Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Togo.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Henry C. Wallich, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1974.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Irving M. Pollack, of Maryland, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1975.

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

Jerome W. Van Gorkom, of Illinois, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 1975.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Leonard Sullivan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

James R. Cowan, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of Section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Herron Nichols Maples, [redacted] U.S. Army.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Daniel Orrin Graham, 540-26-2591, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be brigadier general

Col. Thaddeus F. Malanowski, [redacted] U.S. Army.

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a) and 3384:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Willie Earl Dixon, Jr., SSN [redacted]

Brig. Gen. Bejamin Lacy Hunton, [redacted]

Brig. Gen. George William McGrath, Jr., SSN [redacted]

Brig. Gen. Frederick Arthur Welsh, [redacted]

To be brigadier general

Col. Charles Elmer Blaker, [redacted], Transportation Corps.

Col. Julius Hoesterey Braun, [redacted], Ordnance Corps.

Col. Edwin Francis Dosek, SSN [redacted] Infantry.

Col. Robert Lewis Frantz, [redacted], Infantry.

Col. John David Jones, [redacted] Artillery.

Col. John Q. T. King, [redacted], Medical Service Corps.

Col. Paul Shepard Oliver, Jr., SSN [redacted] Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a) and 3385:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. William Stanley Lundberg, Jr., SSN [redacted].

Brig. Gen. James Lee Moreland, SSN [redacted]

Brig. Gen. D. A. Thompson, [redacted]

To be brigadier general

Col. John Glover Castles, [redacted], Field Artillery.

Col. Allen Anderson David, [redacted], Infantry.

Col. William Herbert Duncan, [redacted], Signal Corps.

Col. William Emmett Ingram, [redacted], Infantry.

Col. Carl Frederick Mauger, [redacted] Infantry.

Col. Ben Lane Upchurch, [redacted], Infantry.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Air Force nominations beginning Benjamin E. Box, to be colonel, and ending Gordon L. Wright, to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 22, 1974.

Air Force nominations beginning Peter V. Abene, to be first lieutenant, and ending David A. Skeel, to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 22, 1974.

Air Force nominations beginning Maj. Vernon L. Beadles, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Maj. Henry T. Capiz, to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 28, 1974.

IN THE ARMY

Army nominations beginning Eugene M. Guglielmo, Jr., to be major, and ending Felipe Frocht, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 29, 1974.

IN THE NAVY

Navy nominations beginning Gary Lee Almy, to be commander, and ending Lt. Kathleen A. Hammel, to be lieutenant commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 22, 1974.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps nominations beginning Robert J. Post, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Robert D. Work, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 22, 1974.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Steven F. Burke, to be second lieutenant, and ending Saul Zavala, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 22, 1974.

The nomination of Richard J. Randolph, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, for reappointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, which nomination was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 28, 1974.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE TROUBLE WITH DÉTENTE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, Crosby S. Noyes has an excellent piece in the Washington Star-News of February 7, 1974, captioned "The Trouble With Détente."

I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE TROUBLE WITH DÉTENTE

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

The Soviet leadership is quite right in believing that its policy of detente with the United States and the West is in trouble. It is quite wrong in attributing the trouble to the work of Zionists, American right-wingers and Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash.

Their problem has nothing to do with conservative elements in American politics, who had no great illusions about detente to start with. It has a good deal more to do with the growing disillusion of American liberals, who have welcomed the rhetoric of detente as the dawn of a new international era of reason, cooperation and good-fellowship.

More and more, this group has come to recognize detente as a one-way proposition, all heading in the direction of Moscow. What the Soviet leaders hope to get are very practical advantages in trade and technology, of which last year's disastrous wheat steal was only a promising beginning.

What they propose to give in return is, in effect, little more than a comfortable feeling of complacency in the West. Relaxation of tension inevitably implies relaxation of effort, including such disagreeable things as defense spending and trying to get along with crotchety allies. For these propositions the Russians have found plenty of takers in the liberal communities of Western Europe and the United States.

One of the problems is the habit the Soviet leaders have developed of explaining—mostly for their domestic audiences—what detente is not. Two years ago, Leonid Brezhnev went out of his way to assure his people that detente "in no way implies the possibility of relaxing the ideological struggle. On the contrary, we must be prepared for this struggle to be intensified and become an ever sharper form of the confrontation between the two systems."

The Eastern Europeans, since the advent of detente, can attest that these are not idle words. So can a large number of Soviet Jews and a small number of Soviet intellectuals. What has happened to such people as Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and Andrei Sahkarov probably has done more to awaken American intellectual liberals to the limitations of detente than anything else.

There are, however, other more objective problems that have arisen that cast dark shadows over the proclaimed era of cooperation and negotiation. The unfortunate fact is that all of the major negotiations between the Soviet Union and the West are on dead center and appear headed toward probable failure.

These include the second round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), the Soviet-sponsored conference on European security and the negotiation on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR)—all of which have been going on for many months. None of them is close to approaching a conclusion and all of them, in one way or another, have added to Western disillusion with detente.

The SALT negotiations have led gradually to the realization that the objective of the Soviet Union was a clear strategic military superiority over the United States in every category of nuclear weaponry. The effort to achieve some kind of rough parity goes on, but the American effort from the beginning has been to try to limit the momentum of the Russian buildup, rather than to achieve a real reduction in the size of nuclear arsenals.

The prospects for the talks have not been improved by what seems to be a far-reaching revision of American nuclear strategy. The emphasis now is on a counter-force nuclear system—one aimed at Soviet missile sites, rather than cities—and a de-emphasis of the importance of land-based missiles as opposed to missile-carrying submarines. Both concepts are sound enough, but they raise new problems for the weary negotiators in Vienna.

The other two negotiations are no more promising. In both, the Soviet objectives have been obvious from the outset: To consolidate the Russian hold on Eastern Europe and bring about a retreat of American military power from Western Europe. Today, the Russians have good reason to believe that they can achieve these goals without the need for any concessions on their part. The hope of the Western powers for a liberalization of the regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and an easier exchange of people and ideas is, if anything, further from realization than ever.

It is not entirely surprising, therefore, that detente is in trouble. The West, plagued by energy shortages and a crisis of leadership, is in a poor positon to hold its own in increasing exchanges with the Communist world. No one, of course, is calling for a return to the tensions and anxieties of the Cold War. But the outlook for a fruitful collaboration between East and West seems at this point distinctly limited.

BENEFITS FOR VIETNAM VETERANS SHOULD BE INCREASED

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, American veterans have performed invaluable services to the United States of America. It is unfortunate that the veterans of the Vietnam conflict have not received the acclaim and benefits afforded the veterans in the past. It is only right that they receive benefits commensurate with their services. We must let these men know that their services do not go unnoticed or unrewarded.

One day of each year has been set aside for the national observance of our veterans' contributions to the United States of America. Veterans Day, celebrated either on the first Monday in October or on November 11, is that day of recognition. No matter what day is chosen to honor these men we can show our genuine appreciation through better programs, more jobs, increased educational benefits, and adequate health care.

In a recent statement to the Congress President Nixon submitted several legislative proposals providing for increased services to our Nation's veterans. It is a step in the right direction. Improved health care, increased benefits for service-connected disabilities, more educational benefits, and a cost-of-living clause in VA pension payments are several proposals that deserve the prompt attention of the Congress.

While the President's legislative proposals are to be lauded, I feel they do not go far enough. Since September of 1972, the date of the last veterans' rate increase, the cost of living has risen slightly in excess of 8 percent. In addition the costs of continuing education have also risen approximately 8 percent. The proposed Presidential measures to increase educational benefits by 8 percent fail to reflect increases in educational expense as well as the cost-of-living increases. The same cost-of-living increases proposed for pension benefits should be made applicable to the educational allowance. A single veteran participating in an educational program receives $220 for living expenses, books, and tuition. Considering the quantum leaps in educational and living expenses, larger benefit increases are in order.

Another problem facing the veteran centers on the relation between veteran payments and social security benefits. Any increases in social security benefits are offset by a decrease in veteran payments. The net effect is, of course, no increase in income. While other citizens enjoy social security income increases, the veteran is penalized and does not receive the benefit of the legislated increases. This practice is an obvious injustice to those veterans receiving social security. This offset procedure should be discontinued.

Congress has afforded our veterans expanded and improved health care facilities, an improved National Cemeteries Act, and a higher rate of employment. We are moving in the right direction, but there is more to be done. Let us work together to insure that our veterans receive the benefits they so justly deserve for their contributions to this Nation.

THE ENERGY CRISIS AND THE POOR

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis has been splashed across the headlines of our news media in recent weeks, inviting national concern and foreshadowing serious ramifications to our economy and our way of life.

While these headlines have stirred emotional levels to a fevered pitch, all too often ignored is the impact of energy shortages on the poor and the minorities. Unless remedial measures are taken, blacks and other low-income groups will suffer most when prices rise and jobs are lost.

While the actual dimensions of the current shortage are being hotly debated, the most immediate problem seems to be a dramatic skyrocketing of gasoline prices. When the cost of gas rises over 50 percent in less than a year, the first ones hurt will be those who drive the most and who can afford it least. Traditionally, jobs have been located outside the poor and black communities. Now, even if a poor person is fortunate enough to have a job in one of these outlying areas, he may well be put in the position of not being able to afford to drive to work. The sad irony is that rapidly mounting fuel costs may in some cases become an added disincentive for the poor to work.

We in the Congress have a special responsibility to enact legislation and to bring pressure to bear in ways that will contribute to holding down gasoline prices. At the same time, we must move quickly to develop and expand mass transportation systems in our communities. Too, industry must be given incentives to relocate in the inner city, to provide jobs for the residents of the inner city and to ease pressures on our overburdened energy resources. In sum, the poor must have access to work, if they are to work at all.

One of the most troubling aspects of the energy crisis is its as yet undetermined effect on the economy itself. Most economists have predicted a significant slowing down of the economy, while some have even predicted a recession. The real point is that unless effective countermeasures are taken, there could be a significant rise in unemployment. Unemployment in south-central Los Angeles is already two to three times higher than the national average. And the Los Angeles Urban League reports that the level of joblessness in this area might well rise to 40 percent if nothing is done to moderate the impact of the crisis.

In times of economic uncertainty, we must have adequate training and public employment programs. The recently enacted Manpower Training Act insures the continuation of public service employment programs in those areas that exceed 6.5 percent unemployment. These programs must be expanded so that no one area or no one minority group will suffer excessively as a result of the energy crisis.

The Federal Government must also take measures to reinvigorate the economy. This means an end to excessively high interest rates, so that money will be available for housing and new investment. This means an end to the impoundment of congressional appropriated funds, so that social programs can be fully funded and developed. It also means new money for new programs, as needs arise.

The energy crisis may also have an unspecified impact on various social problems, such as crime and mental illness. Again, we must be careful that conservation measures will not have particularly adverse effects on any one group. Special consideration must be taken in dealing with high-crime areas, so that the conservation of protective street lighting will not leave residents defenseless. And counseling services must be expanded in those areas where personal hardships and tensions will be aggravated by the crisis.

As a step in the right direction, I am pleased to note the recent creation of the Special Impact Office under the Federal Energy Office which will review and act upon the concerns of low-income consumers affected by the energy crisis. This office will provide a research and policy base for the FEO to determine whether Federal regulations and programs work undue hardships on these groups.

Just as we must insure that no one person or group suffers inordinately as a result of the energy crisis, so must we be certain that no one person or group profits at the expense and sacrifice of the rest.

The oil companies must not be allowed to reap windfall profits while the rest of the country suffers. Recent statistics show clearly that the third quarter profits of the 15 major oil companies increased an average of 62 percent over 1972—or a profit of nearly $5,000,000,000 for the first 9 months of last year. It is expected that without some kind of regulation these will increase even more dramatically this year. Congress has an obligation this year to pass some kind of excess profits tax to insure that these added moneys will be used to spur new developments of mass transit systems and new sources of energy. At the very least, we must put an end to the oil depletion allowance and other forms of preferential tax treatment for the oil companies.

Too, I believe it is necessary for the oil companies to roll back uwarranted increases in crude oil prices allowed by the Cost of Living Council which only serve to further increase the oil companies' record profits and to raise even higher the cost of gasoline at the pumps. I strongly support efforts in the Congress to force such a rollback.

Recently, I proposed an eight-point program which would deal with both the short- and long-range problems caused by the energy crisis. I have urged the following:

One. Acceleration of a national energy policy to coordinate all elements of energy production, development and research, including solar energy, geothermal, nuclear, coal gasification, and oil shale extraction so that the United States may become self-sufficient in its energy supply;

Two. Creation of a single Federal agency with sufficient manpower and resources to develop and implement a national energy policy;

Three. A national program for the prudent utilization and conservation of our Nation's scarce energy resources;

Four. A study of national growth projection over the next two or three decades to develop the proper relationship between increasing energy use and general economic development while, at the same time, preserving our environment;

Five. A requirement that the oil industry supply raw data as to their actual and potential reserves and their imports and exports to Congress, and verification of this information by an independent Federal agency;

Six. Initiation of a national transportation policy that will provide our citizens with an alternative to the automobile; acceleration of the construction of intracity and intercity mass transportation, where feasible;

Seven. Funding of employment programs to assist the increasing numbers of those who have or will lose their jobs as a result of the energy shortage and job layoffs;

Eight. Reconsideration of the status of antitrust laws as applied to large oil companies and their possible treatment as public utilities, similarly to the way telephone, electric, water, and gas companies are created.

MRS. B. V. BROOKS

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, Connecticut has recently lost a great and gracious lady, Mrs. B. V. Brooks of Westport. While I only had the opportunity of knowing her in recent years, I was proud to consider her a friend and her passing is a personal loss to me. For more than 30 years, Mrs. Brooks gave of herself to the community and to the people of Connecticut, but rather than list her many accomplishments and ways in which she served, I would like to offer for the RECORD the following editorial tribute from the Westport News, a publication Mrs. Brooks helped guide to its present stature:

MRS. B. V. BROOKS

She was a lady of unquenchable spirit, with a strong sense of right and wrong, a loyal and stalwart friend to those she loved and trusted.

These were the outstanding characteristics of Florence Goodwin Brooks—"Mrs. B." as she was known to her friends—whose sudden death this week shocked the community to which she has contributed so much through the years. Her activities to advance worthwhile civic undertakings were myriad—the Norwalk Hospital, the Nature Center (formerly the Mid-Fairfield Youth Museum), the Westport Playhouse, the Policemen's Benevolent Association were among the many she assisted, quietly and capably.

We at the Westport News through the years had come to know her as a woman with deep concern for her fellowman and a tendency to "mother" us all, worrying whether we ate properly when busy; questioning to learn if we needed something or the other for our homes; dropping in frequently to chat with staff members about the day's trivia. She always loved to talk with children of staffers, who might be on hand.

She'd smile and her eyes would sparkle when she'd be able to tell a reporter, "Aha! I scooped you!" when she'd learn the news ahead of the staff.

But most of all she impressed us with her loyalty to her friends—loyalty that never wavered when the chips were down and when there was need to speak up for what she believed in, for those she had faith in. As the Earl of Lytton (1831-1891) wrote:

"Ay, there are some good things in life, that
fall not away with the rest.
And, of all best things upon earth, I hold
that a faithful friend is the best."

This is how we knew "Mrs. B" to the untimely end of her useful life.

She will be missed.

THE WASHINGTON HEIGHTS-INWOOD JEWISH COMMUNITY—HOW CAN WE STRENGTHEN AND PRESERVE IT?

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on December 16, 1973, issues of great concern to many residents of the 20th Congressional District were discussed at a leadership conference of the Jewish Community Council of Washington Heights-Inwood, which I was pleased to address.

I was impressed by the serious discussions and action reports given at this conference, the first of its kind. Following is the formal report summarizing the work of the conference:

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS AT LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE—JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF WASHINGTON HEIGHTS-INWOOD

THE WASHINGTON HEIGHTS-INWOOD JEWISH COMMUNITY—HOW CAN WE STRENGTHEN AND PRESERVE IT?

Approximately 150 delegates representing 25 of the participating 40 Jewish organizations in the neighborhood as well as elected government officials attended the first leadership conference of the Council.

In four stimulating sessions, the delegates heard experts and community leaders discuss community problems and plans for communal action. The Council will be entrusted with implementing the programs outlined in accordance with the objectives stated.

The following is a summary of the sessions:

I.—Safety for our community

Stanley Gruss served as chairman. Dr. Eric Erlbach, the speaker, stated that fear of crime is a major cause for families leaving the neighborhood.

He discussed the efforts currently being made to alleviate this problem. For example; The Tenants Patrol—which has been instrumental in discouraging criminals from committing burglaries and violent crimes in apartment houses. Dr. Erlbach stressed, however that these patrols should function during daytime as well as evenings as these crimes occur at all times.

The Street Patrol or WHISP is another promising program. This consists of civilian teams which cruise the neighborhood, after dark in private cars equipped with two-way radio. In this way suspicious individuals and incidents are reported directly to the precinct making immediate police reaction possible. Upon request these teams provide escort service to and from meetings, classes etc.

Block Security and Police Auxiliary function similarly. These projects are aimed at reestablishing confidence in the community's ability to protect its individuals, homes and institutions. But even with these hopeful beginnings, it is self evident that greater safety for everyone will be secured only when all organizations and congregations participate in these efforts. They must be willing to supply their quota of volunteers required to expand these services to all areas of the community.

Capt. Robert Ford of the 34th Precinct referred to a recent Community crime study which indicated that street muggings and car thefts are declining, but that burglaries, violent crimes and rapes are still increasing. Drug traffic has decreased remarkably here, but it appears to be resurfacing instead in New Jersey.

The Capt. reported that the 34th Precinct has been expanded by a detective squad and will be further strengthened in the Spring by the incoming graduates of the Police Academy. Although they are not conspicuous, plain clothesmen make 40% of all arrests and are vital agents in deterring criminals in the neighborhood.

The Police Dept. believes that the Civilian Crime Prevention programs such as WHISP, Tenant Patrol, Block Security and Police Auxiliary are valuable and effective in reducing crime. Capt. Ford pledged complete cooperation with Community Council in coordinating and expanding them.

II.—Organizing our community and relating to others

The Chairman, Sam Hartstein, challenged the audience by stating, "We have an investment in this area and we would like to stay. With a positive attitude and a constructive program it will be possible to preserve this community."

