the nation has successfully weathered its severest constitutional crisis without producing oligarchy or chaos. The three-way division of powers, which has provoked more funeral orations than *Julius Caesar*, still functions. If the recent election showed evidence of apathy, it also provided examples of vigor. Harvard Sociologist Thomas Pettigrew sees "serious good news" in the massive gains that blacks made in Congress and state legislatures. Connecticut's Ella Grasso, the first woman to become Governor without benefit of her husband's coat-tails, is a symbol of the growing numbers of women who seek and win elective office. Optimists may be an endangered species, but news like this keeps them from becoming extinct. Political Analyst Ben Wattenberg (*The Real America*), among the hardest of the species, argues that Americans are "a tough minded, wise, shrewd people. They've coped with assassination, an awful Viet Nam War, city riots, political scandal and all the while made an enormous amount of material and

attitudinal progress, i.e., in the women's field and civil rights. Remember that this is still the most emulated country in the world. Therefore very few nations who are saying they would really like to model themselves after the Soviet Union."

Technology likes to perform its tricks on-stage and its real miracles in the dressing room. Christmas shoppers are happily aware that pocket calculators are now about one-third of last year's price and that before long, transistors and printed circuitry will provide TV sets so thin and flat that we will be able to hang them on the wall like engravings. Of far greater and subtler potential are discoveries that do not immediately reach the consumer. The maligned space program, for instance, has produced satellites and observatories that can survey a nation's military potential. Such hardware is the unspoken guarantor of the SALT talks between Russia and the U.S., and perhaps of detente itself. Geologists have begun to tap the geothermal energy of volcanoes in Mexico and the Azores. New offshore oil deposits have been discovered in such economically eroded countries as Italy and Britain. Researchers have just discovered a new subatomic particle. True, the explorers are not certain about what they have found; pure science seldom knows until years later. But then, who would have dreamed that blackboard physics of 70 years ago would ultimately lead to nuclear power?

Of course, technology is justly blamed for creating many of our problems—from overloading us with unneeded gadgets to fouling our seas and skies. But it is technology that we count on to solve the very problems it has created. Despite a growing reluctance to meet the heavy cost of environmental regulations, vigorous enforcement of these laws and technological innovations have begun to cleanse the nation's air and water. The atmosphere in New York City, Chicago and Los Angeles is cleaner than last year, and fish are flourishing once again in Lake Erie and the Hudson River.

Good news does not always arrive in capital letters or accompanied by trumpets. Tormented by economic distress, Americans may be disregarding some extremely significant and heartening items. Within the past week, President Ford granted full pardons to eight convicted war resisters, evidence that the passions of Viet Nam are finally burning out. There are no longer any American troops fighting and dying in that country, and the draft has been successfully abolished; the volunteer Army is in fact oversubscribed. Congress has begun to reform its creaky, out-moded machinery. Nelson Rockefeller is likely to be confirmed as Vice President, perhaps providing the Executive Branch with the domestic authority it has so far failed to exercise. Overseas, where shadows deepen, there are still a few glimpses of good. The limitation on offensive weapons agreed upon by the U.S. and the Soviets is too high; but the point is that a ceiling has been set, and at least the agreement is an expression of each side's continuing desire for detente. Syria has allowed the U.N. peace-keeping force to stay on for another six months, granting some hope for further negotiations. Greece is slowly returning to a democratic form of government. U.S. relations with India, so long strained, have begun to show some improvement.

On a less global note, there are a few indicators of economic optimism. Nature may not have been kind to farm crops, but she has smiled upon vintners; this year's grape harvest in France and California will be more bountiful and cheaper than its predecessors. A number of food chains have vowed not to raise prices through the end of the year. The out-of-sight costs of materials and labor have had some hidden benefits. Millions have become craftsmen; the arcana of carpentry, plumbing and auto repair have been revealed to those who once thought they

possessed ten thumbs. In a variety of flea markets, church bazaars and garage sales, secondhand furniture and utensils trade hands and are given a new life. The old colonial virtues of "use it up, wear it out; make it do, or do without" are back in style. Metalworking, canning, weaving and bread baking are becoming the sober and necessary pursuits of the common citizen.

In the other Hard Times, back in 1929, there was what Columnist Russell Baker called a "boom in love." Now, millions of families are finding that they have to stay home and save rather than go out and spend. It may not herald a new epoch of romance, but the New Hard Times—together with newly conservative sexual mores—may solidify more families than they dissolve.

One of the happiest trends of the present crisis is an anti-nostalgia backlash. In *The Good Old Days—They Were Terrible!*, Otto Bettmann provides a horrific picture gallery of the American past imperfect. "What we have forgotten," he demonstrates, "is the hunger of the unemployed, crime, corruption, the despair of the aged, the insane, the crippled. The world now gone was in no way, spared the problems we consider horrendously our own, such as pollution, addiction, urban plight or educational turmoil."

Naturally the fact that the past was miserable does little to alleviate the miseries of the present. No medical discovery, no scientific breakthrough, no political initiative or fresh economic approach can immediately reduce the feeling that a way of life is ebbing, that neither American nor the world will be the same. But in itself that is far from melancholy news.

For the first time, Americans seem willing to acknowledge that no continent is an island unto itself, that resources can no longer be the exclusive property of the privileged and that our bounty, however generous, is nonetheless finite. There are even some who hear, in the babel of violence and despair, a few melodies. Quiescent periods of the past have always proved deceptive; the gaiety of the '20s, the silence of the '50s, were both preludes to disaster. In the somber, sober '70s, the problems are there for all to see—and try to solve.

It is possible that Americans will provide some solutions. Only an amnesiac could be unaware that the nation's durability has been grievously underestimated many times—during the Civil War and the Depression, global war and Viet Nam, assassination and resignation—and that somehow, its incredible resilience prevailed. Yet there are many who, forgetting America's great strength and ability to adapt, see today as the very worst of times. Columnist Joseph Alsop, noting "the strange break that has overtaken the spirit of America," wrote recently: "Somehow, self-confidence and energy have been replaced by fear and impotence—and this in a nation grown far more numerous, far richer, and far, far more powerful than the long ago America of my youth. The more I think about it, the more puzzling and inexplicable the subsequent change in America has always seemed to be." Written about the reasons for this loss of

But is it so inexplicable? Much has been confidence—Viet Nam, which taught us about the limits of our power; the energy crisis, which taught us about the limits of our resources; Watergate, which taught us about the limitations of our leaders. Could it be that this emphasis on fear and impotence is, in truth, seriously misplaced—that it would be wiser to heed what poet Archibald MacLeish said in a TV interview a couple of years ago: "When the Great Depression of the '30s brought Marxism and the American Proposition face to face . . . there was every theoretical reason to suppose that Marxism would triumph. It did not . . . because the American Proposition, unimpressed with the mystique of economic

determinism, fought its way out of economic disaster and adapted itself to the new century . . . The truth is that, far from being dead, the belief in man, which is the ground of the American Proposition, is now stronger in the U.S. than it has ever been, and potentially stronger in the world, for it is now the one great positive affirmation left."

Perhaps the problem is, at bottom, a failure of perspective, an inability to see things as they were, as they are and as they might be. Bemoaning his fate, the American is obedient to W. H. Auden's dictum: "Sing of human unsuccess/In a rapture of distress." He is like those ancient fresco painters who, lacking the techniques of proportion, illustrated everything in profile and of equal size. No matter how sophisticated its martial or plastic arts, a society that judges all phenomena without the gift of perspective must in the end be judged primitive. In these bountiful, beleaguered times, the recognition that America needs to acquire that perspective could be the best news of all.

RKO GENERAL TELEVISION PRESENTS 3-HOUR PROGRAM ON INFLATION

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Chamber are agreed that inflation is public enemy No. 1. It is cruelly taxing everyone, particularly those who can least afford it.

I was pleased to be notified last week that RKO General Television will be offering an excellent public service program on inflation. The program, a special 3-hour presentation, will explore useful ways to combat inflation and useful tips on how to stretch our hard-earned inflationary-shrunk dollars.

I think this type of programing is most useful, and I am enclosing a copy of the program notice for the information of my colleagues.

The notice follows:

RKO GENERAL TELEVISION IN ASSOCIATION WITH "BUSINESS WEEK" PREPARES A 3-HOUR SPECIAL—"INFLATION: A FEW ANSWERS"—ON WOR-TV, NEW YORK AND KHJ-TV, LOS ANGELES, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10

(Newsman Sander Vanocur To Serve as Host)

The most devastating inflation of recent decades is currently clamping the damper on everyone's life-style, as well as posing a serious threat to the entire world's economic and social systems.

At the Washington Conference on the Economy, President Ford said that the success or failure of our fight against inflation rests with every individual American. But how and where does an individual tackle such a broad, all-encompassing problem?

"Inflation: A Few Answers," an unprecedented, new THREE hour special which will be telecast on December 10th, 1 P.M. on the two RKO General independent stations: WOR-TV, New York and KHJ-TV, Los Angeles, is a good place to look for help.