Rabbi Jack Simcha Cohen, the first speaker, noted that until some time ago it was accepted that there is little poverty among the Jews. In the last few years, however, figures have proven that 272,000 Jews in the New York City area are at poverty and near poverty levels. As Jewish underprivileged generally dislike to accept public assistance, their poverty is unrecorded.

This problem and that of the aged, safety, housing, etc. are the concern of the local community. He presented the thesis that: If the Jewish Community of Washington Heights and Inwood, with its diverse ideologies and philosophies, is to survive and maintain tolerable living and safety conditions, it must unite its efforts and form a Council. Only as a unit, representing the broad spectrum of the Jewish populace, can it effectively articulate its needs.

This Council must pinpoint the problems and communicate with government and other community organizations. It must demand the available programs and services necessary to support and preserve the community and its institutions.

Michael Bergman discussed the necessity for organizing unaffiliated Jewish youth. He stressed that many of our students, in search for identity and purpose, easily succumb to the pressures of foreign ideologies, other religions and drugs. They leave behind their own rich heritage with which they are unfamiliar. To counteract this frightening development, "involved" Jewish college students have launched a program to reach out to their drifting peers, to give them moral and spiritual strength by acquainting them with Jewish values and Jewish living.

These National Jewish youth groups with trained leadership and techniques have declared themselves ready to sponsor workshops, seminars, and social club type programs to help the unaffiliated Jewish youth in our area. They hope to receive the necessary cooperation and financial support from community organizations to implement these programs effectively.

III.—Tuning in on our elderly

Daniel Stein the Chairman, pointed out that the proportion of those 65 and over among the Jewish population in Washington Heights and Inwood has risen from 16% in 1960 to 30% in 1973. He urged the community to address itself to the needs of our elderly.

Harriette Friedlander, the first speaker, stated that congregations and organizations generally relate to their active members. They must however, assume responsibility for serving the elderly as they drift out of the mainstream of Community life. It is vital to be sensitive to their existence even though it is difficult to keep track of them and reach them. Synagogues and organizations, neighbors, superintendents and even butchers can be instrumental in finding them.

The aged, faced with heavy personal losses and failing health, have compelling needs—religious, economic, physical and emotional.—They must be handled with great sensitivity and consideration for their individual inclinations and self responses.

Dorrit Rosenstein outlined the program of activities for mobile elderly at the YMHA. She indicated that the lunch programs available at various community centers not only provide a balanced nutritious meal, but companionship as well.

The existing "Meals on Wheels" program is extremely valuable for the homebound. But it is limited and should be expanded.

Synagogues and organizations can do a tremendous service in this field. They must appoint committees attuned to the needs of their Senior Citizens to plan programs for them. For example, a "24 hour Telephone Assurance Service" can alleviate the terror of feeling deserted and lonely.

There is also a strong resistance to public welfare among Jewish elderly. They must be informed of the new government program (S.S.I.) providing necessary assistance in form of an extension of their present Social Security payment.

Gary Quinn stressed that in serving the elderly, it is of primary importance to preserve their integrity and self worth. Careful consideration must be given also to their social, intellectual and religious background.

Sensitive students and youth groups, oriented to empathize with the aging, can be most helpful in 1) Reaching out and determining their needs. 2) Escorting them on errands and for appointments. 3) Reading and listening to them as well as studying with those no longer able to attend study groups and services in synagogues. 4) Purchasing incidentals for them. 5) Doing chores difficult for them such as changing bulbs etc.

It was noted that there are a number of Elderly Soviet immigrants moving into this neighborhood. A delegate offered her services to teach English and solicited similar responses from other delegates. This activity will be coordinated by the Council.

IV.—The luncheon session

The luncheon session was chaired by Rabbi Ralph Neuhaus. He declared that if the synagogues and institutions in the community cease to function, the Jewish population will leave.

The President of the Jewish Community Council, Herman Cahn, greeted the delegates and government officials. He emphasized that the goals of the Council are not simply to preserve the community, but to improve living conditions and also attract new residents to the area.

"The basic issue facing Americans is preserving the large urban centers in the Country", was the opening statement of the keynote speaker, Dr. Jack Sable. He went on to say that early immigrants, the victims of religious and economic persecution settled in the inner cities as these are the source of communal and religious strength. As the melting pot concept proved to develop a lost generation, a new ethnic consciousness emerged. We are a pluralistic society and derive strength from the traditional heritage of our respective forefathers. To insure the continuity of the community, a program for action involving all community organizations, the poor, the establishment, and the private sector, can save New York from becoming another Newark or Detroit.

With the Community Council as the vehicle, issues such as safety, housing, Senior Citizens, the poor etc. can be dealt with more effectively. The Council must first identify the problems and set priorities. It must then, formulate a plan for action. It must address itself to sensitive politicians as well as agencies to ask them basic questions and request its rights. It must cooperate with other local groups in its effort to save the community.

V.—Conclusion

Elisabeth Wurzburger, Executive Director, delineated the scope of the Council in the following terms:

Objectives: (1) To organize and activate the Jewish Community in order to strengthen and preserve it. (2) To pinpoint our common problems and needs and to articulate them. (3) To determine the available resources in the community and civic agencies, and to channel them appropriately.

Areas for Priority Concerns: (1) Security (2) Housing (3) Aged and Poor (4) Youth etc.

The proposed program is to activate the best efforts of the participating organizations and creative thinking of our community leaders, to coordinate the work through representative committees; to communicate ideas and information in workshops, conferences and newsletters. In effect, to function as a constructive clearing house and coordinating agency which will improve conditions in the Washington Heights Inwood Community.

In closing, she expressed her satisfaction at the promising response to this conference by community leaders and members, and stressed the great potential that will stem from unified effort.

NATIONAL CANCER ACT AMENDMENTS—VITAL LEGISLATION

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year marked the 75th anniversary of the oldest comprehensive cancer institution in the world, Roswell Park Memorial Institute. The December 1973 issue of Cancer Research, one of the leading cancer journals, featured this celebration as its cover story, and as part of my remarks I include the cover legend from that publication:

Roswell Park Memorial Institute (RPMI), the world's oldest institution dealing primarily with cancer research, is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year. Founded in Buffalo, New York, it is now one of the world's most comprehensive cancer centers, devoted to treatment, research, and education. It is directed by the New York State Health Department within the confines of the University of Buffalo Medical School.

When a grant of $7,500 was first requested in 1897 for the establishment of a "cancer laboratory," the plans were vetoed by the state governor, although the legislature had sanctioned it. With the persuasive efforts of two determined men—Dr. Roswell Park, for whom the institution was eventually named, and Edward H. Butler, Sr., an influential newspaper publisher—a bill was finally passed in 1898 for maintenance of the laboratory.

Since that time, RPMI has grown into a multimillion-dollar operation. Included among its facilities are a 316-bed hospital and many well-equipped cancer research laboratories. There are 2,200 employees in all at RPMI.

Throughout the years, the directorship has played a vital role in determining the growth of the center. Featured on this month's cover are its six past directors:

Dr. Roswell Park, Professor of Surgery at the University of Buffalo, was co-founder of the institution in 1898. Notwithstanding his rigorous duties as first director, he continued to lecture and write extensively, maintained a large private practice, and was an active participant in community cultural affairs.

In 1904, Dr. Harvey Gaylord became the second director. His primary interest was in finding an organism for the cause and cure of cancer and in developing immunological techniques. During his administration, the first hospital building was constructed, as was an experimental farm, still in use in Springville, New York.

Throughout the 20-year term of Dr. Burton T. Simpson, third director, more and more emphasis was placed on clinical activities. His administration (1923–1943) saw the construction of a new 78-bed hospital, with facilities for an enlarged radiation therapy department.

Dr. Louis C. Kress had been associated with RPMI for 26 years when he was named fourth director in 1945. An intensive educational program, to include laymen as well as students and practitioners, was implemented during his term.

Dr. George E. Moore at 32 years of age was made fifth director of the Institute in 1952. His tenure was marked by tremendous expansion in staff and facilities. Contributions of his administration included the establishment of a pediatric department and a non-profit corporation to receive gifts and grants.

Dr. James T. Grace, Jr., who became the sixth director in 1967, continued to pursue clinical studies in gastrointestinal surgery. He was also concerned with the role of viruses in tumor formation. His endeavors were cut short by an auto accident in 1970; he was critically injured and died about 18 months later.

The current director, Dr. Gerald P. Murphy, received his appointment in 1970, after serving as Acting Director since the time of Dr. Grace's accident. He received his M.D. at the University of Washington in Seattle and was Research Associate and Chief of the Department of Surgical Physiology at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research in Washington, D.C. Dr. Murphy was also named one of 18 members of the National Cancer Advisory Board in 1972.

The House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment has just concluded hearings on legislation to extend and amend the National Cancer Act. With the firsthand example of Roswell Park's tremendous work in my district, I have been particularly interested in our Federal assistance to the fight against cancer, and am a sponsor of legislation to improve the national cancer program.

Dr. Gerald Murphy, institute director at Roswell Park Memorial Institute, made a most convincing case for continued Government support in testimony presented to the subcommittee this week. His remarks follow:

REMARKS BY DR. GERALD MURPHY

Mr. Chairman, I would like to testify on the importance of Cancer Centers and their associated impact on community outreach cancer control programs. I refer particularly to those programs mounted by Comprehensive Cancer Centers authorized by the National Cancer Act of 1971. Moreover, I wish to stress the necessity to review this Act at this time. As you know, Roswell Park Memorial Institute and its large constituency supported this Act when this Committee held its hearings at the Institute in Buffalo, New York on 11 October, 1971.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am Dr. Gerald P. Murphy, Institute Director of Roswell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo, New York. Our Institute is the oldest and one of the largest Comprehensive Cancer Centers in the world.

I am also a member of the President's National Cancer Advisory Board. In addition, I am Chairman of the Cancer Control Committee on the Advisory Board. Moreover, I am President-Elect of the New York State American Cancer Society, and a Director-at-large of the Society.

As I stated above, I support the renewal of the National Cancer Act of 1971 which expires June 30, 1974. The consensus of many segments of the medical and scientific community agree that the Act has worked well since its inception; however, as in all new ventures, there is room for improvement and expansion. The following are my impressions:

1. One feature the Act should make more strongly, I feel, is the necessary provisions to insure that the National Cancer Program continues to be unique from other Health Institute programs. I feel that these inconsistencies could be more administratively answered by reinforcing the position of the National Cancer Institute Director.

2. The provisions for full staffing to effectuate the National Cancer Plan, I feel, should be reinforced by increasing special positions from 50 to 100 and that they be specified as not to be counted in the usual allotment of staff positions to the NCI, but be additions. People to review and maintain a high quality program are as essential as the program itself.

3. The authorization for centers should be continued, the number to be determined by the assessment of the needs throughout the country. In addition, construction authority for centers should not be limited to only clinical centers. However, in stating this, I feel there should be some balance. Building more laboratories is fine, but we must recognize that we need Comprehensive Cancer Centers that are going to result by 1974 or 1977 to an increase of the number of cancer cures. In discussing Comprehensive Cancer Centers, I feel it is important to point out that such newly identified projects cannot be totally supported by federal funds. Federal assistance is, in my opinion, intended to provide only Core program aid. Such centers must have local support to assure their success and future availability. The State of New York has in this regard been most generous to our own Institution in Buffalo throughout its 75-year history. Others must in some form do likewise, for a Comprehensive Cancer Center cannot stand alone.

4. On page 6, section 410C, paragraph (b) subsection (1) the words "for direct costs" should be inserted after $35,000. The National Cancer Institute Director should be given explicit authority to allocate this money for the direct costs of cancer research and training without additional interpretations or limitations. This appears to have been the case in allocating $35,000 grants as originally described in the Act of 1971.

5. As regards to the level of appropriation and in view of the cost of everything, I urge support that we amended section 410C of the Act for the next three years by increasing these levels respectively changing $400,000,000 to $750,000,000, $500,000,000 to $830,000,000 and $600,000,000 to $985,000,000. These changes would then be for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1975, June 30, 1976, and June 30, 1977, respectively.

6. In section 409 Cancer Control Program, I feel that this section should be amended by striking out "and" before "40,000,000" and by inserting the following increased levels of appropriations, $65,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and $95,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977. We need to increase the amount for cancer control.

7. The review of this Act must make some provision for evaluation of effectiveness or impact of this program, for, the American people, and I believe all sectors of government have a right and a need to know in defined, reassured steps how this expanded war on cancer is progressing, and what it has meant to all of us. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that such information is available and can be provided. However, to define and provide for this information would be reassuring to all those involved in concern over our national health care.

Mr. Chairman, implicit within the National Cancer Control Program is the urgent need to educate the public and the medical profession. The results of research and study in cancer prevention, detection,therapy, rehabilitation and continuing care must be communicated in an appropriate form to the physicians, nurses and paramedical personnel who see and treat some 90% of this country's cancer patients and to the lay public who must play an active role in preventing and detecting cancer. Greater emphasis must be undertaken by Comprehensive Cancer Centers to reach the practicing physicians who undertake the primary care of the cancer patients. These physicians therefore should not only be informed of the most up to date and effective techniques in cancer prevention, detection and treatment but they should also be motivated in turn to educating their patients in methods of prevention and detection. The success of the cancer control program hinges on how well we outreach and as well coordinate our efforts with other established voluntary and federal health agencies. Comprehensive Cancer Centers are in some present aspects in the best position to outreach by sending out teams to community hospitals and providing consultative service to office based physicians and by such centers establishing effective use of established media, i.e., press, radio, television, films, brochures. At Roswell Park Memorial Institute, we are doing this but need to do this at a greater level and we, like other Comprehensive Cancer Centers, need funds to expand and enhance our programs in these directions.

On February 15, the NCI will review a number of applications from Comprehensive Cancer Centers in this country which are seeking awards for financing these outreach cancer programs. However, the current level of funds for cancer control programs for these eventual awards will only cover the beginning of this program.

8. My last point, Mr. Chairman, I feel is also important. Whereas cancer centers and the academic world are responsible for developing new knowledge and for training cancer specialists, we have seen funds, particularly for training, greatly curtailed. There are recognized shortages of certain cancer specialists on all levels. The Act has to make definite provisions to supply manpower in some acceptable fashion, so that we can effectively implement the National Cancer Act.

Mr. Chairman, now that I have covered some specific items concerning the revision of the National Cancer Act of 1971, I am sure that you might want to know my position on identification and measurement of the results of the programmed action that has come about from the National Cancer Act of 1971.

It is logical to assume that well planned and executed programmed activities has and will accelerate progress. It is logical to assume that the net effect of all our effort for the improvement of cancer control has been beneficial. It is not possible at this time, however, to measure or predict the extent to which an individual program has affected our national progress in the control of cancer.

Nevertheless, I feel that an analysis of our programmed activity at Roswell Park Memorial Institute and at several established Comprehensive Cancer Centers demonstrates that treatment for certain cancers has been beneficial. For instance, in one report it has been shown that among 60 acute lymphocytic leukemia patients treated in the past 18 months, 96% entered complete remission, 92% remained in complete remission at the end of the 18 month period which statisticians say indicated that at least 50% of the patients will remain free of clinical and laboratory evidence of disease five years after diagnosis. End results data from NCI from the years 1955–64 showed a 3-year survival rate of only 5% nationally. We believe that between 30 to 90% of cancer deaths in man may be preventable. A concerted research effort is being mobilized for cancer of the colon, breast and cancer of the prostrate. There is promise for substantial pay-off in these organ sites.

From our Institute, at present the 5-year survival rates for invasive cervical cancer are 75–80%, endometrial cancer 80%, and ovarian cancer 60–75%. This is impressive and demonstrates what good cancer management at a Comprehensive Cancer Center can accomplish.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make very sure that the Committee understands one point about which I am emphatic. We have the means at independent Comprehensive Cancer Centers to provide good cancer management because such centers take advantage of new discoveries that are taking place. The center is where research and education is active. We need to support existing cancer centers and establish new ones so that they can transmit their advances in good cancer management to all practicing physicians. As you know, there is a great temporal lag in getting this to a large percentage for some practitioners.

We urgently need to support existing concer centers and for establishing new independent cancer centers as provided by the National Cancer Act of 1971. We urgently need community outreach cancer programs sponsored by cancer centers, so the U.S. citizen can gain the maximum benefits from these centers.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to present my views.

THE FDA AND THE PHYSICIAN

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration has, in recent days, made a number of highly controversial decisions with regard to withdrawing combination drugs from the market.

In many instances these decisions have been at variance with the experience of private medical practitioners who have been using such drugs effectively for many years.

In too many cases, the views of the private practicing physician have not been taken into proper consideration and FDA determinations have been made on the basis of artificial bureaucratic rules and regulations. This, of course, is the inherent difficulty in providing an administrative agency with virtually unregulated control over any area of American life.

Discussing this unfortunate state of affairs, Dr. William Barclay of the American Medical Association has noted that—

> It seems to me the only people who can tell you whether these mixtures have any effect on symptoms are the doctors in practice who are seeing people in their offices, dispensing the medicine, and then getting some reaction from the patients. So I would make the very, very strong appeal to FDA to put great weight on the evidence submitted by physicians who are qualified to judge whether or not the symptoms have been relieved.

In an article concerning "FDA and the Physician," which appears in the January, 1974 issue of Private Practice, the Journal of the Congress of County Medical Societies, Robert L. Dean, vice president for regulatory and government affairs of Smith Kline & French Laboratories, notes that—

> To the extent FDA is right about any of this, the industry and the medical profession had best be busy correcting itself. To the extent the FDA is wrong, we should be telling them so, in the most cogent way we know—surely, the private practicing physician will want an effective voice in the decisions likely to be made about drug consumption in the next decade.

It is essential that medical doctors, not government bureaucrats, be in the forefront of decisionmaking concerning the availability of drugs. Thus far, the FDA has not taken into sufficient consideration the experience of the private practicing physician. It is high time that this situation was corrected.

I wish to share Mr. Dean's article, which is based on his remarks before the December meeting of State Medical Association Presidents in Anaheim, Calif., from the January issue of Private Practice, with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

The article follows:

FDA AND THE PHYSICIAN

(By Robert L. Dean)

I plan to make just one point: I think FDA is listening—and listening attentively—to what you physicians have to say. It's certainly not news that FDA, nowadays, has to do a great deal of listening. It listens to Congress; it listens to scientists; it listens to consumerists. Once in a while, it even listens to what we in industry have to say.

And more and more, it is listening to what private-practice physicians have to say—the good and the bad—about drugs. Some of you are already talking to FDA, and talking effectively.

It's probably fair to say that, for a good many years, most physicians have taken FDA for granted as the agency somehow responsible for assuring the quality of drugs, and the fairness of drug advertising. They have given FDA credit for that, glad that someone was there to do the job.

But they have not taken so kindly to the fact that FDA is also interested in assuring the quality of the physician's *use* of drugs. You'll recall FDA's concern, back in 1967, with a certain medical text that recommended a drug dosage exceeding the dosage in the package insert? One vocal physician got very exercised over FDA's attempt to invest the insert with unnatural powers over prescribing, and FDA listened.

But that was just a minor skirmish, compared to what lies ahead. Over the past five or six years, FDA and others have been saying that the use of many prescription drugs by physicians far outweighs genuine need. It's been said repeatedly that physicians overuse drugs, are overwhelmed by their number and variety, are not as concerned as they should be about drug toxicity and drug interactions.

What do physicians think of these serious criticisms? What do you *say* about them? To whom do you say it?

And will anybody *listen* to what you have to say?

In order to communicate effectively with FDA, the physician first must decide that he has something important to say. He has to believe he *knows* what he *knows*. He must believe his practical experience with drugs *does* count for something. Then he must do something with what he knows. As the ancient satiric poet Lucilius put it: "Knowledge is now knowing until someone else knows that one knows."

This does *not* mean he should derogate the modern methodology of drug research, nor poke fun at double-blind placebo controlled studies, nor at the academicians who advise FDA. Without these modern techniques and expert advisors, the FDA judgments of safety and efficacy would be paralyzed, or hopelessly wrong. And to say otherwise marks the sayer as an anti-intellectual.

To communicate effectively, private-practice physicians must find a way to help FDA appreciate and value their clinical experience with drugs. During the past decade—and especially during the past three years—FDA has seemed to reject evidence not obtained from double-blind, statistically controlled studies. Yet—and here's an important paradox—FDA is increasingly looking to advisory committees to help make its scientific decisions. So there *is* more to scientific decision-making than simple data. There *is* room, officially, for judgment and experience.

You can understand FDA's viewpoint on the need for data—the complex issue of approval of new drugs cannot be resolved without well-planned, well-controlled studies *before* the drug product is made available. It's FDA's clear intent and responsibility to make the best judgment possible at the drug's point of entry; once the drug is in your hands, they have lost direct control of its use. And I think it's fair to say that better control of drug use—to avoid overuse, abuse, and drug interactions—is what FDA wants.

Yet we and you—and FDA—appreciate that clinical experience *after* marketing is actually likely to be a better measure of the new drug's safety and efficacy than all the controlled studies. Experience measures all the subtle but vital effects a drug may have on the patient's performance, convenience, happiness.

Before a new drug is marketed, the sponsoring company collects the so-called "hard" data—the laboratory evidence, the quantitative and semiquantitative measures of clinical improvement or cure.

After it's marketed, the practicing physician collects most of the soft data on the "patient's capacity for working, walking, dancing, making love, thinking, reading, and enjoying the other acts of daily living."

I borrowed that last phrase from a paper by Alvan R. Feinstein, now at Yale ("The Need for Humanized Science In Evaluating Medication," *The Lancet*, August 26, 1972, pp. 421–23). But how can the practicing physician communicate these subtle things to a Federal agency which, like the rest of us, is far more comfortable with quantitative measures of effectiveness? We all know that unsupported and isolated testimonial clinical evidence isn't enough. We also know that there are kinds of important knowledge that are beyond capturing by double-blind placebo controlled study.

Is there anything in between? Any place where clinical experience can be organized to get the attention it deserves? I think so; and I have a few examples to share with you.

The first example involves FDA's handling of prescription cough and allergy combination products. On June 4, 1973, FDA held an all-day public hearing on its guidelines for the formulation of cough and allergy products. It had published these guidelines in the *Federal Register* of May 15, just two weeks earlier. The guidelines were designed to show how new products could be formulated as substitutes for all of the combinations FDA had declared "ineffective"—among them such widely prescribed products as Phenergan, Actifed, Benylin, "Tuss-Ornade." The *Federal Register* is the FDA's way of communicating with "all interested parties," including the physician. The FDA has many other ways of communicating—in the speeches of its personnel, in frequent testimony before Congressional committees, in hundreds of letters to drug companies.

As a matter of fact, the FDA's half of the dialogue with physicians is voluminous; I sometimes think that *words*, not drugs, are the principal business of both FDA and the industry.

We in the industry have learned to read the *Federal Register* in a hurry, quickly separating the boilerplate paragraphs from the substance.

Fortunately, some few physicians are just as good at speed-reading the *Federal Register*. With only a 5-day deadline, several asked for and were given time to testify at FDA's public hearing on the cough-allergy guidelines.

The physicians who testified were concerned about the loss of useful, time-tested products. But I think they were much more concerned about the erosion of their prescribing choices and the failure of FDA to take their experience into account. Dr. William Barclay of the AMA said it this way:

It seems to me the only people who can tell you whether these mixtures have any effect on symptoms are the doctors in practice who are seeing people in their offices, dispensing the medicine, and then getting some reaction from the patients. So I would make the very, very strong appeal to FDA to put great weight on the evidence submitted by physicians who are qualified to judge whether or not the symptoms have been relieved.

Much the same point was made by three physicians in private practice, and by physicians representing the Congress of County Medical Societies and the American Academy of Family Physicians.

What happened as a result of the hearing? FDA listened. It decided to postpone implementation of the prescription cough-allergy guidelines. It deferred action until its panel that is reviewing *non*-prescription cough-cold-allergy products can complete its job, which will probably be at the end of 1974. As you probably know, FDA has divided the non-prescription (OTC) drugs into seventeen categories, and seventeen panels will review them.

Is the cough-cold-allergy argument over? Hardly; it's only suspended. Keep in mind, FDA's OTC panel must now wrestle with the very same questions FDA has published answers to. Are antihistamines of any use in the symptomatic relief of colds? Should combinations of antitussives and decongestants be allowed?

And here's the $64 question: shouldn't *all* cough-cold-allergy products be *non*-prescription anyway? FDA asked this question several times at the June 4th hearing. One physician answered that he could only deplore the suggestion. It would leave physicians with nothing to prescribe for the patient whose symptoms are severe enough to have him brought to the physician.

At the close of the June 4 hearing, FDA's Dr. Richard Crout, who conducted the hearing, said to AMA's Dr. John Budd, "We make a strong plea to you to help us solve the problem."

He did not mean just the problem of whether one drug product goes and another stays. Let's face it, what eventually happens to Phenergan or "Tuss-Ornade" is important only as part of the overall problem of how you can contribute to the judgments being made about drugs in this country.

Dr. Francis Davis, who is the publisher of Private Practice, the official publication of the Congress of County Medical Societies, has visited FDA with the officers of his society. They have talked to FDA about the need to increase the dialogue with private-practice physicians. FDA has encouraged Dr. Davis and his colleagues to find ways to collect and translate clinical experience that bears on judgments of safety and efficacy.

As a start, Private Practice published a self-mailing questionnaire in its September issue. The questionnaire tells physicians that FDA has classified 480 drugs as "possibly effective," and that FDA must make a decision on them by January 1974 unless it can be shown that they are effective or that the medical issues are so complex that more time is needed. The questionnaire then selects twenty-five of the 480 and asks whether the reader has found them effective. [Editor's Note: see the December issue of Private Practice for results of the survey.]

Obviously, this questionnaire is but a first step; perhaps its greatest worth is in stirring physicians to make formal judgments of clinical efficacy; it can be the beginning of the development of teams of practitioners willing to record and thus document their experiences with drugs, including adverse-reaction experience, patient-by-patient, in a way that can give validity to what would otherwise be isolated observations, confusing and meaningless in a regulatory sense.

A third example of a way physicians have found to try to understand what they know, to organize it, and then to communicate it: just yesterday in Washington, the Academies of Family Physicians of Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia concluded a two-day conference on combination drugs—the science of them, the merits and demerits of them. There has been so much said about combination products, much of it fruitless. Perhaps this conference will help physicians see the issues more clearly, and thereby help FDA.

A fourth example of FDA's ability to listen occurred this past summer when FDA acknowledged in the *Federal Register* of August 8, 1973, that it had received "numerous complaints from physicians, including eminent gastroenterologists, objecting to removal . . . [of the poorly absorbed sulfonamides, e.g., succinylsulfathiazole, phthalylsulfathiazole]" from the market. The Commissioner rescinded the order to withdraw these drugs. An editorial in the October 15, 1973, *JAMA* hailed this action as "evidence that reasonableness can prevail."

A fifth and final example of FDA's interest in the opinions of others is provided by the agency's vastly increased use of advisory committees. At last count, there were some twenty-seven standing committees—you name it—on dental drug products, bacterial vaccines, orthopedic devices, topical analgesics, etc.

I doubt that a day goes by at FDA without a meeting of outside advisors.

Notification of the time and place of these meetings is published in the *Federal Register*. Most are closed to us and the public except for perhaps an hour or two, but even that brief period has been enough to show us that these committees are by no means rubber stamp. They have their problems—what committee doesn't—but they work hard at the job, they take seriously the fact that they're helping FDA with tough decisions. And it's been clear they expect FDA to take their advice seriously.

One of the committees' problems is their natural desire to make difficult decisions on as much data as can be found, and to call for more if not enough is around. They tend to forget that if the data were complete, there'd be little need for advisory committees. The best committees seem to be those that demand data when it's critical and when the methodologies for getting it are available, but that, otherwise, rely on their judgments of safety and efficacy.

How well are primary-care physicians—that is, private practitioners—represented on these committees? On some of them there may be no great point. But on others, there *is* a great need for them to be heard. As the new Commissioner. Dr. Alexander Schmidt, put it at a press conference July 26:

"I think we may be a little shy in representation from the MD practicing world on our committees. One can argue whether a practicing MD is a 'professional' or a 'consumer.' In a way, the MD is a consumer of our regulations. He needs to be heard."

So I hope I've established that FDA does listen.

But that doesn't mean FDA—or at least some of the people there, and in HEW—is not still very much concerned over what I mentioned earlier. They think that many physicians are overprescribing tranquilizers, and antibiotics, are prescribing fixed-ratio combinations without enough thought being given to titrating doses and ingredients to suit the individual patient. They are worried about the drug interactions that can result, and about the giving of ingredients that are simply not needed. They believe that the industry's heavy advertising and promotion has oversold drug products and made physicians thoughtless in prescribing. They are determined to find out just how much overprescribing is going on.

To the extent FDA is right about any of this, the industry and the medical profession had best be busy correcting itself. To the extent FDA is wrong, we should be telling them so, in the most cogent way we know. In any case, surely the private-practice physician will want an effective voice in the decisions likely to be made about the drug consumption in the next decade.

I've mentioned several ways of increasing dialogue with FDA. The first and best is by data, brought to their attention through the literature and through symposia. I've mentioned visits to FDA, surveys of clinical use and experience, testimony at public hearings.

And I've tried to stress serving on FDA advisory committees. The FDA is about to divide its work on drugs into eighteen categories—cardiovascular-renal drugs, dermatological-surgical products, phychopharmaceuticals, antibiotics, etc.; for each category there will be an advisory committee. I believe there is an opportunity and a need for the private-practice physician on each of these committees, *not* as a replacement for the substantial scientific evidence that is needed for the clearance of new drugs, but rather for the help such physicians can give in making judgments about such things as comparative toxicity, relative efficacy of new vs. older agents, actual or likely modes of use.

On both new and old drugs there will be questions the private-practice physician can and *should* help with. For example: How shall the indications section of the labeling be worded so that it cannot be misread? What should be done about labeling for the patient? How can such-and-such an adverse reaction be best communicated to the physician? Should this new drug be made available only for hospital or other restricted use? Should this old drug be made non-prescription? How can post-marketing surveillance in actual use best be done?

There is still another way for physicians to communicate, one I'd like to illustrate with a true story about dialogue with government.

A friend of mine named Ed has a friend who's a member of an important Congressional committee. Ed has another friend who's a physician and who attends the same church the Congressman attends, and knows him quite well. One day, Ed asked the physician what he talked to the Congressman about when they met in the church parking lot. "Oh, school, church, weather."

Ed suggested there *are* other topics—including large medical topics that are very important, and the doctor agreed.

Later, Ed saw the Congressman and confirmed that all he and his physician friend ever talked about was school, children, and so on, and Ed gave the Congressman his business card, with this request. "Look," Ed said, "I've urged Dr. so-and-so to bring up something besides the weather and I've told him I'm sure you'd be interested in his opinion on national medical issues. Let me know what happens when you next talk to him; send me a note on my card."

A few weeks ago, Ed's card arrived back in the mail. It just had two words written on it:

"He didn't."

PLANT CLOSING—VICTIM OF ECONOMIC SITUATION

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by officials of Aerojet Ordnance and Manufacturing Co. that it will be closing its plant in Batesville, Ark., in April upon the fulfillment of the defense contracts it is now handling. This plant has been operating in Batesville since 1965 and has provided a major source of economic growth in the area. Its peak employment reached 1,400 persons about 4 years ago.

Six months ago there were 600 local area citizens working at the plant. Since that time the employment has dropped to below 300. Officials of the firm have assured me that they have, during the past 3 years, made extensive efforts to find and develop new products which could be manufactured by their corporation at Batesville. Their most promising product was air bags to be used by General Motors Corp. This contract was cancelled about 3 weeks ago when General Motors determined that it would not have need for the air bags which the Batesville plant had begun to make. As I understand it, these bags were to be used in luxury model automobiles.

What is happening to the citizens in the Batesville area who are depending on this plant for their livelihood is symptomatic of the current economic conditions which prevail in our Nation. Despite the President's promise in the state of the Union message that there will be no recession, these workers will, it appears now, be having to find other employment in April.

It is my hope that the efforts which Congress has been making and continues to make on behalf of the citizens of small towns—such as Batesville—in the Nation's countryside will prove fruitful and will gain the full, dedicated commitment of the administration. I hope that we will be able to prevent the threat of unemployment the current economic situation carries for the heartland. Recession and unemployment in the heartland is just as serious, just as heartbreaking, just as destructive as it is in metropolitan areas.

THE HONORABLE DONALD PARTNEY

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 26, the Honorable Donald Partney, former mayor of Granite City, Ill., died following a long illness. His death is a personal loss to me, because of our longstanding friendship.

Politically independent, Don Partney had the reputation of being a fiscal watchdog during his 26 years of public service. When his 8-year tenure as mayor of Granite City ended in 1973, the city had an $800,000 surplus. Few municipal executives leave this kind of legacy.

Don Partney served also as alderman from 1947 to 1965 in Granite City and was known for his strong representation of his ward. He fought hard for what he believed, particularly when it came to reducing the costs of government.

President of the Granite City Sheet Metal Works, Inc., Don Partney was a successful businessman who believed that his business experience carried over into his City Hall activities. He felt that business practices could be applied to government service.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the January 28 article from the Granite City Press Record on Mayor Partney:

FORMER GRANITE CITY MAYOR PARTNEY DIES; CITY OFFICIAL 26 YEARS

Donald Partney, 57, of 2600 Illinois Ave., mayor of Granite City from 1965 to April 30, 1973, following 18 years as a member of the City Council, died after a long illness at 4:30 p.m. Saturday at St. Elizabeth Hospital where he had been a patient for the past three weeks.

Born in Ware, Mo., he had lived here 48 years and was married to the former Ruth Druke of Granite City.

He was president of the Granite Sheet Metal Works, Inc., which was operated by his son, David Partney, after his election as mayor.

Former Mayor Partney formerly was a foreman for the Westinghouse Electric Co., sheet metal division, and the Everson Electric Co. aircraft division.

He was an estimator for some of this area's largest sheet metal firms before organizing his own company.

He attended schools in Granite City and Jefferson County, Mo., and studied engineering in Berkeley, Calif., for two years.

Mayor Partney served as president of the United Welders of America in 1942; was president of the Tri-City Shrine Club in 1953; and president of the Logan School PTA in 1954–55.

He was president of the Tri-County Sheet Metal Contractors Association for Madison, St. Clair and Monroe counties in 1957 and was chairman of the All-American City film in 1958.

Mr. Partney was a member of Sheet Metal Workers Union Local 268 and an inactive member of Boilermarkers Local 539.

He was a member of Masonic Lodge 877, Scottish Rite Bodies and Ainad Temple, East St. Louis, and held a lifetime membership in the Shriners' Hospital for Crippled Children.

He was awarded a lifetime membership in the American Legion, was awarded a 25-year pin as a Mason and was a member of The Jesters.

He also was a member of the advisory council of the International Supreme Council of DeMolay; was chairman of the planning and zoning committee under the city's Southern Illinois University program; member-at-large of Cahokia Mound Council of the Boy Scouts; and a member of Elks Granite City Lodge 1063.

He was a Navy Veteran of World War II.

Former Mayor Partney was honored with an award for civic achievement as Fourth Ward alderman in 1956. He received the "Hats Off award" for the Order of DeMolay in 1960, and the DeMolay Cross of Honor in 1962.

He also received certificates of merit from the Navy Mothers' Club of America, the American Cancer Society and Granite City Junior Chamber of Commerce.

He was presented a certificate of civic achievement from St. Elizabeth Hospital and a parchment of Papal Blessing from Pope Paul.

Beside his widow Ruth Partney he is survived by two daughters, Donna Marie and Diana Rose, both of Granite City; three sons, Donald, David and Daniel, all of Granite City; four sisters, Mrs. Viola Kelio, Potosi, Mo., Mrs. Cordelia Bosse, Overland, Mo., Mrs. Claude (Milda) Mierand, Bridgeton, Mo., and Mrs. Jack (Ruth) Hunter, Hillsboro, Mo.; his mother, Mrs. Katherine Lipscomb of Hillsboro, Mo., and five grandchildren.

FIVE-DAY RECESS OPPOSED

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my dismay and indignation at the decision by this body to depart on a 5-day recess at a time when our country faces what can only be described as a national emergency.

With desperately needed energy legislation still awaiting action, unemployment climbing rapidly, campaign ethics, pension reform, tax reform, and myriad other problems still to be dealt with, Congress should be in Washington at work.