Said Robert L. Glaser, President of RKO General Television, Inc., "Television must take an aggressive role in informing the public about economic solutions as well as merely reporting the ups and downs of financial trends. Some topics such as inflation require more time to adequately cover all the angles and fortunately independent

stations such as KHJ-TV and WOR-TV have the necessary flexibility to permit a three hour prime-time telecast."

Al Korn, Vice President in charge of Programming for RKO General Television, said: "Anyone who watches all three hours of this show and can't save money the next day just wasn't really paying attention. We will feature over 170 people on the screen and will give the answers to 250 specific questions which relate to daily survival."

The segments will include a question and answer period during which approximately 125 man-on-the-street questions will be answered by a panel of twenty experts who will all be seen on the screen at the same time.

Food, foreign travel, housing, transportation, medicine, insurance, and energy queries will be discussed by everyone from the neighborhood corner pharmacist to the director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

To dramatize just what inflation means to the consumer, a Cost of Living Billboard will be set up displaying 1967 as the Index Year with a visual comparison of what the same items would cost if purchased today.

Handy Advice from the People We Deal with Everyday gleams information from an auto mechanic, butcher, supermarket manager, appliance repairwoman, TV repairman, and car dealer. In addition to saving by buying-wisely in the first place, learn how to cut corners more by doing your own simple repairs.

Tight Money and the Mortgage explores the crisis in home owning. On hand with some answers will be William Levitt, noted builder of Levittown, Long Island, plus a banking vice president in charge of approving mortgages. Questions will be supplied by a young couple who haven't been able to get a bank mortgage for their new home. They will tell of the many barriers they have had to face in their effort to find a place of their own to live.

Lewis Young, editor of Business Week, will lead a round table discussion on the whys and woes of Wall Street.

While some inflation problems are universal, many are unique to one area, or at least the solutions are. For this reason one part of "Inflation: A Few Answers" will be geared specifically to the Tri-State New York area for WOR-TV viewers and to Southern California for those watching on KHJ-TV. Included here will be instructions on where and how to complain about almost everything in these vicinities: from lost packages to product mislabeling to over-priced services.

"Inflation: A Few Answers" is produced by Al Korn.

OVERCOMING WORLD FOOD SHORTAGES

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, we shall soon consider House Resolution 1399, which expresses the sense of the House on the grave world food situation. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this resolution and am hopeful that my colleagues will demonstrate both to the American people and the world our sincere interest in combating hunger by showing our strong support for this measure.

As a result of high prices for food, energy, and fertilizer, the current world food supply is dangerously low and millions of people are facing famine. Population growth and poor weather

conditions have only aggravated the situation. Now many of the developing nations are turning to the United States for assistance.

We Americans have a history of providing humanitarian assistance to less fortunate nations. We have had the good judgment not to idly stand by in a world in which half the people are malnourished and the other half overfed. Perhaps we have failed in solving the problems of world hunger—but at least we have made a start.

Under the Marshall plan, between 1948 and 1954, we shipped over \$10 billion in agricultural commodities to war-ravaged Europe. Since 1954, we have assisted millions of starving people in needy countries around the world by providing nearly \$21 billion in agricultural commodities under the food for peace program. Although the administration of these programs left room for improvement, it was a demonstration of our concern for our fellow man as well as a contribution to world stability.

Today many countries are facing famine, pestilence, and death as a result of a worldwide shortage of food. This fact is most evident in the developing nations in the Far East, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America.

President Ford has indicated that he will support a substantial increase in U.S. assistance to agricultural production programs in other countries, an international system of food reserves, and an increase in U.S. spending for food shipments to needy nations. I applaud these efforts and strongly believe that the United States has the capability to provide food aid as needed to meet specific short-term emergencies. For example, the Department of Agriculture should begin to develop plans which will enable the United States to provide increased food aid when needed without increasing domestic inflation. The United States has an important humanitarian role to play in reducing hunger in the world but we cannot fulfill this obligation alone. All nations, including industrial, food-exporting, and oil-exporting countries, must join in the effort to combat food shortages.

As Representatives in the Congress, it is our responsibility to exercise prudence in deciding how American tax dollars should be spent. We must, then, assure the American people that we will continue to support those programs that are designed to provide relief to the developing countries of the world without unnecessarily jeopardizing the economy of the United States. Above all we must not convince ourselves that we can unilaterally prevent hunger in the world, because of our unique agricultural success. This could result in encouraging the developing nations to continue to rely on U.S. aid and continue their own inadequate efforts to involve small farmers in modern agricultural programs—this would almost certainly guarantee a more wide spread and destructive famine in the years to come. A policy in which we simply provide money and food to needy nations would, in my opinion, be shortsighted and foolish. We must also share our agricultural and technological ex-

pertise with the rest of the world and encourage all nations to develop their more accessible and, as yet, uncultivated arable acreage—everywhere in the world. Although we have already taken steps toward helping the food-deficient nations achieve self-sufficiency, a much greater effort is needed.

The most significant contribution that we can make to the world food shortage is to help the developing countries grow enough food to feed themselves.

We cannot stress enough, to those malnourished countries, the pitfalls of diverting any portion of the scanty resources available for food production to the establishment of national airlines, nonessential industrial plants, nuclear arms capabilities, or other prestigious activities.

Our job then is clear, we must state our policy in no uncertain terms that the United States is willing to assist those developing countries in need, but they in turn must be willing to practice the best agricultural methods available to help them help themselves.

CANAVERAL NATIONAL SEASHORE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I supported passage on December 3 of H.R. 5773, a bill reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to establish the "Canaveral National Seashore." I did have reservations regarding that bill as it was originally introduced, and particularly the sections under which areas of the NASA John F. Kennedy Space Center would be included in the national seashore. I was concerned that sections of the original bill could possibly be interpreted to mean that NASA's control and jurisdiction over the Kennedy Space Center areas in the seashore would be diminished. That, of course, would have been contrary to all of the efforts over the years—by the Congress, by the executive branch, and by the State of Florida—to establish the Kennedy Space Center as this Nation's primary spaceport.

In view of my previous concerns regarding H.R. 5773, I was pleased that the provisions of H.R. 5773 as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and particularly section 7 of the bill, emphasize that NASA will retain jurisdiction and control over the areas of the Kennedy Space Center contained in the national seashore unless such areas, some time in the future, become excess to NASA's needs.

The John F. Kennedy Space Center—or KSC, as it is called—is a unique national resource as our Nation's spaceport. Its current and future utilization as the Nation's spaceport must be assured for the Space Shuttle, for Spacelab, for space tugs, and for various shuttle payloads and other possible missions involving large space vehicles. All of these and other future programs will be

launched from KSC. Land must be reserved in NASA's control to accommodate these current and future needs. We have already launched from KSC the Apollo manned launches to the moon and the Skylab launches for that experimental manned earth orbital laboratory. We are preparing for the 1975 launch of an Apollo command module for the Apollo-Soyuz test project. And construction has begun on the runway for the Shuttle program. Other follow-on programs are already in various stages of planning and definition.

Kennedy Space Center, which has the responsibility for the integration, test, checkout, and launch of NASA's launch vehicles and spacecraft, is divided into areas carefully established in relation to the potential hazards inherent in those activities. The areas at KSC and all other activities there are, and must continue to be, subject to closure and curtailment as safety and security requirements dictate.

As a reminder of some of the considerations which went into the selection of the area as the Nation's spaceport, it may be helpful to outline some of the details surrounding the original selection and acquisition for the lunar landing program of the Kennedy Center for NASA and Department of Defense programs. Until President Kennedy gave the go-ahead on the lunar landing program in May 1961, there was no official need for a launch area of the magnitude required by the Saturn boosters.

Preliminary master planning data available in early 1961 indicated a great deal of land was needed for launch pads, safety zones between pads, industrial areas, ground support areas, range instrumentation sites, and for "buffer" areas to protect the general public. Two Saturn I complexes—pads 34 and 37—had used all the pad space available at Cape Canaveral by the end of 1961, and a new area had to be found for the manned lunar landing program. Site selection was a joint NASA/DOD effort. On July 21, 1961, the NASA/DOD planning groups published a report entitled "Joint Report on Facilities and Resources Required at Launch Site to Support NASA Manned Lunar Landing Program." This report investigated eight potential launch sites and provided a tentative master plan site layout of launch pads and support facilities at each site.

Cumberland Island on the Georgia coast and the northern portion of Merritt Island adjoining Cape Canaveral were considered the most feasible sites. Cumberland Island was slightly more isolated than the Cape area. The proximity of Merritt Island to the tracking network of the Atlantic missile range and lower development costs were the major reasons for selecting Merritt Island as the launch site for the manned lunar landing program. When the Congress authorized the NASA appropriations for fiscal year 1963 for acquiring the land needed for the launch site, it specifically considered the future control of the Nation's spaceport. That law requires that the launch site remain under the control and jurisdiction of NASA unless it is no

longer needed for the country's space activity at all. I am opposed to changing that congressional mandate.

In the bill that was reported by the committee and passed by the House, this long established policy of Congress is appropriately recognized in section 7. That section provides: First, that any lands within the seashore which the Administrator of NASA considers excess to the needs of NASA may be transferred directly to the Secretary of the Interior, but, second, that any NASA lands not so transferred shall remain under the control and jurisdiction of the Administrator. This is entirely consistent with the 1963 intent of Congress in authorizing NASA to acquire the lands which make up KSC.

More recently, of course, the Kennedy Space Center was selected as the initial launch and recovery site for the Space Shuttle. The selection of KSC for that purpose followed an extensive review by NASA and the Air Force of other candidate sites around the Nation. Certainly the gentlemen from Florida know perhaps better than I that the extent of NASA's landholdings at KSC, and the fact that NASA had and would retain control over those holdings, were key to its selection for shuttle launches and landings. I know that those gentlemen appreciate fully the importance of that decision.

NASA has an excellent record of working with the Interior Department to establishing feasible joint usage of parts of the Kennedy Space Center as a wildlife refuge. This bill will make it clear that NASA is to continue this good work looking toward more recreational use, but with the clear direction from Congress for the NASA Administrator to see to it that this country's prime spaceport is protected as a critically important national asset.

TAX BILL AIDS SMALL SAVERS, HOUSING INDUSTRY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the low- and middle-income saver has been hard hit by our growing inflation, savings and thrift institutions have been plagued by massive withdrawals, and the Nation's housing industry has been troubled by a shortage of funds for construction and mortgage loans.

In September, I introduced a bill to help alleviate these problems by providing a tax exemption for the first \$500—\$1,000 for a joint return—earned by an individual from savings institutions. Thirty-one of my colleagues joined me in sponsoring this legislation.

Average taxpayers have borne a major burden because the tax benefits that are generally available to wealthy individuals—such as tax-exempt bonds or capital gains—are often beyond the

means of the average taxpayer. My proposal adds balance to our tax laws on behalf of the small saver, while adding to the pool of funds available for home construction at the same time.

I am pleased that the Ways and Means Committee has reported favorably on H.R. 16994, which is identical in its terms to the bill which I introduced earlier this year. I urge my colleagues to act favorably on H.R. 16994.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 16994

HON. GUNN McKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill H.R. 16994, to exclude interest on savings accounts from gross income, for income tax purposes. Initially, I favored this legislation as a means of benefiting the small saver, encouraging saving, and creating mortgage funds for the ailing housing industry. All of these goals remain desirable. However, I have become convinced that this bill would not, in fact, attain them.

The Treasury estimates that the bill will generate a one-time shift of about \$10 billion presently invested in other sources. Of this, only about one-third will go into housing mortgages, conferring only a small benefit on the housing industry. This \$3.5 billion will finance only about 100,000 housing starts—a very small contribution to the needs of the housing industry, at a very great price. As my able colleagues, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, and Mr. KARTH have pointed out in their dissenting views, after the initial flow of money into savings institutions, additional saving will cease as interest rates on competing assets rise to adjust for the tax exclusion. Thus, for a one-time shift of \$3.5 billion in mortgage funds to the housing industry, the Treasury will lose \$2 billion annually in revenue. We cannot afford an additional \$2 billion deficit in the Federal Treasury. Such a deficit will fuel the fires of inflation still further and could lead to a tax increase, as well.

The bill is illusory. While appearing to aid the average taxpayer, it pays great dividends to the wealthy high income bracket taxpayer. The bill will serve as an additional loophole for the rich—at a time when we are trying to do away with tax loopholes. In allowing tax exemptions on the first \$500 of interest from savings accounts, each family member could have tax-free interest income each year on up to \$10,000 in savings. For those in the 70-percent tax bracket, this is an extremely significant tax break. For those with lower tax brackets, and smaller savings accounts, the benefit is far less significant. In addition, this tax exemption is not limited to interest from passbook savings accounts. Investors who can afford higher interest savings certificates also will be exempted from

the obligation to pay a tax on that income.

I favor legislation to encourage saving and to aid the housing industry. I believe such legislation can be enacted. However, I do not believe this bill will accomplish its purpose. It will serve merely as a panacea creating the illusion that some economic ills are being cured.

I would urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the bill.

SOME FACTS YOU SHOULD KNOW BEFORE VOTING ON FOREIGN AID

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, today, we will be voting on a foreign aid bill for fiscal year 1975. Our foreign assistance program suffers from many deficiencies, but one of the most unfortunate is the lack of candor about what is really going on on this issue. It is not enough that we are continually maneuvered and misled by the executive branch as to the realities of this program. We are deceiving ourselves about it as well.

I point, for example, to the first page of the report on the Foreign Assistance Act (H.R. 17234) which we will be discussing on Tuesday. On this page we are informed that the bill authorizes a total of \$2.643 billion for foreign assistance for fiscal year 1975. However, if we wade through the report we discover that the real total for fiscal year 1975, including amounts previously authorized for fiscal year 1975, is \$3.248 billion, plus \$250 million more in "special drawdown authority" for military equipment for Defense Department stocks.

On the following page there is a table which indicates that the bill reduces administration requests for foreign assistance programs by \$609 million—a move I would generally support. What we are not told, however, is that the fiscal year 1975 authorization is in reality an increase of \$1.351 billion over the total amount appropriated for foreign assistance in fiscal year 1974. Moreover, as the attached table indicates, the foreign aid authorization has substantial increases in all nine of the foreign aid categories over the levels appropriated for fiscal year 1974, with especially large increases in the military and security assistance areas.

Thus, while we are ostensibly being told that this bill slashes an administration request, what this bill really does is authorize a 71-percent increase over amounts appropriated for foreign aid last year and dramatically expands our military and security assistance programs.

I attach the following table for the benefit of my colleagues to review before our debate on this bill.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE
[In millions of dollars]

Category	Authorized for fiscal year 1974	Appropriated for fiscal year 1974	Recommended for fiscal year 1975	Difference: fiscal year 1974 appropriation—fiscal year 1975 recommendation	Category	Authorized for fiscal year 1974	Appropriated for fiscal year 1974	Recommended for fiscal year 1975	Difference: fiscal year 1974 appropriation—fiscal year 1975 recommendation
Development assistance:					Security supporting assistance	\$125.0	\$112.5	\$585.0	\$472.5
Food and nutrition	\$291.0	\$284.0	\$471.3	+\$187.3	Military assistance programs	512.5	450.0	745.0	295.0
Population and health	145.0	135.0	165.0	30.0	Foreign military credit sales	325.0	325.0	405.0	80.0
International organizations and programs	127.8	125.0	154.4	29.4	International control commission	0	0	27.7	27.7
Contingency fund	30.0	15.0	20.0	5.0	Gorgas memorial	.5	.5	2.0	1.5
Middle East special requirements	0	0	100.0	100.0					
Indochina postwar reconstruction	504.0	450.0	573.4	123.4	Total	2,060.8	1,897.0	3,248.8	+1,351.8

**GOV. OTIS R. BOWEN'S VIEWS ON
H.R. 16204, HEALTH POLICY, PLAN-
NING AND RESOURCES DEVELOP-
MENT ACT**

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on which I serve, has reported out H.R. 16204, the Health Policy, Planning and Resources Act, and it is on the whip notice for floor consideration this week.

The Governor of my State, the Honorable Otis R. Bowen, has written to me expressing his objections to certain features of this legislation. I insert Governor Bowen's letter herewith. In my view, the points he has made are very good and I hope they will be given serious consideration when H.R. 16204 is brought before us.

The letter follows:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,

Indianapolis, Ind., December 4, 1974.

HON. WILLIAM HUDNUT,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: As Governor of the State of Indiana, I share with the Congress and your committee deep concerns for the future of the nation's health delivery system. The legislation currently under consideration, H.R. 16204, manifests a significant effort to deal with a major portion of our mutual concerns. After extensive consultation with the health leadership in Indiana, it is apparent that while substantial portions of the bill are commendable, there are significant areas requiring further consideration.

I am compelled to address the following as objectionable features of the bill:

1. Substitution of federal for existing state and local authority.

2. Substitution of decision making by the Secretary of H.E.W. for existing decision making power of State Governors.

3. Substitution of a state-wide "health commission" for several well-functioning state-wide agencies, and assigning to it functions now handled by such agencies, especially those having to do with regulation.

If H.R. 16204 is passed in its present form, I would urge that the above undesirable elements be corrected by the conference committee.

Kindest personal regards,

OTIS R. BOWEN, M.D.,
Governor.

**COMPETITIVE CORPORATIVE
CITIZENSHIP**

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, competition is the spirit of success and victory in America. We all sense the esprit de corps of competition in the challenge of life. We have known it from the outset in game play at marbles to the Halls of Congress. But never have we exchanged fair play for foul play without resistance. The corporate citizen is no exception. We ask of the corporate citizen nothing more than fair play, fair practices, and an honest recognition of the rules of the game.