We bemoan the fact that the American public is losing faith in its elected Government and we talk incessantly of congressional responsibility and then the majority leadership of this House decrees a holiday and walks away from these many unfinished tasks.

Shortly after the first of this year, I sent telegrams to the Speaker of the House, the majority leader and the minority leader requesting that they exert their authority and call the House back into session prior to the scheduled January 21 reconvening. I pointed out at that time that New England was suffering inordinately from the effects of the energy crisis and that the Energy Emergency Act was still awaiting congressional action.

While the minority leader responded quickly that he was in support of the idea of reconvening early and had himself suggested a specific date, the majority leadership failed to act and the Nation suffered.

The situation in New England that was difficult in early January is desperate in early February and the Energy Emergency Act still awaits final action, as do a number of other pieces of legislation crucial to dealing with this emergency. Against this backdrop, I find it unconscionable that the Democratic majority has called another recess, however brief.

I want to go on record as being opposed to this recess or any other until this body has acted fully and effectively on at least the most critical of the numerous problems besetting our people.

LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WASHINGTON REPORT—THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

(By Congressman LEE HAMILTON)

When the Founding Fathers provided that the President, "shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the State of the Union," they could scarcely imagine that these innocuous words would require such elaborate arrangements.

As I walked about the U.S. Capitol in the late afternoon of January 30, it was obvious that big things were underway. Some of the 450 policemen in crisp, dark blue uniforms guarded every entrance to the Capitol; others cordoned off the area around the Capitol, standing only a few feet apart. Helicopters flew overhead, training powerful searchlights on the buildings and the grounds of the Capitol; walkie-talkies were clacking everywhere; and nearly 100 Secret Service men carefully scrutinized each visitor. Large groups of marchers, some supporting the President, others denouncing him, awaited his arrival. Sleek black government limousines arrived on Capitol Hill to discharge Cabinet officials, high ranking military officers and members of the diplomatic corps. Several ambulances were parked nearby.

On the second floor of the Capitol, in the House of Representatives chamber where the speech is traditionally delivered, extra chairs were being set in place; TV technicians scurried back and forth from the mobile van parked next to the Capitol, checking their cables, which looked like long black spaghetti running to the House chamber. The special color television lights in the House chamber, which had been permanently installed for such events, were being switched on and off. In the press and radio galleries, journalists were speculating about the contents of the speech and the Congress reaction to it.

Downstairs on the first floor of the Capitol in an almost festive atmosphere, members of Congress and their families and guests were dining in the Capitol restaurant and attending scores of receptions and parties. A couple of blocks away, the Indiana Society of Washington was meeting at the Capitol Hill Club where hundreds of transplanted Hoosiers listened to the snappy lyrics of the Purdue University Glee Club and reminisced about life in Indiana. All across Capitol Hill, television sets were readied for those persons who did not have tickets to the event.

To capture a large television audience, the President's address was scheduled for 9:00 p.m. (6:00 p.m. in California and 3:00 p.m. in Hawaii). By 8:00 p.m. the galleries began to fill with people, and within another hour over 1,500 persons filled the room. House pages and employees stood on the edge of the chamber; brightly dressed wives of the Cabinet members took their seats in the President's gallery; and over 100 journalists packed the news gallery right above the place from which the President was to speak.

At 8:30 p.m. members of the House of Representatives began to file in, and in another ten minutes the Speaker of the House called the House to order. At 8:45 p.m. the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the ranking officers of each of the military services, took their seats, followed by the members of the United States Senate. At 8:50 p.m. several hundred ambassadors and ministers of foreign governments filed in, and the Justices of the Supreme Court entered at 8:55 p.m. Just before 9:00 p.m. the President's family was seated to the standing applause of the members of the Congress, and then the members of the President's Cabinet entered. At 9:00 p.m. the bright lights were turned up and the Doorkeeper of the House announced in stentorian voice: "Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States."

The President entered the chamber to standing applause as Senate and House leaders escorted him to the rostrum. After delivering printed copies of his address to Vice-President Ford, the presiding officer of the Senate, and to House Speaker Carl Albert, the President began the 186th State of the Union Address, following a custom that is derived from the British practice of opening Parliament with a speech from the throne.

As the President spoke, he stood before an American flag with the Speaker and the Vice-President seated immediately behind him. On each side were full-length portraits of President Washington and General Lafayette, and overhead, carved in marble, was the national motto, "In God We Trust."

Throughout his 45-minute address, four television cameras, operating in a network pool, scanned the chamber, which hummed with the constant clicking of cameras.

During the speech, and for the only time during the course of a year, all high-ranking governmental officials—civilian and military, executive, judicial and legislative—are gathered in a single room.

Each State of the Union speech is an historic event, and each speech is analyzed, word by word, throughout the world for indications of American policy. The speech has became a potent instrument of national leadership and a solemn annual ritual of the national government.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, because of a longstanding commitment in my district yesterday, I was unable to be in the Chamber for the final two recorded votes.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 24 and "nay" on rollcall No. 25.

INSIDE HBG, WHAT MAKES HENRY B. RUN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, recently the San Antonio Express and News carried a series of articles in five parts between January 6 and January 10 about HENRY B. GONZALEZ, who represents the 20th Congressional District of Texas. The series is by Mr. Jim McCrory and he did an excellent job in writing about a fine Texan.

In the series are some interesting facts, a little fiction, some south Texas humor, and perhaps a little propaganda. I must say it adds measurably to HENRY GONZALEZ' congressional biography.

Seriously, I must say that my friend and fellow colleague, Congressman GONZALEZ is an outstanding Texan, American, and statesman. I commend him for his efforts in these Chambers and I especially commend the people of the 20th Congressional District for sending such a man to Congress.

The first part of the five parts follows:

WHAT MAKES HENRY B. RUN?—HBG: THE MAN AND THE MYTH

(By Jim McCrory)

It was the classic political matchup, certainly the greatest one-on-one campaign confrontation in the modern annals of Bexar County.

The year was 1961. The antagonists for U.S. Rep. Paul Kilday's 20th district seat were Henry B. Gonzalez and John Goode.

Kilday had been appointed by President John F. Kennedy to the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

If the Bexar County Democratic and Republican parties had cast about for the strongest challengers to carry their colors into the lists, they couldn't have selected a better pair.

Gonzalez, Democratic liberal, state senator, and flamboyant, versus Goode, Republican conservative, former county chairman, solid and a practicing attorney.

BIG GUNS

Neither party spared the horses.

President Kennedy, for whom Gonzalez had campaigned in 11 states as national co-chairman of the Viva Kennedy Clubs, endorsed Gonzalez.

Vice President Lyndon Johnson teamed with Mexico's famed comedian, Cantinflas, to barnstorm for Gonzalez in the closing days of the campaign. Gonzalez returned the favor for LBJ in 1964, serving as co-chairman of the Viva Johnson Clubs.

Acting House Speaker Carl Albert and U.S. Rep. Jim Wright came in to lend a hand to Gonzalez.

GOVERNOR, TOO

Many of Gonzalez's State Senate colleagues aided and abetted the Democratic charge, and Gov. Price Daniel, whom Gonzalez had run against in 1958, offered his support.

The governor described Gonzalez as "big

enough to rise above political differences" to endorse and support the governor's legislative program.

LBJ BUSY

But it was Vice President Johnson, more than anyone other than Gonzalez himself, who set the stage for and administered the coup de grace to Goode.

The vice president bounced into San Antonio a few days before the filing deadline. At that time at least one other Democratic heavyweight, Judge John Onion, was giving considerable thought to making the race.

ONION OUT

Johnson, after first insisting he wouldn't presume to try to tell Bexar County voters how to vote, issued a strong endorsement of Gonzalez's candidacy to a San Antonio Express and News reporter.

The door slammed shut, for all practical purposes, on Onion.

Vice President Johnson then neutralized Shefiff Owen Kilday's antipathy toward Gonzalez. Owen was Paul Kilday's brother. Between the two brothers, they had dominated the political scene for many years.

ATTACKS STOP

Gonzalez had picked up readings that Owen was attacking him for his liberalism, and he asked the vice president to intervene.

"I asked the vice president to tell Kilday if he couldn't support me, at least not to hurt me," Gonzalez recalls.

The vice president spoke to Kilday, and the sheriff desisted in his attacks on Gonzalez.

IKE ARRIVES

For the Republicans, the big gun was former President D. Eisenhower. Ike, who had been stationed at Fort Sam Houston, had coached high school and college football in San Antonio. He had married his wife here, was well loved in Bexar County.

He had carried the county handily in both the 1952 and 1956 elections. And there was probably no Republican figure in or out of office who could have helped Goode more.

WIDE NOTICE

The contest drew national attention, since it was viewed as the first test for acceptance or rejetcion of President Kennedy's New Frontier. Gonzalez, of course, had been arguing for years for many of the ideas incorporated in the New Frontier.

The vice president carried the message of Democratic prosperity and Republican depression across the county. And he cut radio and television tapes for Gonzalez.

NAMES WRONG

Ike's efforts for Goode, and for Henry Catto Jr. were diminished by the fact he had trouble pronouncing their names. He referred to Goode in his speech in front of the Almo as "Gudie", and to Catto as Kato." Catto later became U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador.

And with his usual honesty and candor, Ike conceded he hadn't known either man very long.

Republican Catto was running against Democratic State Rep. Glenn Kothmann for Gonzalez's State Senate seat, but their race was ancillary to the main event.

Both Gonzalez and Goode conducted hard-hitting personal campaigns, with their most memorable confrontation coming at Temple Beth El.

Gonzalez, demonstrating his mastery of the verbal boards, commandeered the meeting and held the floor.

Over a Sunday brotherhood breakfast of bagels and eggs, Gonzalez argued the issues of the campaign were "bread and butter, tortilla and beans."

Gonzalez stunned one questioner by informing him his question was an "elliptical, hypothetical question calling for a gratuitous answer." It was one of the great non-answers of the campaign.

MISQUOTED

The senator also was quoted in a subsequent speech as saying he would rather have Texan Vice President Lyndon Johnson campaigning for him than an old has-been president. That drew a caution from the vice president, but Gonzalez insisted, and does to this day, that he was misquoted.

What he really said, Gonzalez explained, was that he would rather have a man who is vice president campaign for him than a man who had been president in the past.

That, however, just doesn't have the true Gonzalez ring.

Ike himself took umbrage at the quote, saying he would rather be a has-been president than a never-was.

CONCLUSION

Goode complained at one point he couldn't unravel Gonzalez' answer to a campaign question. The question was whether Gonzalez believed the U.S. should resign from the United Nations if Red China were admitted.

Goode said he was stymied even though he had a transcript of Gonzalez's answer.

From what he could determine, Goode reported Gonzalez would favor such admission "under certain conditions." Goode said he favored immediate withdrawal if Red China were admitted to the U.N.

AVID READER

Gonzalez is an avid reader. He has a library which exceeds 8,000 volumes on politics, history, philosophy and related fields. At the moment, he is into a study of the impeachment, trial and beheading of Charles I of England.

Also prominently displayed on the shelves of his library at his West Kings Highway home is Joe Martin's "My First Fifty Years in Politics." Gonzalez is still 27 years shy of being able to reminisce for as far back as Martin, but he is from a long-lived family.

JACOB'S VOICE

During Gonzalez's 1961 campaign his readings stood him in good stead when he was trying to drive a point home.

Take this little biblical twist.

"My opponent speaks with the voice of Jacob when he heaps encomiums on President Eisenhower, while he grabs votes from the Birchers with the hand of Essau," he intoned.

The 20th congressional district at the time of the election comprised all of Bexar County. Now it is restricted to the old city limit lines generally.

STRONG SIXTH

Gonzalez had run statewide for the U. S. Senate earlier in 1961 (the seat vacated by Johnson). That famous race which drew 71 candidates. Although he came in sixth statewide, he came in a strong first in Bexar County.

He also reaffirmed as he had in 1956 and 1960 that his hold on Bexar was formidable enough to give him a good chance of capturing the congressional seat.

On election day Nov. 4, 1961, Gonzalez closed out with 10,000 votes more than Goode.

ETHNIC EDGE

More than 90,000 votes were cast, a record for any special election in Bexar County. The Mexican-American areas, noted for their apathy, came alive. They turned out 75 per cent of the vote, giving Gonzalez an edge of more than 12,000 votes.

Gonzalez carried the West Side M-A boxes by margins of 12-1, and the black precincts on the East Side gave him a 9-1 margin.

Goode's strength, meanwhile, centered in the silk-stocking areas, gave him an edge of only 6-1. That was not enough to counter the Gonzalez margins on the east and west sides.

BIG BLAST

The victory triggered a huge celebration at the old Democratic Headquarters in a two-story house on East Elmira Street. The celebrants packed the old structure, since demolished, spilled out across the lawn, and emptied into the street.

The crowd was so large that police were forced to close the block to traffic.

So Gonzalez, a first generation American of Mexican descent, became the first Mexican-American from Texas ever elected to Congress.

He left the next morning for New York and a campaign in the Mexican-American and Puerto-Rican areas for Democratic candidates there. In the years since, he has campaigned for Democrats from California to New York, from Texas to Alaska, and in points between.

The year 1964 drew Vice President Johnson, Cantinflas, and Gonzelaz, to a reunion and re-enactment of the 1961 experience.

LOSING CAN BE FUN, TOO—FEARLESS HENRY B. WENT IT ALONE

While his election to the U.S. House provided, for the first time, some degree of financial security for Henry B. Gonzalez, the 1958 race against Gov. Price Daniel gave him the greatest satisfaction.

"I had no fear of losing and no false hope of winning," Gonzalez explains. "I was able to express myself as my heart and mind dictated."

He entered the race when the only opponent of any stature lined up against Daniel was former Gov. W. Lee (Pappy) O'Daniel. Gonzalez, then a State Senator, immediately dubbed Daniel "Tweedle Dee Dee and O'Daniel "O'Tweedle Dee Dee."

The cautious Democrats Of Texas, withheld any endorsement from Gonzalez. The DOT feared an endorsement of Gonzalez would have an adverse effect on U.S. Sen. Ralph Yarborough's chances for re-election.

LABOR, TOO

The same was true of state labor.

When DOT leaders apologetically explained to Gonzalez why the new liberal organization couldn't endorse him, he took DOT off the hook. He hadn't asked the organization's help, he said, and the liberal conscience was salubriously salved.

With his nominal base of organized liberal-labor support defused, Gonzalez hung loose, rattling around the state in a second-hand station wagon, which held together by fits and starts for 30,000 miles of hard campaigning.

As expected, Gonzalez lost the race. But when he returned to Austin for the 1959 session of the Texas legislature, he found he had gained new stature and respect from his colleagues.

Explaining why he disdains tickets after running with the San Antonians ticket in 1953, Gonzalez reports:

"You become part of the pack. You are expected to go along to get along. I don't believe in that."

His meanest race, he assesses, was that against then-Democrat Bob Strickland. He defeated Strickland in a runoff, the last runoff he was forced into, in 1960. Strickland subsequently switched to the Republican party.

Strickland's campaign, Gonzalez asserts, was a repeat, with variations, of the campaign of Republican Jesse Oppenheimer against him in 1956. That was the year he was elected to the Senate.

He understood Oppenheimer to have called him a Communist in a confrontation at Trinity University, Gonzalez said. He added, however, that when he went over to take issue with Oppenheimer on a closer than verbal basis, the Republican explained Gonzalez had misunderstood.

All he had called Gonzalez, he insisted, was a left-wing, creeping Socialist.

INTRODUCTION OF ENERGY INFORMATION BILL AND FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION ACT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if a consensus exists on any issue in America today, it concerns the need for accurate, verifiable, and impartially compiled data on energy resources—where it is, who controls it, and how much it should cost. For many years the energy industry with the unwitting aid of the Federal Government has cloaked its operations in a web of secrecy rivaling that which governments use to protect State secrets. This Nation has never made the effort to establish an accurate inventory of energy resources on public lands and has accepted unfailingly the word of private interests regarding the resources under their control. Further, the Federal Government has been incapable and unwilling to insure that prices consumers pay for the use of energy are fair and reasonable.

As early as 1962 there were those who recognized the need to develop an improved method of keeping stock of our energy resources. The Petroleum Study Committee reported to President Kennedy in September 1962:

> Satisfactory information concerning petroleum reserves, productive capacity and deliverability, and their expansibility under normal emergency conditions is seriously lacking. Suitable cost information is even more seriously lacking.

According to a report commissioned by the Library of Congress, two trade associations which control the dissemination of the great majority of energy data (the American Petroleum Institute and the American Gas Institute) have consistently underestimated reserves, failed to standardize reporting techniques, and concealed raw data needed for verification of their publicly released figures. The terrifying aspect of this practice is that there is no telling how important a role this unreliable information has played in Government policymaking.

There are daily reports in the media which emphasize the need for reform in our energy information system. For example, the Federal Energy Office, which is charged with the responsibility of overseeing the Nation's energy network, reported that for the week ending January 18, 1974, there was a 7.8-million barrel discrepency between oil inventories as estimated by the API and the FEO.

Laurence Stern of the Washington Post once wrote:

> Precision has never been the curse of our national energy accounts.

How true those words are; for to a greater extent than in most regulated industries the primary source of governmental intelligence about fuel resources comes from the regulated companies themselves. This is like asking a mouse to guard the cheese.

The energy data flow is as subject to question as the oil flow itself—not because it is inaccurate but because no one knows whether it is accurate. The public outrage will not be quelled until and unless the Government can assure, on the basis of definitive data scientifically assembled, that the energy information being disseminated is accurate to the fullest extent practicable.

We face a serious shortage of adequate energy data in both the public and private sector. A variety of legislative measures is needed, both to close the energy "information gap" and to deal with the energy crisis itself. Two of the needed bills have now been introduced; others will follow.

The first bill, which I introduced yesterday, would establish within the Department of Commerce a Bureau whose sole function would be the collection and dissemination of accurate energy data. In addition, the General Accounting Office would collaborate with the Department of Commerce to insure that the methods utilized by this Energy Information Bureau result in accurate information. Mandatory reporting of energy data would be required of all energy companies and would bring the United States out of the energy information dark ages.

Today, I am introducing legislation which would create a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, to operate alongside industry in the development of oil and gas reserves which lie beneath public lands.