Marbles for money or money for marbles does not change the basic principles of fair play in the competitive games of life. We each have an ethical duty and a moral responsibility for participation in any venture of competition above the minimum level of conduct required by the rules of the game. However, it has become commonplace to proceed with all haste to success and victory on the barebones concept of the minimum requirements of the rules—and not to be caught in violation of the law. Is that the test of duty, of honor, of success, and of victory?

Mr. Speaker, the "game play" of our time demands more of every citizen, including the corporate citizen. The freedom to participate demands much of us all. What participation and what victory is worthy of respect if "foul play" becomes the rule that produced the result of success and victory?

I do not seek to oversimplify the complexities of life—but are the principles reduced in proportion to the obligation whatever the venture?

Mr. Speaker, the obligations for fair-play attach to all whatever and wherever and I am saddened that our economic, political, and social experiences are temptations for occasional violations of basic principles of conduct acceptable to all.

Corporate competition is no exception in the course of commerce and the corporate citizen cannot be excused

from the fairplay expected of every American citizen. The failure to participate accordingly may end the freedoms we have known—challenge the endurance of a free enterprising economy and ultimately destroy the fields of play, the grounds of opportunities, and all that we have known to be right, because of compelling forces of foulplay for too much of that which is wrong.

DR. KENNETH W. CLEMENT

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to the recent passing of one of the most dedicated public servants to bring honor to the ranks of the medical profession. Last Friday, November 28, 1974, marked the death of Dr. Kenneth W. Clement.

A man of many talents and varied interests, the good doctor distinguished himself not only in his own noble calling, but also in the fields of politics, community relations, education, and civil rights. His loss will be deeply felt both here in Washington and at home in Cleveland. His exceptional abilities won him appointments by two U.S. Presidents. President John F. Kennedy gave Dr. Clement the assignment of serving on the 1963-1965 National Social Security Advisory Council, representing the first appointment of either a black or a physician to that body. President Lyndon Johnson gave the doctor another Federal assignment as a member of the Presidential Appeals Board of the National Selective Service System. Dr. Clement also participated in writing the first medicare regulations as a member of the original Hospital Insurance Benefits Advisory Council. Another long-term link with Washington was Dr. Clement's continuing affiliation with his alma mater, Howard University, where he had been a trustee since 1968.

At home Dr. Clement was associated with numerous organizations dedicated to the public interest. He was a member of the executive committees of the Cleveland branch of the NAACP, the Cleveland

Urban League, the Cleveland chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union and the Cuyahoga County Cancer Society. He was a member of the distribution committee of the Cleveland Foundation and a member of the Ministers and Missionaries Benefit Board of American Baptist Churches, as well as President of the Cleveland Baptist Association.

Dr. Clement's awards and achievements locally and nationally are too numerous to mention. One aspect of his multifaceted career which I will always remember was his contribution to the great effort of electing the first black mayor of a major American city, my brother Carl Stokes. As campaign manager Dr. Clement's guidance and practical advice proved invaluable.

We will not soon forget Dr. Kenneth Clement's unselfish devotion to the welfare of his fellow man. He will be sincerely mourned by everyone who had the privilege of coming in contact with this rare human being. To better acquaint my colleagues with the remarkable life of a great man I submit the following article from the December 4, 1974, edition of the Washington Post:

DR. KENNETH W. CLEMENT, 53, SURGEON, HOWARD TRUSTEE

Dr. Kenneth W. Clement, 53, a Cleveland surgeon and former president of the National Medical Association, died Friday after a heart attack in Cleveland.

A graduate of Howard University's College of Medicine in 1945, Dr. Clement had been a member of the university's board of trustees since 1968, and at the time of his death was chairman of the board's planning and development committee.

Howard University had honored him in 1966 for his postgraduate achievements in medicine.

Dr. Clement was a leader not only in the medical field but in Cleveland's black community. He served as campaign manager for Carl B. Stokes when the latter became the first black mayor of a major American city in 1967.

Born in Pittsylvania County, Va., he was a graduate of Oberlin College. After graduation from Howard, he interned in New York City and Cleveland and had been in private practice in Cleveland since 1953.

Dr. Clement was on the staff of a number of hospitals and taught at Western Reserve University. He had been head of the National Medical Association during 1963-64.

A member of Cleveland's Mayor's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped since 1958, Dr. Clement had served during the 1960s on the National Advisory Committee on Social Security and had been a consultant to the office of technical cooperation and research of the Agency for International Development.

A former member of the Cleveland Community Relations Board, he had held high positions with local and state units of the National Urban League, the NAACP and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Dr. Clement served in the medical corps of the U.S. Air Force during the Korean conflict.

A prolific writer of medical articles, he held numerous awards. He was a diplomate of the American Board of Surgery, a fellow of the American College of Surgeons and a member of the Aero-Space Medical Association and the Association of Military Surgeons.

He is survived by his wife, Ruth Doss Clement, and two daughters, Lia and Leslie Clement, of the home in Shaker Heights; a son,

Michael, of Cleveland, and a sister, Elaine Jackson, also of Cleveland.

RHODESIAN CHROME EMBARGO

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives may soon vote on S. 1868, a bill which would reimpose the U.S. embargo on strategic materials such as chrome and ferrochrome. I intend to oppose this bill and would like to enter in the RECORD two articles which effectively state why this measure should be defeated. The first article from Metals Week is entitled "The Folly of a Rhodesian Chrome Embargo" and the second article from Business Week discusses "The Impact of a Ban on Rhodesian Chrome."

The articles follow:

THE FOLLY OF A RHODESIAN CHROME EMBARGO

An embargo on Rhodesian chrome imports by the U.S. would have immediate and devastating effects. No chrome is available from the GSA stockpile, the USSR would become a very powerful ore supplier to the U.S., plant shutdowns would certainly occur, and the move would cost the U.S. at least \$400 million per year.

The U.S. has no domestic chrome resources, and Charles E. Bennett (D-Fla.) is determined not to let any chrome out of the stockpile. (Bennett has an overriding interest in his economic stockpile amendment and the preservation of a three-year strategic stockpile goal.)

According to a recent survey, the inventory of ferrochrome in the hands of U.S. stainless steel producers (based on 91% of the industry) is less than a 30 day supply—and these and other U.S. consumers are on allocation from domestic ferrochrome producers. An embargo on Rhodesian chrome would thus have almost immediate effect.

Rhodesia supplied 50,751 tons or about one-third of U.S. ferrochrome imports last year. (South Africa accounts for another third.) U.S. demand for ferrochrome is placed at 470,000 tons for this year—to be supplied by 240,000 tons of domestic production and 130,000 tons of imports (down 25,000 tons from last year), leaving a 100,000 ton gap to be filled from scrap or inventory. Demand in 1975 is projected to rise by 50,000 tons to provide for automotive catalytic converters. If Rhodesian chrome is embargoed, the "gap" will about double to 200,000 tons in 1975.

Advocates of the embargo say, "That's just fine. The resulting price rise will stimulate new domestic ferrochrome capacity to halt the decline in U.S. capability—now down to only 50% of demand." But these advocates ignore the fact that in the interim, huge costs will be involved to make up the shortfall—costs of imported ferrochrome over which the U.S. has virtually no control. Every 1¢-a-lb. increase in the price of ferrochrome adds about \$8 to the raw materials purchase cost for one ton of stainless steel. A 50¢ rise in the price of ferrochrome (and such a rise is probably a conservative projection in the present extremely tight market) would annually cost the United States \$400 million on stainless steel alone.

Most certainly U.S. ferrochrome capacity could be raised. But where would the extra

ore come from? The major source would essentially be the USSR, with Turkey and South Africa as smaller suppliers.

Let us not be hypocritical. If the U.S. imposes sanctions against Rhodesia and its "oppressive" regime (bearing in mind that the U.S. is basically the force behind such sanctions) then the U.S. should impose sanctions against the even more oppressive government of the USSR—as even Henry Kissinger admits. Unfortunately, hypocrisy seems to be the order of the day—if not, why doesn't the U.S. restrict Turkish trade to protest the planting of Turkish poppies for the opium trade? If the U.S. embargoes Rhodesia, then let it be consistent—embargo Russia, Turkey, and South Africa, too.

Labor is viewing the embargo through rose-colored political glasses. U.S. ferrochrome capacity has indeed dropped by 50%—the last embargo did irreparable damage. But is labor going to hold U.S. consumers for a minimum \$400-a-year ransom in the interim to force ferrochrome production up? And can labor justify the shutdowns that must come with an interruption of supplies? And can anyone justify such an inflationary move as the embargo at a time of supreme inflation consciousness?

THE IMPACT OF A BAN ON RHODESIAN CHROME

Chrome consumers in the U.S. are in an uproar over the prospect that President Ford will restore the embargo on chrome imports from Rhodesia. The reason for their concern: A worldwide shortage of all forms of chrome has already pushed world prices up a heady 150% this year, and U.S. users—chiefly manufacturers of stainless steel and other alloys—fear the price will go through the roof if the U.S. slams the door on Rhodesian imports. "Any cutback in supplies will result in continued substantial price increases," says Martin N. Ornitz, president of Colt Industries, Inc.'s Crucible Stainless Steel Div.