No major industrialized nation in the world, other than the United States, leaves an entire country's oil production in private hands where management must be responsive to stockholder investments rather than public interests. Under existing legislation there is no Government authority at any level with the ability to gage the petroleum industry's cost of operations, production, or profit levels from operations on public lands or to explore and develop oil and gas on public lands.

The Federal Oil and Gas Corporation would have five essential goals:

First. To explore for, develop and commercially distribute oil and gas found on Federal lands to meet the needs of the Nation at the lowest cost practical.

Second. To develop advanced techniques for producing oil and gas with minimal impact on the environment.

Third. To provide, for Government and public review, complete and accurate information about the costs of producing oil and natural gas which would serve as a yardstick against which the costs and performance of the private oil companies could be measured.

Fourth. To manage national petroleum reserves in order to provide the United States with additional fuel supplies to reduce our dependence on foreign petroleum sources.

Fifth. To provide additional competition in the petroleum industry.

The development of public resources by a public corporation is not a new concept. The success of the Tennessee Valley Authority adequately demonstrates the ability of the Federal Government to operate expertly in the energy field. I am calling for a similar approach in the oil and gas field. There is a great deal of oil and gas beneath public lands—in fact the bulk of our resources are owned by the American people. They belong to the people and should be, in part at least, developed by a corporation whose responsibility to the people is insured by law. The oil companies have no reason not to demand exhorbitant prices from the consumer because the consumer has no criteria on which to dispute the industry's figures—we simply have not bothered to find out what they are doing on our land. We must develop an energy reporting system now, a system which would provide us with the most comprehensive inventory of all our energy resources.

I believe that these two bills together would generate the data needed to evaluate industry's energy activities, and stimulate the creation of Government energy expertise independent of the petroleum industry. They would allow the American people to believe in their Government again, to feel that their interests in obtaining the cleanest and least expensive energy possible have not been compromised.

THE REPEAL OF THE ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT OF 1970

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 8, 1974

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my distinguished colleagues in urging the immediate repeal of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970.

The staunchest defenders of these absurd and harmful controls now admit their failure. As you know, the President has decided not to ask for a renewal of the act when it expires in April, but will ask that controls continue on the petroleum and health care industries. I oppose retaining any controls. Phase 3, phase 3½, and phase 4 certainly showed the fallacy of placing controls on one sector of the economy while leaving others uncontrolled. The economy should be free and prices must be allowed to seek their natural level. I realize that this will cause a temporary surge of price increases but as was shown by the lifting of the freeze on beef prices, this will be followed by a price decrease as supply returns to normal.

I doubt that there is a Member in this Chamber whose district has not suffered misallocations and shortages as a result of price controls. Most recently, we have seen farmers without baling wire and oil producers without tubing since price controls have made the production of these steel goods unprofitable. How ironic that at a time when the Government is urging full production on the farms and in the oil fields it hinders this production by the imposition of price controls.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for retaining these controls for another 3 months. Everyone admits that they are harmful and deserve to be discarded. I, therefore, urge an immediate repeal of the Economic Stabilization Act and an end to controls.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING LEGISLATION IS INTRODUCED FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that I have introduced comprehensive campaign finance legislation to govern elections in the District of Columbia through H.R. 12638.

The overwhelming need for such legislation is pointedly obvious. The disclosures stemming from the flagrant abuses of law and political decency that have become known as Watergate show the terrible inadequacy of the way we have come to finance elections.

We have seen the distortions in public policymaking that occur when moneyed special interests are permitted to purchase access to the policymakers. We have seen governmental policies determined by the highest bidder to the detriment of the vast majority of citizens who have few resources to make their voices heard.

Special interest groups have had an undue influence in our political system since the beginning of our Republic, though the abuses have rarely been as severe or as pervasive as in the past several years. Money has spoken with a loud voice not only in the executive branch of the Federal Government, but also in Congress, in State government, and in municipal government across this land. The time for change is upon us.

The time for reform is especially ripe for the District of Columbia. The recently-passed self-government legislation places in the hands of a relatively few elected officials a legislative power in many ways equal to that possessed by State governments. While the existing campaign law applicable to local elections has been barely adequate for the elections it now covers, it simply cannot shoulder the burdens placed on it by the election of a new government with substantial power to make public policy for the District of Columbia. New laws are needed to assure that this new government is the instrument of the people and not of narrow economic interests by carefully regulating the extent to which money, or lack of it, will govern the outcome of elections.

The problem has two aspects. Not only should the impact of money be limited, but campaign finance legislation should make it possible for all serious candidates to make their voice heard and not be overwhelmed by lavish well-financed campaigns. A major purpose of this reform legislation will be to encourage competition focused on the issues, making it possible for all candidates, even those not favored by those with money, to have their say.

Briefly, let me outline some of the ways in which the current law leaves the way open for abuse:

There are no effective ceilings on campaign expenditures. The law does limit expenditures by a political committee to $100,000, but this applies to even relatively minor offices, and there is nothing to prevent a candidate from having multiple committees.

The current limitation on an individual contribution of $5,000 is excessively high, and because of drafting errors in the home rule bill is not applicable to mayor and city council races.

Labor unions and most corporations are allowed to make direct contributions to municipal elections. Federal law precludes such contribution in races for Federal office.

The financial reporting standards regarding contributions and expenditures do not require sufficiently detailed disclosures.

The frequency of filing of disclosure reports—5 days before and 30 days after an election—does not allow for adequate monitoring by opposing candidates and responsible Government agencies.

There is no independent enforcement mechanism to insure strick compliance and vigorous enforcement.

The campaign finance reform bill that I am introducing in general provides for the following:

Comprehensive disclosure of contributions and expenditures, together with regulation of political committees in the District of Columbia. In large measure, these standards are patterned after those in Federal law.

An independent District of Columbia Political Campaign Finance Commission, given overall responsibility for the administration and enforcement of local campaign finance laws.

Strict campaign spending and contribution ceilings, and limitations on cash contributions.

A system for public financing of campaigns through matching payments.

COMPREHENSIVE DISCLOSURES

Candidates for local office in the District of Columbia and their political committees will be required to make every aspect of their financial affairs a matter of public record. Each candidate will be required to designate in writing one committee as his central campaign committee. Though a candidate may have more than one committee operating in support of his candidacy, his central committee will be responsible for consolidating the financial reports of these other committees and monitoring the expenditures of the other committees for violations of the overall spending limitations. Every political committee will be required to register with the Commission at the point that it anticipates receiving contributions or making expenditures in excess of $100. Committee must file full disclosure reports on March 10, June 10, September 10, and 15 and 5 days before an election, as well as an annual report on January 31 of each year. Contributions in excess of $200 given within 5 days of an election must be reported within 48 hours. The disclosure reports, among other things, must include the name, address, and occupation of every contributor giving more than $50 in a year. Also, the report must disclose the name of every person to whom an expenditure in excess of $10 is made. A comprehensive definition of a "contribution" is set forth to include in-kind contributions and anything else of value.

Candidates for the Office of Delegate are exempt from these local filing requirements because they must make substantially identical filings under Federal law. This is also true under current law.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLITICAL CAMPAIGN FINANCE COMMISSION

The legislation would also create a Political Campaign Finance Commission, an independent Commission with authority and responsibility for administrating and enforcing the campaign finance law. The Commission would be composed of five members, not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party. Two members will be appointed by the Chairman of the Council, and three by the Mayor. The Commission would be completely independent and not subject to direction by any nonjudicial officer. The Commission will have the subpena power, and most importantly, the power to initiate, prosecute, defend, or appeal a court action in the name of the Commission to enforce the law.

The Commission will receive all campaign reports and registration statements. It shall have the duty of making such reports available for public inspection, and otherwise disseminating public information about campaign finances.

This authority is not given to the existing board of elections because the regulation of campaign finance requires a separate expertise substantially unrelated to questions of administering the technical details of carrying out an election. Further, the task calls for full-time attention that can only be diluted if mixed with separate responsibility over the mechanics of running the election itself.

FINANCE LIMITATIONS

This legislation contains strict limitations with respect to the role of money in political campaigns. These limitations, combined with public financing, will make it possible to conduct broadly financed campaigns. No single contributor will have predominate influence by virtue of his contribution. Nor will candidates be able to overwhelm opposition with lavishly financed campaigns. These measures, taken together, should enable every candidate to be heard, and no serious candidate to be silenced by the din of opposing campaigns. The following contribution limits by an individual are set: $900 in a calendar year for mayor or delegate; $500 for Chairman of the Council; $250 for Council or Board of Education candidates at large; and $100 for ward candidates for Council or Board and party offices. No candidate will be allowed to have spent in his behalf in a single election—primary and general election are separate elections—more than $90,000 for mayor or delegate, $50,000 for chairman of the Council, $25,000 for members of the Council or Board of Education at large, $10,000 for ward candidates and political party officials. These limits are intended to be a middle point between curbing unreasonable campaign expenditures and allowing ample spending to conduct vigorous campaigns that allow a candidate to take his message to the people. The figures will be readjusted periodically, under the legislation, to meet the demands of inflation.

In addition to these limits, no individual may expend or contribute more than $2,000 in a calendar year to District of Columbia elections.

Cash contributions of over $50 are prohibited. And corporations and labor unions are barred from making direct contributions to local elections, except to the extent that such contributions would be allowable under Federal law. This is intended to allow the so-called voluntary funds and direct communication to union members and stockholders of corporations on political matters.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MATCHING PAYMENT FUND

The legislation also provides for partial public financing of District of Columbia campaigns on a matching basis. This will make it possible for candidates to finance campaigns on a broad basis without having to appeal to monied special interests for substantial campaign support. A District of Columbia Matching Payment Fund is created out of sums appropriated from the District of Columbia budget. A candidate will be entitled to payments upon his becoming qualified to appear on the ballot and upon raising a threshold amount of money, which amount varies according to the importance of the office.

A candidate will be entitled to receive a matching payment to meet campaign expenses for every contribution he receives, except that only the first $50 given by a contributor in a calendar year can be matched. For example, if a contributor gives $20, the candidate will receive a $20 match. If the contribution is $175, only a $50 match will be tendered to the candidate. This has the effect of providing every incentive to seek moderate contributions, and preventing an unreasonable multiplier effect for large contributions.

It is somewhat difficult to calculate the cost of such a program because we have so little experience here in the District with financing local campaigns. Still, I have taken a stab at some rough calculations. Assuming that all races are contested by a large number of candidates who have some substantial capacity to raise private funds, the cost in public funds will be about $400,000 to $500,000 on an annual basis. It should drop off somewhat after the extraordinary circumstance of the first municipal election in over 100 years. My estimate is high. I suspect that the actual figure will be somewhat lower, given the difficulty of raising political funds on a broad base anywhere.

This legislation is not the complete answer, but it begins to bring elections down to manageable size, to give them some proportion, balancing the scales between the people and large political contributors.

If this legislation is enacted, as I believe it will be, we will have model law that will lead the way for other jurisdictions to clean up their own political mess.

While it may be several months before this law will go into effect, it is my intention to comply on a voluntary basis with every aspect of it applicable to the Delegate.

HER SABBATH PRAYER

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Gimbel, widower and father of a retarded daughter, has written a warm and courageous poem entitled "Her Sabbath Prayer." During these trying days in our Nation's life, we can take heart from Mr. Gimbel's courage for today and hope for tomorrow.

Mr. Gimbel's poem follows:

HER SABBATH PRAYER

(By David Gimbel)

I remember the treasure of our happy years,
But now is left only emptiness and tears.
Our home was aglow with love and with cheer
And we three had each other so precious and dear.

On the eve of the Sabbath the candles were in place,
And when they were lit I would look at her face,
She would silently pray to the Lord up above
That He watch over us with His kindness and love.

Then we kissed each other and each took his seat—
We never had much but our lives were complete.
Like the fallen snow the tablecloth so white
And everything around us was heavenly bright.

When the dinner was completed she pushed me towards the sink
And handed me a towel with a smile and a wink.
Togetherness is precious when two people share
And everything was done with such tenderness and care.

But suddenly one day the sun ceased to shine
And the most precious of jewels would no longer be mine.
I prayed and begged but on Yom Kippur Day
An angel from heaven just led her away.

So now I light the candles when the sun begins to set
And how many times my eyes are sad and wet!
But I shall carry on despite my pain and fear
So my retarded child shall still have her daddy dear.

VIETNAMESE ORPHANS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of one of two primary bills to facilitate adoption of Vietnamese orphans I believe the time has come for a full discussion through congressional hearings of the problems facing these children and their prospective adoptive parents.

My personal correspondence from Americans throughout the Nation and from social workers within Vietnam is overwhelmingly in favor of speeding the adoption of these innocent orphans who still suffer from the results of a war which we once considered our highest national priority.

However, from other branches of this Government I have received questions about the general advisability of Vietnamese-American adoptions. Over the next 3 days I am presenting a list of these points and rebuttals from "The Children," a book on Asian-American adoptions written in 1969 by Jan de Hartog. I am most grateful to Atheneum Publishers for granting permission to reprint these copyrighted excerpts:

SOME COMMON OBJECTIONS TO THESE ADOPTIONS

(By Jan de Hartog)

1. "ADOPTION IS NOT THE SOLUTION"

The first time I heard this one was in Saigon, during the summer of 1967. I had just come back to the hotel, sick to my stomach after visiting my first Vietnamese orphanage, haunted as I entered the lobby by the faces of dying infants in iron cots and by the vision of hundreds of toddlers lying apathetically on the hot concrete of the courtyard in the scorching sun, some masturbating in vacant boredom, one lapping his own urine to slake his thirst. On my way to the elevator a war correspondent whom I had met the day before invited me for a drink in the bar.

I had to do something to banish those images from my mind; this was as good a diversion as any. I followed him into the bar, crowded with officials and officers; there he introduced me to a man in his early forties, a government social worker whom I shall call Andrew Hopkins. The three of us had a drink together and talked about the war, the sufferings of the civilians, especially the children; soon I found myself telling the two men in terms that must have been fairly emotional what I had seen that afternoon. They listened courteously; when I had finished, the correspondent said, "I can imagine that what you saw must have upset you, but let me tell you that the place you have seen is nohing compared to . . ." and he mentioned an orphanage in another part of the city. "You are upset because you're new here," he added. "Once you have been in Vietnam for a few weeks you'll see things more objectively."

"But I don't want to see the suffering of these children objectively," I protested. "Only by looking at it subjectively can I hope to keep the sense of urgency I'll need if I want to get some of them out."

"How do you mean, out?" Hopkins asked.

I told him that I had come to Vietnam to trace sixty orphans under the age of three, allotted to our Quaker organization by the Vietnamese government after we had found families in the United States prepared to adopt them. I had expected him to be sympathetic to my mission, but he was not. "I'm sorry," he said, "but I'm afraid that what you are proposing is not merely pointless, it's wrong. I think it only fair to warn you that I will feel obliged to do whatever I can to stop you."

"Stop me?" I asked, incredulous. "Why?"

"For the simple reason that adoption is not the solution," he answered.

"The solution to what?"

"To the problem of the displaced and orphaned children of Vietnam," he answered patiently. "We are trying to do a professional job here against impossible odds. We are in a country with no welfare organization worth speaking of, riddled with corruption and nepotism, where at every turn you find some tollgate or somebody's cousin blocking the road. Our only hope is that we will eventually convince the Vietnamese that our way of dealing with these problems is efficient and humane; to achieve that we must not compromise our case by permitting private citizens like yourself to pick over the trash heaps, so to speak, and make off with one or two individual kids for adoptions, or for special treatment in a hospital in the States, or what have you . . ."

We sat in the bar for another hour. It was the first time I had encountered that argument, and I tried to reason with him. I knew myself how difficult it was to visualize any of these children as individuals. You never saw one of them alone, they always came in packs: swarming around a tank manned by soldiers distributing candy, shouting "Ho, ho, ho!" at an American sergeant dressed up as Santa Claus, waving little paper flags and singing in high-pitched voices in honor of visiting dignitaries. Even in a hospital bed they were not alone but forced to share it with two others, whether wounded, diseased, or dying; their numbers made it almost impossible to visualize them separately.

I knew this from experience. While still in America, I had found myself talking about "the " Vietnamese orphans and "the" foundlings of mixed parentage until in the end I felt as if I were working not for children of flesh and blood but for swarms of disembodied little ghosts undistinguishable one from another, countless identical little faces shouting voicelessly in my dreams. The only way to combat the hypnosis of their numbers, Marjorie and I discovered, was by becoming involved with them as persons on an everyday basis; we escaped from the spell of their numbers only after our own children arrived. Here in Vietnam the only people I had met so far who seemed to be able to consider the fate of one isolated child without the guilty feeling that they were meting out preferential treatment were the nuns who looked after the children in the orphanage I had just visited. But even the Mother Superior, who had left her office for an hour to accompany us through the wards, had seemed reluctant to allow one child to be singled out for salvation among the hundreds milling around her, as if she thought it more virtuous to let all of them perish in misery and deprivation than to permit one of them to get away. "Perish" was not too strong a word; the mortality rate of infants under eighteen months in the orphanages of Saigon was horrendous. Sixty doomed infants could be saved in this instance by placing them with American families for permanent adoption; to prevent their leaving the orphanage would literally condemn them to death. Certainly as many of them as possible should be helped, as soon as possible, but if sixty out of half a million were placed for adoption overseas it would neither retard that help by one second or take anything away from the others. On the contrary, seeing these adopted children in American communities might stir more private citizens in America to support such help, while to the orphanages it would mean sixty mouths less to feed. In my opinion, Andrew Hopkins had no case beyond the abstract maxim that all relief should be directed at the greatest good for the greatest number of people. To sabotage the saving of sixty children on that basis alone seemed indefensible.

But although he was courteous and patient and, once the drinks took effect, even amiable, he remained adamant in his determination to stop me. "Adoption is not the solution," he reiterated, stubbornly.

Maybe the Dubonnet we were drinking was stronger than I remembered, maybe it was the passion of the moment, but I must confess I quoted to him a line from William Blake's *Jerusalem*: "He who would do good to another must do it in minute particulars; general good is to the plea of the scoundrel, the hypocrite and the flatterer."

He took it with good grace, there never seemed to be any feeling of personal animosity toward me on his part. I was, to him, simply a well-meaning but dangerous dilettante about to corrupt the professional purity of his planning; he obviously had made a decision of conscience and a man's conscience is not up for revision during the cocktail hour. But at the time I still thought he could be convinced by arguments.

My last argument was, "The child I was looking for this afternoon is called Nguyen Xuan Phong. He is eighteen months old, a foundling, and the American doctor who saw him said that unless he was taken out of the orphanage within a week he would die. How would you feel toward someone who was trying to stop me if the child's name was not Xuan Phong but Andrew Hopkins?"

He smiled, rose to his feet and patted by shoulder. "Jolly good try," he said, then he winked at his friend and left, undaunted. Only later did I realize that I had tried to argue with an article of faith.

Should you encounter this argument yourself, you might as well realize before you start that you will never convince your opponent, not even by pointing out that, according to the theory that aid may only be given on the basis of the greatest good to the greatest number of people, Jesus' miraculous healings were impermissible demonstrations of preferential treatment. It is more than just a philosophical problem: why should one sufferer among the thousand be granted the grace of the Master's attention? Why Lazarus and not another?

We may never know the answer to that question, but at least one answer seems wrong: that for the sake of fairness the miracle shall be undone and its beneficiary thrown back among the sufferers. The reasoning that no man shall be granted the grace of Salvation unless all are saved makes sense only to a computer.

OIL HAS NO WINDFALL PROFITS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Dick West's editorial column in the Dallas Morning News always shows a commonsense viewpoint on issues facing our country. I would like to give my colleagues the opportunity to read this excellent editorial from the January 25 Dallas Morning News concerning the question of windfall profits:

THOSE "WINDFALL" PROFITS

It is time—past time, forsooth—to talk some sense about oil company profits. Little enough sense is being talked in Washington these days.

Scarcely does one know how to begin recounting the malignant acts lately imputed to the oil companies. They contrived the energy crisis so as to make "windfall profits." They are gouging the American energy-consumer with robber-baronish glee. Why not cut their water off? They have cut our oil off. And so the corollary proposals follow in frantic cadence: Let us roll back crude oil prices; let the Treasury confiscate all windfall profits; let Congress set up a federal corporation to sell oil at "reasonable" prices.

And so to the basic question: Are the companies really making a killing on the energy crisis? They are making money, this is certain. But a killing? A windfall profit? Not so.

A few basic facts, if you please: Oil has long been a profitable business, but not so profitable as we imagine. From 1963 to 1972, return on invested capital in the industry fell from 9.5 per cent to 7.4 per cent. Meanwhile, expense skyrocketed. In 20 years, the cost of finding a dollar's worth of oil reserves more than doubled. Yet government restraints on the price of oil and gas kept the industry from raising enough capital to finance an adequate number of exploration and expansion projects. The consequence: An energy shortage.

Comes 1973, and at last we find the companies earning lots of money; a 60 per cent increase in profits is what Exxon reported the other day. Frankly, we ought to be glad. Those profits are going to get us out of the energy shortage.

In a recent Wall Street Journal article, Dr. W. Phillip Gramm of Texas A&M draws a striking parallel. Before anyone found oil in America, Gramm points out, we relied on whale oil. But in the 1840s and '50s the whale supply became scarce; as it did, the price of whale oil rose rapidly—from 43 cents a gallon in 1823 to $1.45 a gallon by 1865.

What thereupon happened? Let Gramm tell it: "Rising prices caused consumers to act out of their own self-interest to economize the use of fuel. Rising prices gave an inducement for producers to increase output of whale and sperm oil through increases in investment, improvements in technology and increased labor output . . . It appears that rising prices caused output to increase perhaps by 1,000 percent. Meanwhile, Col. Drake had struck oil in Pennsylvania; the high price of whale oil gave crude-oil men the incentive to develop a cheaper source of energy.

That is how the free market works, and that is how it will work now if we let it. What is the oil industry doing with its windfall profits? Well, Exxon plans to increase capital expenditures 73 per cent this year; it proposes to find more oil, build bigger refineries. And very glad of it we should be.

Our oilmen are like the 19th-century whalers; until someone undercuts them with a cheaper energy source, they have a job to do, and they will assuredly do it—unless harpooned by the Captain Ahabs of the U.S. Congress.

THIS COULD HAPPEN IN YOUR CITY

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in the course of implementation of the Public Buildings Amendments Act of 1972

(Public Law 92-313) a situation has developed between the U.S. Postal Service and General Services Administration which is unexpected, unnecessary and unwarranted.

These two agencies in the past have endeavored to maintain a fair reciprocal balance in rentals. That is, on space controlled by GSA and used by the Postal Service, the rental payable to GSA would be in line with that charged to GSA for comparable quarters in a Postal Service building.

For fiscal year 1975 GSA has promulgated a new fee schedule at significantly higher rates than present charges. In Pocatello, Idaho, a city of 40,000, GSA increased the annual rental for postoffice space from $3.40 per square foot to $6.71, effective July 1, 1974. The postoffice, alleging they were encumbered with and paying for more space than was actually needed since completion of another postal facility in Pocatello, leased another building for considerably less money and made plans to move March 1, 1974.

There are points pro and con for both agencies. The Postal Service cannot be faulted for trying to economize wherever possible. General Services Administration understandably is anxious to realize the best possible revenue from the buildings under its management/control, and admittedly in some areas a reasonable increase in rentals is justified and overdue. On the other hand, rentals of necessity must be kept in line with comparable space in the immediate area if a landlord expects tenants to remain.

For Pocatello citizens and American taxpayers, however, the cold fact is that GSA, storekeeper for the Federal Government, is being left with a virtually unrentable building space at an annual loss of $36,000, while the Postal Service is paying out a yearly $5,000 to rent another facility and alleging it is "saving money"—for the Postal Service, but certainly not for you, for me, or for the taxpayers who must assume the double burden at a total outlay of more than $40,000.

I have met with officials of the Postal Service and General Services Administration several times in an effort to resolve the situation. I have written Postmaster General Klassen, OMB Director Ash, and President Nixon. My letter to the President follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 1974.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A serious problem has arisen in the City of Pocatello, Idaho which might well be repeated elsewhere in the nation. Pocatello has a population of more than 40,000, and is the largest city in my Congressional District.

In September 1973 the Postal Service decided to move from its Federal Building quarters in Pocatello to a less expensive, privately-owned facility. The new quarters are not as accessible, not as commodious, not as convenient for parking. However, a lease was signed November 11, 1973 and the post office plans to move March 1, 1974. The reason given for the transfer was that General Services Administration, under implementation of the Public Buildings Amendment of 1972, is promulgating a new fee schedule which will result in a greatly increased rental effective July 1, 1974. GSA claims the Postal Service has never made any formal request to negotiate, and in fact has reported to me that they (GSA) are in the process of reevaluating their rate schedules with a view to possible significant reductions in certain localities.

For Pocatello citizens and American taxpayers, the cold fact is that GSA, storekeeper for the federal government, is being left with a virtually unrentable building space at an annual loss of $36,000, while the Postal Service is paying out a yearly $5,000 to rent another facility and alleging it is "saving money"—for the Postal Service, but certainly not for the taxpayers who must assume this added burden, a total cost of more than $40,000.

What has happened in Pocatello may and very well could happen in other parts of the United States as a result of disagreement between two federal agencies—each striving to keep its finances in the black—resulting in an unrealistically high cost to the nation's taxpayers, primarily the middle income families who are already overburdened.

There must be a compromise, on both sides. Federal government offices admittedly have been getting an inexpensive ride for a long time. Inflationary cost of rentals and maintenance long ago caught up with private business, and have now made their impact felt on federal facilities.

GSA and the Postal Service must reevaluate their rates, however, on a more realistic local level. What is applicable in Brooklyn or Philadelphia certainly would not be appropriate or fair for Pocatello, Idaho or Wilson, North Carolina.

Mr. President, this should not be allowed to develop into a matter of contention between any agencies of the government which will result in disservice to the people—the taxpayers of the nation who support that government. This is a problem which must be resolved on a cooperative level for the greatest benefit of the public these agencies were created to serve.

I urge that you enjoin the Postal Service from removing its facility, and the General Services Administration from any increase in rates over FY 1974, until a complete review can be completed of all aspects of the matter and an acceptable compromise worked out.

Thank you for your attention.

Warm regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ORVAL HANSEN,
Member of Congress.

NO PAY INCREASE FOR CONGRESS

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution of disapproval concerning the President's recommendation with respect to executive, legislative, and judicial pay raises included in the fiscal year 1975 budget proposal. Unless we as Members of Congress act promptly, these salary increases will take effect in less than 30 days in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Salary Act of 1967.

The last pay increase was 5 years ago in 1969, and since then the cost of living as reflected by the consumer price index for all items has risen over 20 percent. The issue here is not whether we deserve an increase in pay, but whether we as the elected Members of Congress are going to set the tone for wage demands in 1974 by accepting this 7½ percent increase.

We already know that the United States is now in a dangerous inflationary spiral. I tell my colleagues, if the Members of Congress will not set an example for the people of America, then who will begin to cut the rate of inflation?

VEYSEY URGES SOLAR ENERGY PRIORITIES

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, we were today scheduled to take up legislation which deals with the more futuristic aspect of our struggle to find enough energy to meet this Nation's seemingly insatiable demands. The change in our floor schedule prompts me to suggest we can make this first step in the solar energy legislation a bit more effective with some minor changes. Solar energy has been to most Americans, one of those strange but never really get to know—a regular part of our life which is too close to really see analytically.

We think of the Sun as a blessing when it brightly turns a February freeze into a balmy early spring. But we do not really have the perspective to imagine the Sun running our cars, our machinery, or even see it providing us with hot water and space heat inside our homes. Yet, all of these are possible.

I have a particular appreciation for the potential of sun to provide domestic heat. In the earlier years of this century, when the California desert was growing and when I was growing up in it, and before we had "unlimited" modern power and fuels, the pioneers of the Southwest had their own unlimited power reserve. They heated their water, their homes, and their businesses with solar heat. With cumbersome, homemade, crude-looking but inexpensive contraptions, they turned sunshine into controlled domestic heating. And they were doing it at a fraction of today's heating expense in the same area.

Then prosperity and progress began to set in and the contraptions disappeared with the arrival of electric stoves and furnaces, and heaters of all kinds.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can all gain from the experiences of those early 1900's desert dwellers. They had exactly what we have today. A need for hot water and home heat—and a sun overhead ready to go to work. Of course, some of us have a greater need, and some of us have more sunshine. But it really is only a matter of degree. The key is to correlate the potential with the need, and I hope our legislative efforts will be so directed. The bill we were to consider today is a beginning. It gets us on the road.

But I would like to see us become much more specific and more program-oriented in this measure, and, in the future considerations.

I would like to see some priority programing and some projects authorized.

The most inexpensive solar energy use and one of our most needed is water heating. The Sun can heat water half as cheaply as electricity and just about at the same cost as gas at today's prices.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this most immediately available use of solar energy should be explored thoroughly and without delay. I believe that it should be our *top priority solar* development project and I believe that we should include it specifically in any solar energy program we develop, including this particular legislative effort.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, academia, science, and industry in southern California are involved in this very concept. Southern California Gas Co. and university scientists are working on the Cal Tech campus in Pasadena on a solar heating project which I can report looks extremely encouraging.

They believe that in the near future—and depending on the future price of gas—they can develop a solar converter which will fit into southern California homes, and which will take care of all water heating needs except on particularly cloudy days.

And they are especially enthused about the possibility of servicing apartments. There, efficiency would, in theory, be much greater.

The gas company would produce and install the units, renting them to the customer. Regular gas heating units would also remain in the homes to be used when overcast skies prevented adequate sunshine to operate the solar converters.

Right now, research funds would greatly assist this worthy project along. Cal Tech is requesting grant funds and I am urging that they be awarded such financing. But many more such projects could be undertaken if we in the Congress make them a top priority.

Another especially attractive potential for solar energy is in the heating of space and water in mobile homes. Mobile homes first have limited cubic feet to heat. Second, they have a metal shell in most cases which would be more conducive to heat than stationary homes.

Third, mobile homes are becoming more and more common. They accounted for some 20 percent of our new housing starts in the Nation in the past year. Mobile homes are especially popular in the South—where, by coincidence, there is an abundance of sunshine.

Finally, the mobile home industry itself is interested in helping develop solar energy. They, of course, would like to advertise their product as energy-efficient, and therefore, will be a more than enthusiastic partner with the Government and with science in developing this potential.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of projects we must become involved in and we must do so with a rifle shot approach—not a scattergun blast.

Again, priorities must be established.

First, should be the most readily usable and most promising use of solar energy—as a replacement for gas in the heating of water. This is the area where solar energy today can compete on an economic level with our current technology and with our current prices. And it is twice as economical in this context as is electricity.

Second, as a space heating component, solar energy requires more adaptation than gas or electricity—but it is not a major adaptation. Given new technology or higher prices—solar energy could very well become a mainstay in our home heating systems.

Third, cooling by solar energy is a little further down the line. It will take more work. Still, it is within reach, and deserves a specific research effort.

Finally, within sight, but far down the line, is the conversion of solar energy to electricity.

Right now, this would be prohibitively expensive.

Mr. Speaker, these kinds of projects, and this set of priorities would make this legislation and all of our legislative efforts in this field of solar energy much more incisive and much more efficient.

The legislation in question and which we will soon consider is on the right track, and I intend to support it and similar efforts.

However, I hope that when we begin to implement this legislation, and when we write future legislation, we can sharpen our cutting edge and set some priorities, some goals, and some concepts in hard language.

In that context I intend to suggest some specifics which I believe would fit neatly and constructively into the bill authorized by my good friend and colleague, Mr. MCCORMACK.

I will propose development of a priority schedule for research and development, ranking specific solar energy uses by their capacity to contribute to our immediate energy supplies, and committing us to intensify our research and development effort, and to provide necessary funding for those projects which demonstrate the best chance to contribute quickly to our energy needs. My proposals will be geared to the concept of becoming energy self-sufficient by 1980.

I offer these proposed amendments for your consideration:

SECTION 15

The Administrator of this Act shall be responsible for the enforcement of the following provisions;

(1) Developmental efforts under this Act shall be assigned a schedule of priorities, concentrating available funds and project resources on the most immediately commercially feasible solar energy uses.

(2) Research and development efforts under this legislation and the priorities assigned to solar energy uses shall be determined in part by the availability of private funds and the extent of private industry interest in specific projects.

(3) A schedule for development of solar energy and the establishment of annual goals for progress and annual standards for expanding solar energy's contribution as a percentage of our total energy needs shall be defined within six months after passage of this Act.

(4) This priority schedule shall be keyed to the goal of achieving energy independence by the year 1980.

(5) All priorities, goals, and schedules established under this provision, and progress in attaining those goals shall be reported annually to the Congress through the appropriate Congressional Committee.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Committees is making a valiant attempt to revise, modernize, and reform the committee structure of this body. I know the committee has labored long and hard to produce their working report of December 7. Yet, I find the committee has made one significant omission in their preliminary report. They made no provision for a Small Business Committee and it is essential the House has one.

We need a Small Business Committee for two seemingly contradictory reasons. First, small business in aggregate represents a huge segment of the American economy whose interests must be represented. And, second, small business is composed of the little guy down the street who needs Government protection because he lacks an organized or powerful lobby to push his interests and concerns.

Small business represents about 40 percent of the GNP; it provides 50 percent of the Nation's employment; and, it constitutes 95 percent of all businesses. These are facts which cannot be ignored. The small business community has a huge impact on the economy which must receive consideration in congressional deliberations. It is all well and good to argue that committees now take into consideration the small business impact in work on various legislation. Yet, as a practical matter we must recognize that just does not happen and there is no reason to believe it will. A Small Business Committee is the only means to bridge this gap.

A segment of the economy so large also needs a committee due to the number and variety of problems and Federal actions which affect it. Other committees could not possibly hope to fully explore this area, let alone produce balanced and cross sectional recommendations and acts. We can only hope a full fledged Small Business Committee with adequate resources can do the job.

Small businessmen by their very nature are independent and not susceptible to organization. Rather than embracing Government, they have stayed away wanting only to be left in peace. While this philosophy is commendable, the result has been numerous "little guys" standing by themselves unable to withstand predatory big Government and big business.

Because they are small, there is a pressing need for a single forum and single committee for them to air problems and get action. Small business simply cannot fight the large interests for even time to be heard. A Small Business Committee will guarantee access.

In a sense, small business interests are essentially negative—some of us feel that "negative" is actually positive in this case. They ask the Government for practically nothing and repay what they get with interest. Their thrust is to get Government and big business off their backs, so they can compete in a free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, the House needs a Small Business Committee desperately. Let us give the little guy who supports breadwinners for over 100 million Americans and asks for practically nothing, a chance to receive real consideration by the Federal body most representative of the people.

RALPH R. BARTELSMEYER

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 25, Ralph R. Bartelsmeyer, Deputy Highway Administrator, U.S. Department of Transportation, died following hospitalization for treatment of a heart ailment.

A close friend of mine, Ralph Bartelsmeyer had been one of the outstanding highway engineers and administrators in the Nation. An expert in transportation problems. Ralph Bartelsmeyer's death takes from this Nation an individual whose talents and abilities will be sorely missed during the energy crisis.

Ralph Bartelsmeyer was not only competent, dependable, and able. He retained that special human touch that few people possess. No problem, however complex, was so large that Ralph Bartelsmeyer lost sight of the importance of dealing with people in a straightforward, honest fashion. Ralph Bartelsmeyer was one of the most trusted and respected men in public life.

A former resident of Belleville and Nashville, Ill., Ralph Bartelsmeyer was the St. Clair County superintendent of highways from 1948 to 1953. He then served as chief engineer of the Illinois Highway Department for 10 years.

After holding the State position for nearly 10 years he was a vice president and consulting engineer for H. W. Lochner and Co., with its principal office in Chicago. He assumed his Federal position in 1969.

Born near Hoyleton in Washington County, Mr. Bartelsmeyer had been engaged in highway work ever since his graduation from the University of Illinois in 1931.

He started his career in a district office of the Illinois Highway Department, then served as the Washington County superintendent of highways and later was a field engineer for the late Marquette Cement Co. His appointment as the St. Clair County superintendent of highways followed.

He was a past president of the Illinois Association of County Superintendents of Highways, the American Association of State Highway Officials, and the American Road Builders Association. He was a member of the Illinois Society of Professional Engineers since 1942.