The U.S. mines no chromium and is dependent on imports for virtually all its primary needs, though recovery from scrap and sales from the strategic stockpile have significantly augmented the supply.

With steel booming, the nation's appetite for chrome jumped 23% last year alone, and the U.S. consumed one-fifth of world production. Rhodesia was the third largest foreign source of the metal, supplying 13% of U.S. imports, compared with 31% for South Africa and 21% for the Soviet Union.

Industry fears about a price hike have a precedent beyond the present tight supply situation. When the U.S. joined other U.N. members in 1967 in boycotting Rhodesian chrome exports, the nation became heavily dependent on Russian chrome exports. And the Russians were quick to use their new market leverage to boost prices. The situation so disturbed Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., (Ind-Va.) that in late 1971 he succeeded in tacking an amendment onto a military procurement bill providing for a lifting of the Rhodesian chrome embargo as long as the Soviet Union remained a U.S. supplier. Byrd was concerned not only about the jump in Russian prices—up 70% during the embargo period—but about the dangers of overdependence on Soviet sources.

ADVANTAGE

At least as far as the Administration is concerned, these fears have apparently evaporated in the era of détente. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has declared that he is "personally convinced that the Byrd provision is not essential to our national security, brings no real economic advantage, and is costly in our conduct of foreign relations." Accepting this view, the Senate last December voted to reimpose the embargo,

and President Ford's endorsement may tip the balance in the House, where a close vote is expected.

The Administration's move may be inspired by more than constant criticism from Third World nations. Some observers believe the government is thinking of the prospect of future oil and raw material imports from Black Africa. And the action is sure to score points with members of the black caucus in Congress and with labor union groups concerned about the decline of domestic chrome smelting capacity (a significant part of Rhodesian exports to the U.S. are in the form of the smelted product, ferrochrome).

SHORT SUPPLIES

But industrial consumers argue that the move is ill-timed. They point out that the stainless steel industry's chrome inventories are already dangerously low—about one month's supply. "Repealing the Byrd amendment," says Fred B. O'Mara, executive vice-president of Union Carbide Corp., "would send chrome prices sky-rocketing and aggravate our nation's already serious inflation." One industry observer sees the possibility of a 50c per lb. rise in the price of ferrochrome, a hike that would add over \$200-million to the stainless steel industry's raw materials bill.

Higher costs would not be the only problem, say critics of the embargo. Lane M. Currie, president of H. C. Macaulay Foundry Co., claims that there is simply no spare supply of the metal around. "We've tried to purchase South African chrome, but we were told that consumers were on allocation and we wouldn't get any for about a year." And F. C. Kroft, Jr., president of Union Carbide's Ferroalloys Div., says that without Rhodesian supplies, the company would have to drop two of its major chromium product lines.

One alternate source of chrome could be the government's strategic stockpile, which contains nearly four years' supply of the metal. But the Administration needs Congressional approval for further sales from the stockpile, and Representative Charles E. Bennett (D-Fla.), chairman of the House subcommittee overseeing stockpile releases, reportedly opposes new sales until the government considers setting up economic stockpiles to counter threats from foreign mineral cartels. Still, the Administration feels it could get Congress to approve some sales in the event of a crunch.

Meanwhile, what is particularly galling to some chrome users is their belief that most of the nations boycotting Rhodesian chrome have honored the boycott more in the breach than the observance. Even the U.S., which was one of the most scrupulous observers during its participation in the embargo, unwittingly let some metal slip in. Thus, Ira L. Friedman, executive vice-president of Metallurgical International, Inc., a metal powders producer, predicts that U.S. consumers would still be able to get some Rhodesian chrome if the embargo is reimposed but "through third parties at double or triple the current price."

KANSAS CITY AND THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

HON. RICHARD F. VANDER VEEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. VANDER VEEN. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the Democratic mid-term convention in Kansas City. Much was accomplished there to provide the Democratic Party with a charter—a constitution wherein we shall codify

our party's goals and put down on paper what the Democratic Party stands for.

However, I think it appropriate for us to consider what was done in Kansas City in light of what was and is being accomplished by the House Democratic Caucus. David Broder, in the Sunday Washington Post, writes of this relationship and what can reasonably be expected of the party, and the Congress, in the months and years ahead.

Mr. Broder states:

The (caucus) reforms give the Democrats the power to pass the bills they consider proper. They also give them the responsibility. And they deny them any real excuse for not acting.

Power. Responsibility. Accountability.—The fourth ingredient is leadership and if there is leadership forthcoming, the benefits for the country can be tremendous.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD Mr. Broder's column from the Washington Post of Sunday, December 8:

THE REAL REFORMERS

(By David S. Broder)

KANSAS CITY.—While the Democrats were gathered here for their midterm mini-convention, a session devoted to ratifying the party's first formal constitution, the real work of strengthening the majority party for the rigors ahead was being done back in Washington.

Words on paper are one thing, and this charter conference was concerned with finding the right language to inscribe on the party's statute books. But words are cheap compared to deeds, and the deeds that were done in the Democratic Caucus in the House of Representatives count far more heavily in the reconstitution of the party than any new constitution could.

The essence of genuine political reform is the balancing of power, responsibility and accountability. That balance is only occasionally approached in the charter the Democrats have been debating here. Probably it was too much to hope that the drafters could invent a scheme subtle enough to accommodate the conflicting demands for participation and internal cohesion in a time of party decay.

It is only now, looking back over a decade's developments, that one can see how that problem of party responsibility has been addressed—and skillfully surmounted—in the complex but finite world of the House of Representatives.

In that span, control of the majority party in the House has effectively been taken away from a handful of elderly men, re-elected every two years from safe districts and really accountable to no one, and transferred to an elective leadership group responsible to all the representatives of the party.

Instead of control being exercised by a few dozen men, who divided all the committee and subcommittee chairmanships among themselves, power has now been dispersed—not equally but very broadly—among the entire membership.

There are many members and staff assistants on the Democratic side of the House who can claim a share of the credit for this historic transformation, but the greatest force has been the turnover in the membership of the House in recent years.

Reform in the House has been not so much the achievement of liberals—there were no more liberals elected to the House in 1974 than there were in 1964—as it has been the by-product of bringing in scores of freshmen in each of the recent election years.

These underclassmen are impatient with the old ways of doing business and are far more insistent on a share of the power—and responsibility—than were their elders.

It should not be forgotten that the first impetus for overhaul of the House came, not from the Democrats, but from some of the

renegade Republicans, including now-White House Chief of Staff Donald Rumsfeld, who rather obstreperously began demanding changes in the House structure in the mid-'60s.

It is ironic, then, that just when the Democrats are finally achieving the kind of structural reform that permits real accountability in the legislative process, some Republicans are raising a cry about "King Caucus" return to Capitol Hill.

It is a false alarm. While the Democrats have significantly strengthened the power of their caucus and its agencies to make committee assignments, to select (or depose) committee chairmen and to coordinate the legislative schedule, they have not even approached a situation where a serious conflict could arise between individual conscience or political prudence and the demands of caucus discipline.

Rep. Thomas Foley (D-Wash.) made the vital distinction that is overlooked by some critics of the Democratic rules changes. Foley said that the caucus has no right to direct him how to vote on the floor of the House, because as a legislator he is responsible only to his own conscience and to the constituents who elect him.

But, he noted, he owes his position on the Agriculture and Interior Committees, not only to his constituents, but to the caucus, which selects him to serve on those committees.

Thus, there is nothing improper about the caucus telling him, as a member of those committees, what bills it thinks should be reported to the floor of the House, so that all members can vote their individual consciences and judgments on them.

Actually, the need for such caucus instructions will be rare, now that Democrats have given themselves committee ratios commensurate to the majorities they won in the election, and have taken the power of committee assignment away from the Ways and Means Committee and placed it where it belongs—in the caucus' agent, the Steering and Policy Committee.

The reforms give the Democrats the power to pass the bills they consider proper. They also give them the responsibility. And they deny them any real excuse for not acting.

Power. Responsibility. Accountability. Those are three of the four elements needed for healthy politics. And in the House they now coexist. The fourth ingredient is leadership and if there is leadership forthcoming, the benefits for the country can be tremendous.

RIISING COST OF LIVING

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, no problem is of greater concern to my constituents than the rising cost of living. In talking with them and from the letters I have received, I am aware of the financial hardships facing families because of high food prices and the increased cost of gasoline and other basic goods and services which we need. Finding a way to halt inflation is my number one goal.

As many of you know, I was one of eight Members of Congress chosen to meet earlier this year with our Nation's top economists. I also was chosen as a delegate to the President's Summit Conference on Inflation. The congressional leadership selected me to address the summit on my reactions to the economists' proposals. I outlined at the sum-

mit some basic principles which I believe must be followed if we are to whip inflation.