Surviving are his widow, the former Marjorie Shirley; two sons, Fred Bartelsmeyer, 30 North Cape Court, Belleville; and Karl Bartelsmeyer, Carbondale; two brothers, Clarence Bartelsmeyer, Ferguson, Mo.; and Dr. Erwin Bartelsmeyer, Taylorville, Ill.; and six grandchildren.

THE FEDERAL PAPERWORK BURDEN RELIEF ACT

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to quench the thirst for information that has developed among Federal bureaucrats who want to run the economy from Washington. In particular, Congress must take action to protect American small businessmen, independent farmers, and self-employed individuals from redtape imposed by a Government more concerned with shuffling papers than with providing services.

I am today cosponsoring legislation entitled "The Federal Paperwork Burden Relief Act." It is a simple bill, designed for prompt action to bring a ridiculous situation under control. One recent survey observed that the Government now requires some form or report from these businessmen every 15 days, and this is in a free enterprise economy.

My bill directs the General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, to investigate Federal paperwork requirements. After this investigation, which shall take no more than 1 year, the GAO is to report its findings and recommendations to Congress for subsequent legislative action.

Although it is not specified in the bill, I would expect the GAO to give particular attention to the requirements of the Economic Census of Business being conducted by the Bureau of the Census. The reports required under this project are too lengthy, too detailed, too complex, too confusing, and require specialists to fill them out. Taken together with forms and reports required by the Internal Revenue Service, the Federal Trade Commission, Social Security, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and other Federal, State, and local agencies, the total reporting requirements are time consuming and expensive.

The resulting paperwork burden is also counterproductive if the role of these Government agencies is to improve opportunities for small business within our free enterprise economy, as I believe that role should be. Small businesses cannot hire full-time accountants to handle the full-time paper shuffling imposed by Government. A recent survey by the National Federation of Independent Business, an organization which has endorsed this bill, showed that in 94 percent of the firms surveyed the owner and his or her small staff are directly involved in filling out these many forms. Only 6 percent of these small business firms can afford the luxury of independent accountants to do the work.

Of necessity, the time spent on these forms must be taken from the time these businessmen should be spending serving their customers. There is something very basic and very wrong about this in a free enterprise economy.

In looking for someone to blame for all this, Congress does not have to look very far. The mountains of regulatory legislation enacted over the last four decades have led directly to the situation we face today. Armed with this legislation, Federal bureaucrats have issued regulation after regulation, each requiring one or more forms showing compliance. In 1972, it cost the small business community $18 billion to handle the estimated 10 billion sheets of paper required in Federal reports.

No wonder our small businessmen, farmers and self-employed professionals are increasingly leary of "big brotherism" in Government. They represent the cornerstone of our system of private enterprise, and we are burying them in paper.

Congress is initially responsible for this, and now Congress must own up to this responsibility and sweep away this glut of paper. This bill is a start.

In addition, we must remember how this came about and not let it happen again. I would suggest that any future legislative proposal be accompanied by what might be termed a "paperwork impact statement" showing the estimated time and costs involved in any Federal reporting requirements. Any such requirements should be simplified and standardized across agency lines.

Our people are being separated from their Government by a layer of paper. It is time to cut it away and allow the Government to serve the people rather than forcing the people to satisfy the curiosity of every bureaucrat.

THE DESIGNATION OF A HOLIDAY HONORING THE LIFE AND WORK OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have once again introduced a bill which would designate the 15th of January of each year as a national holiday honoring Dr. Martin Luther King.

I have reintroduced H.R. 8497 again in order to reemphasize the need for the United States to symbolically reaffirm its commitment to civil rights and equality.

Much of the harm which resulted from segregation and discrimination came from the idea that Negro Americans did not count as part of the American public.

This idea is poisonous. It is the type of thing that makes it seem that the U.S. Government is not the Government of all the people. It reverses Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

The Congress of the United States can, by the simple gesture of enacting this legislation, give the lie to any contention that black Americans do not count in our history or in our present.

We all know that in all the emotional storms of our history which threatened the stability of the public, whether it involved farm groups, the South after the Civil War, the right of any man to become President despite his religion, that the energy for such spasms came from the idea that the majority of the people was indifferent to some of the people.

I have offered this legislation to counteract the feeling of Americans committed to civil rights that they and their cause have been forgotten. The designation of such a holiday is merely the recognition of what most Americans already know, that Martin Luther King was an authentic American hero who inspired not only his own country, but the world as well.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER MARTHA DOLENGA OF STERLING HEIGHTS, MICH.

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, Martha Marie Dolenga of Sterling Heights, Mich., recently won third place in the Michigan Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Contest. The V.F.W. is certainly to be commended for this fine tradition of promoting good citizenship in this fashion, and I am naturally pleased to have a resident of the 18th District of Michigan as one of the winners. I commend Miss Dolenga's very excellent statement to the attention of my colleagues, which follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

(By Martha Marie Dolenga)

Not gold, but only man can make
A people great and strong
Men who stand for truth and honor's sake
Stand fast and suffer long.

Brave men who work while other's sleep
Who dare while other's fly ...
They build a nation's pillars deep
And lift them to the sky.

Ralph Waldo Emerson's poem inspires a pattern for my role as a citizen and its responsibilities. In Math I learned the whole is equal to the sum of its parts: thus, our country's strength depends on the contribution of every citizen. The United States can only be as good—or as bad—as the citizens entrusted with self-government. We must treasure the rights our forefathers established and accept the responsibilities that come with them.

The pillars of our nation are implanted in a strong base. I am proud to know that I am now a part of this structure. I want to add the same quality of substance so that future generations will continue to build upon a firm foundation.

How can I do this? The pattern suggested by the poem implies four ways. First, the individual must stand for truth and honor. To accomplish this we must lift our eyes above the doubt and fear that may surround us and hold fast to our great expectations. This will give us hope and maintain our faith in the future of our country.

Second, each of us must be a part of creating a people great and strong. Let's start in our own community. We can reach out with an open heart and extend an open hand to our neighbors. Let us give of ourselves. Let us accept each person for what he is and recognize his goodness. Let us respect the rights of others and obey the laws.

Third, a good citizen must work while others sleep. Be aware and interested in current events. Form an opinion and express it. Exercise the privilege of voting—the ballot is the strongest power of the people and the best way for us to voice our views. In these ways we will be working to build pillars of strength while others sleep.

Finally, citizens who would put their dreams into action must dare while others fly. We must venture to try our ideas so that our country will continue to grow with the changing times.

I asked myself, What am I *really* doing to fulfill my responsibility as a good citizen? I am trying to be an example of my beliefs. I strive to give a little of myself each day to those around me. I am concerned with the events happening at my school, in our community, in the nation and the world and try to keep informed about them. I express my opinions to others. I have a deep pride in my home and work to keep up its appearance.

Becoming a good citizen is a growing process—like a flower it takes time to develop from a tiny seed to its fullest bloom. My ideas and beliefs have grown from the seed planted by my mother and father, sisters and brother, teachers and people around me. The responsibilities of a good citizen have developed through the years and now the flower appears. I shall always try to be a strong part of the whole and to give of myself to the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Not gold, but only I can make
A people great and strong
I will stand for truth and honor's sake
Stand fast and suffer long.

I will work while others sleep
And dare while other's fly
I will help to build a nation's pillars deep
And lift them to the sky.

SEVERE ECONOMIC CRISIS IN GREECE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, a very important statement came out of Greece a few weeks ago.

The value of this document will be enhanced if its importance is appreciated here in the U.S. Congress.

The author of the statement is George Mavros, the respected, pro-Western leader of the Center Union, the largest political party before the 1967 coup. Mr. Mavros is also the former head of the Bank of Greece and a keen economic analyst.

The Mavros statement on the present economic crisis in Greece deserves our close attention. Events in Greece inevitably affect American interests in Europe and the Mediterranean, as well as our standing with the Greek people.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. GEORGE MAVROS

The attempt to face the country's crucial economic situation with measures such as those announced recently reveals a total lack of knowledge of both the nature and causes of our financial problems. At a time of soaring inflation, created by the economic policies of the past seven years, the second, within two months, drastic and unexpected official raise in fuel and electricity prices well beyond the level of international fluctuations in petrol prices, will further aggrevate the existing rate of inflation, with dramatic effects on the population's working conditions and living standards. The chain reaction sparked off by these spasmodic measures is already evident, just a few days after their announcement. They will lead, with mathematical certainty, to heavy price index increases and simultaneous decreases in the purchasing power and employment level of the population.

Unquestionably, the international economic crisis could not but influence the Greek economy. The acuteness, however, of the present economic crisis in Greece is the direct result of domestic causes, and in particular the reckless inflationary policies of the period 1967–1973. During these seven years, the public debt rose from 32 to 100 billion drachmae, budgetary expenditure from 38 to 98 billion drachmae, imports from $1,153 million to $4 billion, the trade deficit from $749 million to $2,750 million and the foreign exchange commitments of the economy from $1,129 million to over $3 billion, weakening the economy to such an extent that the international economic crisis found it in a state of disintegration. While all western countries were taking in time measures to face the oncoming storm, Greece persisted in following a policy designed to encourage consumer spending and inflation; the only measures taken were the reformulation of the price index on a basis designed to conceal price rises.

It is the consequences of such policies that the Greek people are asked to pay for now. The excessive rise in petrol prices sentences tens of thousands of small and medium-sized businesses to decay and extinction.

To face the crucial situation of the country's economy, it is obviously not sufficient to enact spasmodic measures concocted on the spur of the moment, which can only aggravate, rather than improve, the situation. What is needed is an integrated system of economic policy and a series of urgent measures to curb inflation and gradually restore the sick organism of the economy to health.

Success in this task presupposes the cooperation of the people as a whole. Such a cooperation will never be achieved through concentration camps, martial law and press censorship. A nation can no longer be governed by the whip. The people must be kept fully informed as to the current state of the economy and the necessity of the measures required to solve existing problems. This is exactly what is happening today in all western countries, the sole exception being Greece, where the people are kept in the dark, each time caught by surprise by the spasmodic measures sprung upon them. Such tactics can only lead them to despair, thus creating the conditions for an acute social upheaval with unforseen consequences.

It must be understood by all that the economic laws are implacable. And far more powerful than tanks. They revenge themselves inexorably on whoever disregards them. The present national crisis can be handled successfully only by a Government respecting the people and enjoying its full confidence. And such a Government can only be a Government of national unity and wide democratic acclaim.

CHARLES H. WILSON

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I wish to recognize and commend the distinguished record of a colleague who has taken an assertive role in so many issues vital to black Americans.

CHARLES H. WILSON of California's 31st District has demonstrated his strong concern for the black community for six terms in the Congress, and I have had the opportunity to observe this commitment as a fellow member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

CHARLES H. WILSON of California has worked closely with my colleagues of the Black Caucus; on more than 50 major rollcall votes of the House in 1973, he has staunchly supported our position.

On almost every issue that counts to black Americans, CHARLES H. WILSON of California has respected and met the legitimate needs and expectations of his black constituents.

KEY VOTES

On the following key notes affecting the black community CHARLES H. WILSON voted with the Congressional Black Caucus each time:

Rollcall 32.—H.R. 4278 amends the National School Lunch Act to assure that Federal assistance to each child is maintained for child nutrition programs for the coming fiscal year. March 5, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 45.—H.R. 71 strengthens and improves the Older Americans Act. March 13, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 108.—S. 50 strengthens and improves the Older Americans Act. Voted to concur in the Senate amendment to the less liberal House amendment. April 18, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 169.—H.R. 7806 extends through June 30, 1974, appropriations in the Public Health Service Act, Community Mental Health Centers Act, and the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act. May 31, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 190.—H.R. 7935 increases the minimum wage rates. Expands the coverage to include thousands of domestic workers as well as youths. June 6, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 255.—Amendment that would permit individuals to bring suit against the Legal Services Corporation and recover costs in case of favorable rulings. This was clearly aimed at reducing the number of suits filed by legal services attorneys for fear of costs being levied against them if they lost the suit. June 21, 1973, "no."

Rollcall 262.—H.R. 7824. Final pasage of the Legal Services Corporation bill. June 21, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 271.—H.R. 8825, providing for appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. June 22, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 287.—House Resolution 455, provides appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies including the Office of Economic Opportunity and Headstart programs. June 26, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 290.—H.R. 8877. Amendment to the HEW and Labor appropriations bill which seeks to reduce funds for OEO. June 26, 1973, "no."

Rollcall 291.—H.R. 8877. Amendment to the HEW and Labor appropriations bill seeking to reduce funds in 26 sections of the bill. June 26, 1973, "no."

Rollcall 292.—H.R. 8877. Amendment to HEW and Labor appropriations bill seeking to increase funds for bilingual education programs. June 26, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 294.—H.R. 8877. Amendment to HEW and Labor appropriations bill which seeks to reduce funds in 26 sections of the bill by $600 million. June 26, 1973, "no."

Rollcall 295.—H.R. 8877. On final passage of the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and other agencies including the Office of Economic Opportunity and Headstart program. June 26, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 395.—H.R. 9360. Passage of the Foreign Assistance Act which includes $30 million for famine and disaster relief to the African Sahel. July 25, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 428.—Conference report in bill to increase the minimum wages. August 3, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 430.—S. 1888 to amend the Agriculture Act to assure consumers of plentiful supplies of food and fiber at reasonable prices. August 3, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 441.—H.R. 8547. To amend the Export Administration Act to protect the domestic economy from drain of scarce materials and commodities and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. September 6, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 449.—A vote to override the President's veto of the emergency medical services bill providing assistance in planning, research, and training projects for systems for the effective provision of emergency health care services. September 2, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 450.—H.R. 7974. To amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations. September 12, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 455.—H.R. 9639. Amendment to the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Act to delete the section of the bill which raises reimbursement by the Federal Government for school lunches from 8 cents per lunch to 10 cents. September 13, 1973, "no."

Rollcall 456.—H.R. 9639. Amendment to the School Lunch Act to provide additional Federal financial assistance to the school lunch and school breakfast programs. September 13, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 459.—H.R. 8070. Conference report to authorize grants for vocational rehabilitation services. September 18, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 465.—A vote to override the Presidential veto of the minimum wage bill. October 3, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 483.—H.R. 981. Revision of the Immigration Act which would allow the entrance of political refugees from all countries including Haiti. September 26, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 495.—Amendment to the Urban Mass Transportation Act to delete provisions for Federal funding of operating expenditures of mass transportation systems. October 3, 1973, "no."

Rollcall 496.—Amendment to the Urban Mass Transportation Act to increase the total amount authorized for assistance. October 3, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 512.—H.R. 9682. To provide self-government for the District of Columbia. October 10, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 544.—H.R. 10586. To authorize use of health maintenance organizations in providing health care. October 23, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 552.—H.R. 10956, the Emergency Medical Services Systems Act of 1973. October 25, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 560.—H.R. 8219. Authorizes the President to extend special privileges and immunities to the Organization of African Unity. November 6, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 561.—H.R. 10937. Extends the life of the Watergate grand jury. November 6, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 563.—House Joint Resolution 542. Override of President Nixon's veto of the War Powers Act limiting the capacity of the President to introduce, employ, or commit U.S. Armed Forces into hostile areas. November 7, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 564.—H.R. 11104. Adoption of an increased temporary limit on the public debt without consideration of an immediate 7-percent social security increase for the elderly. November 7, 1973, "no."

Rollcall 577.—H.R. 8916 appropriates funds for certain Federal agencies including the Commission on Civil Rights, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and Small Business Administration. November 13, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 592.—H.R. 11333 provides for a 7-percent increase in social security benefits beginning in March 1974, payable in April, and an additional 4-percent raise beginning in June 1974, payable in the July 1974 check. November 15, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 601.—H.R. 11010. Amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS) to increase funds for manpower training. November 28, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 602.—H.R. 11010. Passage of the Comprehensive Manpower Act. Programs under this act include public employment services, opportunities industrialization centers, and Office of Economic Opportunity job training programs. November 28, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 605.—H.R. 11579. Amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) to restore funds cut from the race relations and equal opoprtunity programs of the Department of Defense. November 29, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 622.—H.R. 8877, approves funding for Headstart, Office of Economic Opportunity programs and Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. December 5, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 631.—H.R. 7130 provides for a budgetary control system in the Congress with strong anti-impoundment provisions. December 5, 1973, "yes."

Rollcall 634.—House Joint Resolution 735, confirming the nomination of GERALD R. FORD to be Vice President of the United States, "no."

Rollcall 662.—H.R. 11450. Amendment to the Energy Emergency Act to prohibit the allocation of fuel for busing. December 13, 1973, "no."

Rollcall 669.—H.R. 11450. Amendment to the Energy Emergency Act to permit the allocation of fuel for school-board-ordered busing. December 14, 1973, "yes."

SPONSORED LEGISLATION

In his 11 years of service to the Congress and to California's 31st District, CHARLES WILSON has established a distinguished record of introducing and supporting legislation which has directly affected the black community. During his sixth term in office, he has authored or cosponsored over 70 measures of vital concern to black Americans.

Among them:

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

H.R. 9640. Establishment of an American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress.

CHILD WELFARE

H.R. 6819. Establishment of a National Center on Child Development and Abuse Prevention.

H.R. 10167. The Runaway Youth Act, establishing program for housing, psychiatric, medical, and counseling care for transient youths.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

H.R. 1279. Requirement that individuals be appraised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies.

H.R. 1281. To protect the constitutional rights of civilian employees of the U.S. Government.

H.R. 2200. Free Flow of Information Act.

H.R. 6211. Continued operation of the Legal Services program.

H.R. 7762. Confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, inquiries, and other requests from the Bureau of the Census.

H.R. 10181. Governing the disclosure of certain financial information by financial institutions to governmental agencies.

H.R. 12267. Prohibiting discrimination by any party to a federally related mortgage transaction on the basis of sex or marital status.

H.R. 12268. Implementing the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

H.R. 4. To open meetings of Government agencies and of congressional committees to the public.

H.R. 1283. To provide for no-cost letter mail to Senators and Representatives.

H.R. 9004. To provide no-cost letter mailing to the President, Vice President, and Federal executive departments.

House Resolution 472. To provide toll-free telephone service for calls to the district offices of Congressmen.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

H.R. 2932. Definition of food supplements in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

H.R. 12089. Unit Price Act.

H.R. 12090–12094. To provide consumers with accurate information in package labeling as to name and address of manufacturer, packer, and distributer, perishable or semiperishable foods, date of manufacturing, and ingredients.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

H.R. 6317. Creation of a Federal Disaster Insurance Corporation.