First, there must be a reduction in Federal spending. No responsible individual or businessman would continue to spend money he does not have and pile up bigger and bigger debts. A majority in the Congress, however, has followed just such a policy during the last 15 years. This deficit spending has increased the supply of money with dollars we did not have. The result has been too many dollars chasing too few goods and prices have skyrocketed. The Government has been forced to borrow billions to finance its debts and thus has competed with the private citizen for the available credit. The result has been outrageous interest rates.

Second, it is necessary to exercise restraint in the supply of money and credit. Trying to halt inflation by a tight money policy alone has never worked. It only contributes to higher interest rates with disastrous effect on major areas of our economy, like housing. A moderate monetary policy coupled with a broad range of other policies can be effective and a disastrous credit crunch avoided.

Third, there must be a program to bring about price stability. I supported strongly the establishment of the Council on Wage and Price Stability. The Council can monitor changes in wages and prices and bring public pressure to bear on those in business and labor who abuse their economic power and fail to exercise responsible restraint. I believe serious consideration should be given to allowing the Council to temporarily suspend wage and price increases which are irresponsible and inflationary.

Fourth, we must develop an effective long-range energy program. This program must insure our Nation a sufficient supply of energy without relying heavily on foreign oil at high prices. Our present reliance on foreign oil has resulted in a massive foreign debt which has damaged our international monetary policy and threatens the value of the dollar. Any meaningful energy policy should include strong steps to insure conservation of energy such as Federal regulations to insure good gas mileage for new cars as well as possible tax incentives for properly insulated homes. A tax on excess oil profits should be included in any comprehensive energy package.

Fifth, we must direct our efforts toward improving productivity. We must concentrate on technological advances which will enable man to produce more goods with the same amount of effort. We must remove laws and regulations which restrict productivity and competition and cause high prices.

Sixth, stiff Government policies to deal with violations of our antitrust laws are needed. At a time when inflation is hurting all Americans, antitrust violations which curb competition and raise prices cannot be tolerated.

Finally, we must establish programs to deal more effectively with unemployment. The Congress must immediately consider more comprehensive unemployment benefits and public employment programs.

Shortly after the summit meeting,

President Ford proposed to the Congress a 31-point program to deal with inflation, which he asked the Congress to consider and act upon. His program contained many of the ideas I had suggested at the summit.

Since that time, unemployment has worsened and prices have continued to rise. The American public in the elections in November clearly signaled Congress that they wanted action on the economy.

So far, the Congress has ignored the public's demand for action. The lame duck session which the majority leadership called for the purpose of action on the economy has failed to seriously consider the President's proposals. The majority party which has control of every committee and committee chairmanship has the responsibility to take action on President Ford's proposals or to present concrete legislative proposals of their own.

The legislative calendar set up by the majority leadership has basically ignored proposals dealing with the economy. Critical pieces of legislation are being neglected. For example, the Small Savers Act, which would give a much-needed boost to our housing industry and a small tax exemption for interests and dividends from savings accounts, has been rescheduled and may not come up at all.

Recent news accounts indicate that ranking Democratic members on the Rules Committee may not allow to come to the floor the important tax bill which gives some tax relief to low-income families and phases out the oil depletion allowance.

The President has requested budget cuts of \$4.6 billion, but the majority leadership has indicated it will not support such proposals. Basically, every Presidential proposal dealing with the economy has been rejected or ignored. No alternative proposals have been offered.

There is still time to act. If we do not act now, however, the problems of reorganizing a new Congress will delay action at least 2 months.

Congress has the authority under our Constitution to initiate and enact an economic program. It does not have to accept the President's ideas if it has better ones. I have urged the majority leadership which controls the actions of Congress to act. Certainly, it is easier to criticize the President and to do nothing, but the economic condition of our Nation does not allow for that. Action is demanded and action now. I have indicated my willingness to cooperate with the White House and the majority leadership to enact legislative solutions to our economic problems. I will continue to devote whatever time is necessary to get a program through the Congress as soon as possible. If the majority leadership does not act, it must bear the responsibility of allowing our present economic condition to continue.

THE LITHUANIAN CRY

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, most of us here know well of the plight of Simas Kudirka, the Lithuanian seaman who was recently allowed to return to the United States, almost 4 years after he had attempted to defect to the U.S. Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant*.

A very timely article by Irene Leonavicius of the Lithuanian Students' Association, which comments on this event and goes on to discuss the general plight of Lithuanians, appeared recently in the *UCLA Daily Bruin*. I wish today, Mr. Speaker, to respectfully call to the attention of my colleagues in Congress this very thoughtful article, the complete text of which follows:

LET OUR COUNTRY GO

(By Irene Leonavicius)

On November 23rd, 1970, a Lithuanian seaman, Simas Kudirka, attempted to defect from a Soviet ship to the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Vigilant* while the two ships were moored alongside each other in the waters off of Massachusetts. The attempt failed when Coast Guard authorities ordered Kudirka returned to the Soviet ship. Kudirka was tried and sentenced to a 10 year term in a "labor camp." It appeared as though Kudirka was lost to the world.

However, the incident did not go unnoticed by the people of the United States. In New York, Cleveland, Washington, Chicago as well as in other cities, Americans of Lithuanian heritage marched in protest of the action in the case. In downtown L.A., college students from USC, Loyola, Cal State LA as well as UCLA organized a great march in support of Kudirka.

Through these mass demonstrations, as well as letter writing campaigns to the press and to Washington, many public officials began to take interest in this case. The actions of the protesters were not in vain, when last week, because of the work of the Congress and the State Department, Simas Kudirka and his family were returned to the United States.

Meanwhile, Sen. Henry Jackson (Wash.) steadfastly clung to his amendment which required the Russians to release 60,000 immigrants a year in return for favorite nation status, and U.S. grain.

These two events lead to two assumptions. First, the Russian government of the Soviet Union is very conscious of U.S. public opinion. Second, the Russians would do anything for our grain and technology.

The Lithuanian Students' Association believes that the U.S. should continue the diplomacy called "detente," if it is used for constructive purposes. Even today, the economic power of the U.S. is a much more effective tool than either diplomacy or the military. The U.S. should use this power whenever and wherever it can to help the oppressed people within the Soviet Union.

The Jackson Amendment is great for minorities within the Soviet Union, such as the Jewish population. However, it would be a disaster if it were applied to the nations within the Soviet Union such as Lithuania, Latvia or Estonia.

Latest statistics, as published in the *L.A. Times*, show that Latvians make up only 56% of the population in Latvia, and the Estonians are not much better off. The Lithuanians, with over 80%, have been the most successful in resisting massive efforts by the Russian government to "russify" the Lithuanian population. Nevertheless, Opera-

tion Russia is continuing in the Baltic States. Mass emigration would only harm the nationalistic struggle.

Lithuanian students have shown great opposition to the dreaded Russian regime. In 1971, a university student, Romas Kalanta, drenched himself with gasoline and burned himself in the main park of Kaunas. This incident was followed by massive riots which were put down by Russian storm troopers. Kalanta was buried in an unmarked grave, but people discovered the site and deluged it with flowers and wreaths. The Russians, wary of another popular uprising, moved the body.

The great nationalistic upsurge in Lithuanian students has also been seen by their interest in Lithuanian humanities courses in the universities, and their pride in Lithuanian folk culture and traditions. A student-clergy coalition has formed one of the most formidable underground movements in the Soviet Union.

These events show the desire of Lithuanians, young and old, for freedom from their Russian overlords, who drain the country economically and physically.

Thank you, Sen. Jackson, for your amendment. But, take note: The Lithuanians do not cry, "Let our people go!" We cry, "Let our country go!"

REPRESENTATIVE ELFORD CEDERBERG

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 3, 1974, an article appeared in the State Journal, Lansing, Mich., with a readership going beyond the Sixth Congressional District which I am privileged to serve, commenting on my good friend and distinguished colleague, Representative ELFORD CEDERBERG, of Midland, Mich. The article, written by Angela Green, touches on the increasing workload and responsibilities that will fall upon his shoulders in the 94th Congress, as he will be sharing the position of senior Republican in the House, in addition to his tremendous responsibilities as ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure his constituents are as proud of his hard earned record as are those of us who have the opportunity to work with him on a day to day basis, and I insert this article in the RECORD so my colleagues and others will have an opportunity to review his comments:

ELECTION GIVES REPRESENTATIVE CEDERBERG
COVETED SENIORITY
(By Angela Green)

WASHINGTON.—One bad thing about seniority is that by the time most congressmen have been around long enough to earn it, they're getting too old to enjoy it. But for Rep. Elford Cederberg, R-Mich., that's not the case.

In January, the 56-year-old Midland congressman will find himself sharing the position of senior Republican in the House—with Rep. John J. Rhodes, R-Ariz., and Rep. Bob Wilson, R-Calif.

Even speculating retirement at age 65, that means Cederberg, who has served 11 terms, could be around for four or five more terms unless defeated. His 10th district includes

counties from Antrim south to Clinton, from Mecosta east to Midland.

Retirement is not something Cederberg will speculate about.

"I don't have any plans. I just play it by ear and when I decide I've done all I can do here I'll retire, but right now I'm reasonably young and active," he said.

Cederberg, whose rise in seniority follows the retirement or defeat of several more senior members, said his new rank will mean "more responsibility, more weight and more work."

For instance, as ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, he already sits in on 13 subcommittees and any conferences on bills produced by the committee. He also is a member of the new Budget Committee and a regional whip for Michigan and Wisconsin.

"You don't get any time and a half for overtime but I like it because it puts you in the middle of things," he said. "There's no doubt about it that the longer you're here the more valuable you are to the state and the district," he added.

With the added responsibility comes prestigious moments such as being among congressional leaders invited to the White House Tuesday for a briefing on the President's Far East trip.

As a "senior statesman of the party," Cederberg is also going to be in the middle of mapping strategy for operating in a Democrat-dominated House.

"You become masters of the art of compromise," he said. "In the coming Congress we'll be out-voted two to one, which means pretty much that what the Democratic party wants to do it can."

"Republican views will not be closed out completely," he said. "We'll have a chance to express our views on the floor and in committee but I think the Republican view will get little consideration."

Even with the veto power in the hands of a Republican president, Cederberg feels that power should be used sparingly, partly because party ratios in the House will make it difficult to prevent an override and partly because compromise is a better tactic.

"I just don't think you can effectively operate in the legislative arena on the threat of vetoes," he said.

One thing Cederberg hopes the two parties can work together on is the President's economic program.

"The overall program is a good program but if you try to implement it piece by piece, it will be self-defeating and I don't think Congress is going to implement very much of it," he said.

However, Cederberg said he believes Democratic dominance will be shortlived and the Republican party will rebuild.

"It always does. More people consider themselves Democrats but more and more people are voting independently," he said.

THE COST OF DEFENDING AMERICA

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the current debate over budget priorities is more intense than at any time I can recall. It is certainly appropriate and commendable for Members of this body to take a hard look at where the American tax dollar is going—and where it can be saved or rechanneled in the interests of fighting inflation, and easing recession.

Because the Department of Defense

expenditures occupy a sizable share of total Federal expenditures, the defense budget has become an increasingly attractive focal point for budgetcutters seeking swift and politically popular ways to trim Federal expenses.

I think that a critical and independent look at our defense budget will reveal aspects of waste and mismanagement that can and must be eliminated. I have voted for some cuts in the defense budget in the past where I have felt that my vote would help eliminate waste and free funds for more useful purposes. But I would caution my colleagues against succumbing to the seductive myth that the defense budget is bloated, spiraling, and can easily withstand huge cuts. The facts are otherwise.

Defense programs in the fiscal year 1975 budget consume the smallest percentage of the GNP, and of the Federal budget than in any year since 1950.

While defense spending in the last decade has risen far less rapidly than any other major item in the Federal budget, the Defense Department has been as hard hit by inflation as any segment of the U.S. economy. It is estimated that in this year alone, the Defense Department has lost \$11 billion in purchasing power. In real terms, the Defense Department now has less buying power than in any year since 1950.

Over two-thirds of the defense dollar goes for the manpower-related costs of maintaining an all-volunteer army. Only 7 percent of increases in the defense budget over the past 20 years have gone for the combined total of weapons procurement, research and development, and military construction.

As the debate over the fiscal year 1976 defense budget gets underway in Congress, it is important that myth is not allowed to obscure the fact that our defense dollar is reasonably well employed in the interest of national security.

At a time when no U.S. troops are fighting anywhere in the world, and when we all have great hopes for the success of SALT, MBFR, and other negotiations with the Soviet Union, it can be difficult to generate enthusiasm for national security expenditures. Yet it is important to remember what détente has not achieved so far—and to plan ahead so we will never be forced to negotiate from a position of weakness.

The well respected Cincinnati Enquirer published a timely editorial entitled "The Cost of Defending the Nation." I commend it to the attention of my colleagues for the clear perspective it brings to the discussion of defense spending:

THE COST OF DEFENDING A NATION

Because America's role in foreign affairs—as well as our own survival—depends as much on our military strength as on our economic strength, the view many citizens have that defense expenditures should be cut as one way to fight inflation is cause for some concern.

Both a nationwide poll by George Gallup and a statewide survey by the Ohio Poll, found evidence many citizens feel the nation is spending "too much" on national defense. Dr. Gallup reported 44% of those he interviewed felt the nation was overspending on defense, while the Ohio Poll reported more than half the Ohioans it interviewed—

52%—"favor reduced military spending as a means of balancing the federal budget and thus helping to control inflation."

These attitudes are cause for concern because they will be translated into votes this Election Day for candidates who will have a critical impact on defense expenditures for years to come.

At a time when the United States is not engaged in a highly visible military confrontation, defense expenditures can easily be singled out as one area where a small cut—expressed in terms of even a few percentage points—can yield a large dollar savings.

To an extent, the Defense Department is often its own worst enemy. It is top-heavy with high-ranking commissioned officers who not only have a vested interest in preserving large numbers of openings in the officer corps but whose higher salaries and benefits reduce the number of enlisted troops who could be part of a lean, trim fighting force for the same money.

And defense interests have been less than efficient in determining the cost of their weapons systems and irresponsible in the amount of money spent for luxurious facilities for the officer corps.

But if the United States is not to become the second-rate military power Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger warned against, then the nation has to respond with an adequate defense budget.

Secretary Schlesinger believes a "wasting disease" is attacking both Pentagon spending and manpower levels. His concern is not only that the nation will become a second-class military force, but that it will do so unconsciously by "allowing the erosion of purchasing power for the Department of Defense to drive us into that . . . status."

According to Defense Department figures, here is what is happening:

The Pentagon has lost \$11 billion in purchasing power this year, "due mostly to inflation on top of a \$2.6-billion congressional cut," the Washington Post has reported.

The cost of weapons has been rising at the rate of about 15%, 10 percentage points higher than the projected 5% inflation rate.

Because of inflation, the Pentagon says it is \$9 billion "short of funds to carry out procurement programs already approved by Congress," according to the New York Times.

Despite a rise in the Defense Department budget over the years, when funding is expressed in terms of "constant dollars"—that is, dollars "discounted for inflation"—military expenditures have been declining to the point that they are 18% below what was being spent 10 years ago, the Times reported.

For a nation that must be strong militarily as well as economically, what are the consequences of these economic and budgetary factors?

Defense spending by the United States has fallen to about 6% of the gross national product (GNP), the sum total of all goods and services produced in the country, from a high of 9.4% of the GNP in 1968, a year in which the nation spent heavily for the war in Vietnam.

The Soviet Union is outspending the United States in defense. The Central Intelligence Agency says the Russians spent the equivalent of about \$80 billion in 1973, while this country spent only \$76 billion for defense that year.

The Soviet Union has 1.7 million more men in its military service than does the United States, 3.8 million men for the Russians, 2.1 million for the United States.

This nation's defense policy calls for "essential equivalence as a continuing requirement for our strategic nuclear forces," Secretary Schlesinger says. But, he adds, "it is equally vital to establish a balance of conventional forces between" member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Pact. More than that, the American defensive posture requires that the

nation "keep our defense perimeters in the Western Pacific sufficiently strong to hold until reinforced and to guard those sea lanes essential to the well-being of the United States and its allies."

For the United States to mount the kind of defensive posture a bipartisan foreign policy has ordained, each voter must understand the nature of its cost in light of the damage inflation and successive budget cuts have done to the defense dollar.

If the Defense Department has to go back to Congress for a supplemental appropriation before the end of the fiscal year, it will need the support of an understanding legislature.

But the Pentagon must do its own budget-cutting, as well. A flexible military force, freed from the costly burden of a turgid officer corps and an ever-expanding civilian bureaucracy, relying on proven weapons systems that can perform well in either brush-fire wars or as major deterrents to nuclear war, is the first step in compensating for the damage inflation has done to national defense.

Yet if the Pentagon is to be believable when it asks Congress for funding, it has to be in a position to show that it is trying to cut the fat from its own operations. On that, it is having some difficulty.

Gen. George S. Brown, new chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says 60% of the defense budget is consumed by payroll costs for civilian and military personnel. At least some of these costs, the general believes, are consumed by "needless layering" of personnel in various headquarters staffs. But Secretary Schlesinger is still waiting for a report he ordered a year ago on the size of those staffs. Because there is no "unanimity of opinion" on how to reorganize command staffs, the general said, that report and recommendations to the President may not come until the spring.

Only a military establishment dedicated to reducing expenditures for needless personnel can make an effective plea for additional funds for weapons systems and the research and development so critical to remaining a military power second to none.

PELHAM, GALLANT PELHAM

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, our history books abound with heroes from the War Between the States but for the most part these men are usually the generals such as Lee, Grant, and Jackson who commanded whole armies. Heroics, however, was not limited to just these men. No, in fact, there were many younger soldiers who rose above the average military enlistee to earn respect for his military savvy and his gallant actions.

John Pelham, of Jacksonville, Ala., was one of these younger soldiers but he was in a class all to himself. At the age of 20 he resigned his commission to the U.S. Military Academy to join the southern forces. In just 3 short years he rose to the rank of major and had gained the respect of his men and his superiors.

Upon his death in March 1863, at Kelly's Ford, Va., the whole of the South mourned his loss. Known for his integrity and valor, eulogies expounded on Pelham's dedication and allegiance to the southern cause. Robert E. Lee praised

him as the "gallant Pelham" and J. E. B. Stuart, Pelham's own commander, extended to him the highest of tributes for his battlefield merit.

I am submitting for the RECORD of this body an article which recently appeared concerning this great Alabama war hero. I do hope that each of my colleagues takes the opportunity to read the article for I feel it is a fine example of the heights even a young man can attain:

PELHAM, GALLANT PELHAM

During the war of Blue against Gray the hell of battle produced one of history's greatest artillerymen—Major John Pelham, Lee's gallant redleg.

In 1861 at age 20, Pelham resigned as a first classman from the U.S. Military Academy when his native Alabama seceded from the Union.

Entering the Confederate Army as a lieutenant he organized and commanded Major General J.E.B. Stuart's Horse Artillery. Promoted to captain in the same year, Pelham fought at First Manassas, in the Peninsular Campaign, at Second Manassas, Antietam and Fredericksburg. He also took his Horse Artillery on Stuart's Raids around the Union Army of the Potomac.

A brave but modest officer, the quiet, tall, blond blushed a deep red when praised—and as it turned out this was often. In an Army possessing scores of brave men, no less than General Robert E. Lee himself praised him as "the gallant Pelham." When Pelham was killed at Kelly's Ford, Va., in March 1863 the entire South mourned his death.

His entire combat service was characterized by exceptional valor. The Battle of Gaines' Mill in June 1862 represents a case in point. After his 12-pounder Blakely cannon was disabled with the first Union Army counterbattery fire Pelham faced eight Federal pieces with only a captured smooth-bore Napoleon in one of the war's most gallant and heroic actions. The gun had been captured earlier at Seven Pines.

Pelham coolly directed the resistance against the Union barrage. The Federals' fire slackened under the determined shooting of the imperiled Napoleon which tenaciously held its ground until Pelham was reinforced by then Major General Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson with several batteries of rifled pieces.

When he filed his official report of Gaines' Mill Stuart paid Pelham one of the highest tributes accorded an officer in the Civil War: "Captain John Pelham, of the Horse Artillery, displayed such signal ability as an artilleryman, such heroic example, and devotion in danger, and indomitable energy under difficulties in the movement of his battery, that, reluctant as I am at the chance of losing such a valuable limb from the brigade, I feel bound to ask for his promotion, with the remark that in either cavalry or artillery no field grade is too high for his merit and capacity."

Pelham's promotion to major came less than 2 months later in time for Antietam at age 21.

At the Battle of Fredericksburg in December 1862 Pelham dashed to and fro on horseback shifting his fires and personally bringing fresh firing batteries into action. He steadied his men with his coolness and cheerful voice. Lieutenant General James Longstreet called him "... the bravest human being I ever saw in my life."

BOLD IN BATTLE

Even with some of his guns and caissons shattered and his men dismembered by enemy shells Pelham persisted. Blood, death and decimation could not keep him from his mission as he led his Horse Artillery with a calm, determined boldness.

Using the same Napoleon cannon he had

captured at Seven Pines he initiated the battle on the right flank, drawing close-range, frontal fire from four Union batteries and a damaging enfilading fire from a 30-pound rifled Parrott battery positioned across the Rappahannock River. Pelham never flinched as his bronze smoothbore defiantly belched cannonballs and grapeshot at the Federal forces, mauling the enemy.

Observing the activity from a hill above, General Lee admiringly exclaimed, "It is glorious to see such courage in one so young."

Not until his ammunition was expended did Pelham cease firing. Ordered to retire, he moved to a new and more important position. Pelham immediately assumed command of all artillery on the right wing of the Army of Northern Virginia (Jackson's Corps) and fought his batteries with skill and courage.

Advancing his weapons steadily he severely punished the Union left flank. His counter-fire assault silenced the Union artillery. Pelham's exploits that day only underscored all of his accomplishments from First Manassas forward.

The immediate result of his fire was the repulse of the advance of Union Major General George G. Meade's division, whose lines Pelham enfiladed until Major General Abner Doubleday's division arrived for the sole purpose of protecting Meade's left flank from Pelham's destructive fire.

Following the battle, Jackson, who like Lee had personally witnessed Pelham's thundering guns, remarked to Stuart: "Have you

another Pelham, General? If so, I wish you would give him to me!"

MATCHED PAIR

Two spirits more kindred than Stuart and Pelham probably never served together on the field of battle. Stuart had an affinity for the use of artillery which was almost excessive while Pelham's abilities in its employment of the guns ranked as sheer genius. The pair delivered an independency of action and a degree of mobility to horse artillery which stylized it to the war's end. Others later imitated Pelham's innovative tactics but few could match his flair and courage.

After Fredericksburg students of war began to accord Pelham stature as a ranking military genius, crediting him with the development of new artillery tactics. He pioneered the daring techniques of sprinting his guns ahead of the infantry, leading pursuit as though his horse artillery were cavalry and dashing ahead quickly with many halts located on good firing terrain in order to delay pursuit.

In a relatively minor skirmish March 17, 1863 at Kelly's Ford on the Rappahannock about 15 miles northwest of Chancellorsville, the 22-year-old Pelham was killed by a Union artillery shell. He had galloped, saber at the high, to the head of the Third Virginia Cavalry and was hit, battle shout on his lips, encouraging his comrades.

It was typical of Pelham's *elan* in battle that he died while separated from his beloved guns, which had not yet caught up with

the young commandner. He was posthumously promoted to lieutenant colonel.

HIGH TRIBUTE

Nearly a year after Pelham's death the flamboyant Stuart penned another accolade alluding to the brilliant artilleryman. Writing of the conduct of Confederate cavalry following Antietam (September 1862) up to Pelham's death, Stuart wrote:

"In all these operations I deem it my duty to bear testimony to the gallant and patient endurance of the cavalry, fighting every day most unequal conflicts, and successfully opposing for an extraordinary period the onward march of McClellan."

"The Stuart Horse Artillery comes in for a full share of this praise, and its gallant commander, Major John Pelham, exhibited a skill and courage which I have never seen surpassed. On this occasion I was more than ever struck with that extraordinary coolness and mastery of the situation which more eminently characterized this youthful officer than any other artillerist who has attracted my attention. His *coup d'oeil* was accurate and comprehensive, his choice of ground made with the eye of military genius, and his dispositions always such in retiring as to render it impossible for the enemy to press us without being severely punished for his temerity."

Pelham, gallant Pelham, an Artilleryman extraordinaire. Whether in the Civil War, World War II, or Vietnam . . . brave Americans would follow in his footsteps.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 10, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Herbert C. McCoy, First Christian Church, Dickson, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for this opportunity to be here today serving this Nation. We thank Thee for Your infinite love and Your mercy. Our prayer be with this Congress that is here and that Your divine guidance and wisdom will be given to each and every one.

In Jesus' precious name 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 had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6925. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands between the pueblo of Acoma and the Forest Service;

H.R. 8824. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Mrs. Harriet La Pointe Vander-venter; and

H.R. 17026. An act relating to former Speakers of the House of Representatives.

The message also 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. 3164)

entitled "An act to provide for greater disclosure of the nature and costs of real estate settlement services, to eliminate the payment of kickbacks and unearned fees in connection with settlement services provided in federally related mortgage transactions, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate receded from its amendment to a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6274. An act to grant relief to payees and special indorsees of fraudulently negotiated checks drawn on designated depositaries of the United States by extending the availability of the check forgery insurance fund, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House with an amendment to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 782. An act to reform consent decree procedures, to increase penalties for violation of the Sherman Act, and to revise the expediting Act as it pertains to appellate review.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 5463) entitled "An act to establish rules of evidence for certain courts and proceedings," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HART, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUGH SCOTT, and Mr. THURMOND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4141. An act authorizing the erection of a statue to commemorate the founding of

Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C., by President Thomas Jefferson; and

S.J. Res. 262. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of an addition to a building on privately owned property adjacent to the Capitol Grounds.

REV. HERBERT C. MCCOY

(Mr. BEARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome Rev. Herbert C. McCoy, from Dickson, Tenn., who is a constituent of my district. I want to thank him for delivering the prayer to the House of Representatives, and say to him we certainly appreciate him. I appreciate him for the wonderful work he has done in Dickson, Tenn., with the young people there and so many who are in need.

He has been an outstanding leader in our community, and I feel very honored to be his Congressman.

IN MEMORY OF JAKE, SUSIE, AND BENJY APPLEWHITE

(Mr. YOUNG of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last, a staff member of mine and a staff member of Congresswoman JORDAN of Texas, together with their 4-year-old boy, lost their lives in the tragic airplane accident. Jake Applewhite, Susie, and Benjy were three people who,