H.R. 6904. Establishment of a national program of Federal insurance against catastrophic disasters.

H.R. 7240. Establishment of emergency communications facilities.

ECONOMY

H.R. 4820. One-year extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act.

H.R. 8621. Equitable rents under the economic stabilization program.

EDUCATION

H.R. 4189. Tutorial and instructional services for homebound or handicapped children.

H.R. 6332. Extension of the Public Health Services Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act and Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act.

H.R. 7818. Improvement of the Adult Education Act.

H.R. 8312. Development of youth camp safety programs.

ELECTION REFORM

H.R. 9642. Voter registration through the Postal Service.

EMPLOYMENT

H.R. 1418. Public service employment for unemployed persons.

H.R. 3987. Public service employment program.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

H.R. 6567. Congressional control of the Office of Economic Opportunity reorganization.

House Concurrent Resolution 174. Continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

HEALTH

H.R. 2222. Voluntary health insurance for medical, hospital, and dental care.

H.R. 7440. Expansion of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases.

H.R. 7733. Authorization of health maintenance organizations to provide health care.

H.R. 7091. Payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for optometrists' services and eyeglasses.

H.R. 11126. Appropriations for the nutrition program for the elderly in the Older Americans Act.

H.R. 11470. To limit the medicare inpatient hospital deductible to present or lower rate.

IMPOUNDMENT

H.R. 3943. To prohibit the President from impounding any funds without the consent of the Congress.

House Resolution 242. Authorization for Congressman to sue on behalf of the House because of the President's illegal impoundment of funds.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

H.R. 936. Establishment of an institute for continuing studies of juvenile justice.

H.R. 8402. Compensation to victims of crime.

H.R. 10440. To prohibit harassing telephone calls made to collect alleged debts, and to inform the public of their rights to be free from harassing, coercive, abusive and obscene telephone calls.

H.R. 11520. Establishing a National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape and provide financial assistance for a research and demonstration program into the causes, consequences, prevention, and treatment of rape.

MILITARY AFFAIRS

H.R. 7857. Reemployment rights of members and former members of the U.S. Armed Forces.

H.R. 10869. Prohibiting the inclusion of certain information on discharge certificates.

PENSION REFORM AND SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 3883 and 3884. Revision of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

H.R. 3886. Improvement of the Older American's Act of 1965.

H.R. 4564. Reduced time qualifications for old-age and disability insurance benefits.

H.R. 4887. Require State to not consider social security increases in determining eligibility for other assistance programs.

H.R. 5358. Revision of the system for Federal match funding to State for social services assistance.

H.R. 7092. Remove limitation on the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security.

H.R. 7093. To increase the lump-sum death payment to $750.

H.R. 7097. Inclusion of qualified prescription drugs under the hospital insurance program.

H.R. 8019. Delete 10-percent limitation provision to States for social services payment to the aged, blind, and disabled.

H.R. 9097. Free or reduced airline rates for handicapped persons and for individuals 65 years or older.

H.R. 9381. Half-fare for elderly people on common carriers during nonpeak travel periods.

House Resolution 226. Opposition to the curtailment of medicare and medicaid program benefits.

H.R. 12365. Establishing a program of food allowance for older Americans.

TAX REFORM

H.R. 851. Extension of full tax benefits of income splitting to unmarried persons.

H.R. 1040. Broadening the income tax base, equity among taxpayers, reform of the income and estate tax provisions.

H.R. 6353. Tax deductions for theft losses, on costs for theft protection and for the medical or funeral expenses of crime victims.

H.R. 7095. Full deduction of medical expenses incurred for the care of individuals 65 or older.

H.R. 7096. Personal exemption for a

dependent over 65 without regard to the dependent's income.

H.R. 12425. To provide for income averaging in the event of downward fluctuations in income.

VETERANS

H.R. 1493. Prevent reduction of veteran's pensions because of increased social security benefits.

H.R. 4751. Certain social security increases be disregarded in determining pension.

H.R. 6195. Veterans disability rates and construction of veterans hospitals.

H.R. 9147. No time limit on veterans' educational benefits.

H.R. 9148. Emergency treatment of veterans in private hospitals.

H.R. 9706. Sixty-day military privileges and health benefits to former military members.

WOMEN'S WORK—AND PAY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the conventional wisdom of our day acknowledges that women, on the average, make less than men are paid for the same work. Often such comparisons are made in professions where women traditionally have been denied employment. Supposedly, as more women enter fields that historically have been male domains, the average salaries for men and women with the same experience and training in these fields will approach equality.

A recent study by Bruce Bosworth, of St. John's University, upsets this sanguine assumption. Professor Bosworth compared the earnings of women and men working at occupations in which women were the majority. Again, given the same experience and training levels, women earned far less than men.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following article on the Bosworth study. It was written by the Washington Post's William Chapman and appeared in the February 4 edition of the Post:

WOMEN'S WORK—AND PAY

(By William Chapman)

Everybody knows that female accountants make less money, on the average, than male accountants. On the average, women bus drivers earn less than men drivers, saleswomen less than salesmen. And when the first women break into pro baseball, they will earn, on the average, less than the men.

The *averages* have been used for years now in the working woman's quest for equality. A very large share of that differential in earnings, it is argued, is sheer discrimination.

The counter-argument goes something like this: Averages are deceptive and the difference in average earnings between men and women is not sex discrimination. In most jobs, men and women of comparable education and abilities are paid comparable salaries. The difference is principally due to the woman's shorter work experience. Women have only recently entered the man's world to do such things as drive buses. They have not had time to step up the pay grades that men have. Women have been more apt to enter, leave, and re-enter the job market as they became worker, then mother, and then worker again. So, on the average, they earn less.

That has a sensible ring to it until you consider those fields which women have long dominated. Women have been teachers and nurses and social workers a lot longer than men. So, one would expect, following the work-experience theory, that their average earnings would be greater than men's or that at least they would have achieved parity. As you may have guessed, it isn't so.

The first hard look at those occupations historically dominated by women is an intriguing paper written by an assistant professor of quantitative analysis at St. John's University, Bruce Bosworth. Using 1970 census data, he compared the average earnings of professional men and women in five occupations. Women were a large majority in each. And their average earnings were anywhere from 22 to 33 per cent less than their male counterparts.

There is the case, for example, of professional librarians, archivists and curators. Eighty per cent of them are women. Their educational training differs from men by about a half-year of schooling. Yet men, on the average, earn 27.5 per cent more than women in that group of occupations. Males earned an average of $8,062, women only $5,843.

Then there are the nurses (descendants of Clara Barton, remember) and dietitians. Almost 95 per cent of the people in those occupations are women. But the men make a third more than they do. On the average, a male nurse or dietitian earns $8,235 a year and the woman only $5,514. Perhaps the men have gone to school longer or have received more training. Hardly. The difference in education is measured at about seven-tenths of one year.

It is the same picture for health technologists, social workers, recreation workers. Women are in the majority and the difference between them and men in educational background is hardly consequential.

Finally, there are the teachers. If any profession in America has been sterotyped as women's work, it is teaching. In the last decade, as salaries improved, a lot of men found they moved in on the field. Still, 71 per cent of all teachers today are women. Yet men, on the average, earn 31 per cent more money. The average man's salary is $8,684, the woman's $5,948.

Professor Bosworth, in short, pretty much demolishes the notion that in her own field, given comparable training and experience, the woman will find equality. It isn't the case of woman suffering in what has always been a man's world, which is how even the more sympathetic experts have explained it all away before. The net of it is that women get the short end, even when they're doing what they're always told to do, which is to stick to women's work.

OVERSEA CREDIT UNIONS STILL THE SERVICEMAN'S BEST FRIEND

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1967, when branches of American credit unions opened in various military installations overseas, servicemen were paying interest rates on the average of 36 percent to borrow funds for new cars. Some companies were charging interest rates as high as 100 percent on short-term personal loans. Because of the high interest rates thousands of servicemen were in debt far beyond their capacity to repay and this caused a severe problem among our Armed Forces overseas.

When the credit unions opened their doors and charged a maximum interest rate of only 12 percent for unsecured loans and in many cases a rate as low as 9 percent for automobile loans, servicemen were quick to realize that the credit unions were the answer to many of their financial problems.

Today the overseas credit unions are still providing much needed financial services for their men and women in uniform. Although some servicemen still borrow money at extremely high interest rates from other lenders, it is only because they have not heard about the credit union and once they realize the advantage of the credit union they stay away from the high interest rate lenders. It was through the efforts of the Banking and Currency Committee that these credit unions were opened. It was the Banking and Currency Committee that conducted an investigation that uncovered the shocking loan practices going on throughout Europe which forced servicemen to pay extortionate interest rates. The Banking and Currency Committee's answer to the problem was to open low-cost credit unions.

Since the credit unions were opened both in Europe and to a smaller degree in the Far East, the Banking and Currency has not received a single complaint about their operations or the services they offer to their members. This is an extremely fine record and one that should encourage the Department of Defense to provide all assistance possible to military credit unions. The January issue of the Credit Union magazine, a publication of CUNA, included an article describing the operations of overseas credit unions. I am including that article in my remarks since the overseas credit unions deserve as much publicity as possible for their work on behalf of service men and women:

SERVING SERVICEMEN OVERSEAS

"We need credit unions. The army has services to take care of its other needs. But it has nothing that could replace the credit union."

That's the view of the commander at Vicenza Military Post in Northern Italy, Col. H. F. Lombard. And his view coincides very well with that of other officers and enlisted personnel serving in Italy and England.

But interestingly enough, the military does have something that competes very well with one important credit union service. That's the United States Serviceman's Payroll Deposit (USSPD) which pays a government guaranteed annual interest of 10 per cent on servicemen's savings. The hitch is that deposits can only be made while a serviceman is overseas and funds can be withdrawn only after he has returned to the continental U.S. and been stationed there for at least 90 days. They can be withdrawn while still overseas in the event of an emergency but only with the written approval of the base commander.

How credit union services fare in the face of 10 per cent competition, how the "brass" views the credit unions, and what sort of service the members get from overseas credit unions are some of the questions *The Credit Union Magazine* sought answers to by interviewing U.S. army and air force professionals at military installations in Italy and England.

Mississippi's Keesler Federal Credit Union has been serving troops in England since 1968; Washington's Fairchild Federal Credit Union has been serving those in Italy since mid-1969.

KEESLER FCU'S ENGLISH ACCENT

With a combined staff of 14 at four bases, Keesler FCU's operations in England serve 15,640 members with shares of $4 million, loans of $8.5 million, and a delinquency ratio of .93 per cent. Since organization overseas, members have borrowed more than $34 million; write-offs amount to $43,360.

All data are transmitted to the Mississippi office by airmail or Telex; original documents are mailed at the end of each working day with duplicates kept overseas. Future plans include nightly transfer of accounting data to the home office through a dataphone, with printout mailed daily to England.

Because of the 10 per cent competition from USSPD borrowers are urged to save by rounding out monthly allotments 10 to 15 per cent above the agreed loan payment, and to continue the allotment after the loan is repaid.

The big advantage credit union savings offer is that members can get their money whenever they want it, Katherine M. Turley, manager of overseas operations, points out. "This is attractive to members because much of the savings we get is put aside with specific goals in mind. Typical reasons for saving are to buy stereo equipment, furniture, a car, or a vacation in Europe or the United States."

Overseas loan officers have authority to approve all loans within the limits of the credit union's policies. That's why the credit union has been able to make more than 48,500 loans during five years of operation in England.

When the loan officer feels the information provided does not justify approval, final disposition is made by the credit committee at the main office in Mississippi. When a loan application is referred to the stateside committee, the member is invited to send along a personal letter of explanation. The committee occasionally requests additional information from the member, overseas staff, or both, before deciding. Loans are approved in about half of these cases.

KUDOS TO KEESLER

The loans run the usual gamut, with only slight variations because of the military and overseas aspects of the borrowers.

When TSgt. Gene W. Fort, married and the father of two children, was transferred to England his pay did not start until nearly three months after he arrived. The credit union tided him over.

SSgt. James M. Morris and his wife, SSgt. Barbara J. Morris, had an opportunity to buy furniture from someone returning to the States. All they needed was cash on the spot.

And then there are the slightly unusual cases. SSgt. Robert A. Goines came to England with his wife and two kids and four problems: "I had a $4,000 debt, was unable to get any part-time work, my wife could not find a job, and my monthly instalment payment with interest on the old debt exceeded my salary by $50." A fifth problem was that he had been turned down by a finance company in Columbus, Indiana and didn't know where to turn in Mildenhall, England. That is, until he learned of the credit union.

SSgt. Goines' loan was one of those approved by the stateside credit committee. It was a $4,000 consolidation loan with two sergeants as cosigners. "Now I have no worries and know that by June of 1976 I'll be completely out of debt."

While Keesler's overseas credit union operation copes with these problems on a daily basis without much fanfare, its efforts do not go unnoticed by the military's top brass.

"It's good to have the credit union's experienced staff to help our men and women when they're in need of money or counseling," commented Col. R. B. Watson, base commander at R.A.F. Station Bentwaters. "We appreciate what the credit union is doing for our people on the base."

In East Anglia, meanwhile, Col. E. R. Johnston, base commander at R.A.F. Station Lakenheath, is impressed with the lack of red tape and the low cost operation.

"Military banking service costs the government a considerable amount of money while the credit union costs the Department of Defense nothing. I think military banking and credit union services complement each other."

FAIRCHILD FCU'S ITALIAN FLAIR

Nearly a continent away, Fairchild Federal Credit Union's offices in Italy provide similar services with similar results. Sp/5 Curtis C. Turner, for example, had to wait nine months after his transfer to Italy before his misplaced military pay record was located. When you're married and have a two-year-old child, that's rough. But the credit union helped smooth out the bumps.

Fairchild serves 6,000 members in Italy (shares $2.5 million; loans $3 million; delinquency ratio 1.18 per cent) with a staff of nine at three locations. Since organization, overseas members have borrowed $16 million with a $42,000 write-off. Documents are sent from sub-offices to the Vicenza office for photostating and forwarding to the main office in Spokane, Washington.

To speed up share and loan disbursements at outlying locations, members are encouraged to call in their requests several hours in advance. This makes it possible to combine long distance calls to the Vicenza office for verification of the member's account status.

The rising savings ratio of Fairchild FCU's overseas members has been largely influenced by two factors, overseas manager Don J. Newberg believes: good response of younger members to systematic promotion in the communications media of each local army post and air force base; and the absence of other attractive investment opportunities to civilian government employees in the field of membership.

Like many credit unions, Fairchild has problems as a result of operating in a foreign country. It's also weak in counseling, Newberg claims. "The need is there, but our limited staff makes it impossible to give comprehensive counseling assistance except in extreme cases. We need more U.S.-trained personnel at our overseas bases. Perhaps a solution would be a special series of training seminars for employees, both in general credit union administration and counseling. It could be sponsored by CUNA and the Defense Credit Union Counsel, either overseas or in the States. In the U.S. it could combine attendance at the CUNA School with practical experience in the credit union's stateside home office."

If Newberg does see a weakness in the credit union's counseling program, that view isn't shared by Pvt. Robert W. Clark.

Pvt. Clark, his wife and two children arrived in Italy along with a $284 shipping bill for sending their personal belongings and another $320 bill for customs and storage fees. Unable to make these unexpectedly high payments, Pvt. Clark checked with the Red Cross and Army Emergency Relief, only to find that neither agency was able to help.

NOT JUST A "FAIR WEATHER" FRIEND

"When I told the credit union that I had the choice between a credit union loan and going to an Italian jail, things began to happen," Pvt. Clark recalled. "First the credit union tried to see whether there were any other army or civilian resources available to help me. There weren't, so it made me a loan for the storage and customs fees of $320 and suggested that I write the Philadelphia shipping company to let me pay off its fee at $20 a month."

The shipping company agreed to the payment schedule, which ended Pvt. Clark's nightmare. "It taught my wife and me that our credit union is a real friend—not the fair weather type, but one we can count on when the chips are down."

DR. WILLIAM E. ALLEN

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in this month's issue of the American College of Radiology News for it documents the story of Dr. William E. Allen, Jr., the first black radiologist in the world to receive a Gold Medal from the American College of Radiology. Dr. Allen will be honored for distinguished achievements in radiology and in the medical field when the ACR holds its annual meeting and convocation in New Orleans in April.

Dr. Allen was elected to fellowship in the ACR in 1945. After receiving an M.D. degree from Howard University in 1930, he served his radiology residency in St. Louis at City Hospital No. 2 and and Homer Phillips Hospital. Dr. Allen has been active in organized medicine on all levels. He is a member of the St. Louis Society of Radiologists and the Missouri chapter of the ACR, where he serves on the board of directors. He holds membership in the National Medical Association, where he has served with distinction as vice president and as chairman of the Council on Scientific Exhibits, the Radiological Society of North America, the Society of Nuclear Medicine, and the American Society of Therapeutic Radiologists.

He was director of the department of radiology and director of the radioisotope laboratory of Homer G. Phillips Hospital. He was also director of the department of radiology at St. Mary's Infirmary and People's Hospital. He now serves as radiotherapist to the St. Louis University Hospitals, consultant in radiology to the Missouri State Crippled Children's Service, associate clinical professor of radiology at St. Louis University School of Medicine, and assistant clinical professor of radiology at the Washington University School of Medicine.

Dr. Allen is best known for his work in 1933 when he organized one of the first approved American training schools for black X-ray technologists at St. Mary's Infirmary. Among the awards he has received are the Special Silver Plaque Award of the St. Louis branch of the NAACP, the Distinguished Service Award of the NMA, and the Howard University Distinguished Alumni Award.

I commend Dr. Allen on the work he has done in his field and share his achievements with my colleagues.

The article follows:

DR. WILLIAM E. ALLEN

(By Don C. Weir, M.D.)

"Judge me not by the heights to which I have risen, but by the depths from whence I come." These words by Booker T. Washington are William Allen's personal credo. And judged by any standard, William Edward Allen, Jr. has come a long way.

Born in Pensacola, Fla., in 1903, the son of a building contractor, he attended Howard University, graduating with a B.S. and M.D. in 1930. During his college days Bill, an accomplished musician, supported himself by playing the saxophone and clarinet with a small local jazz group. He also played first violin in the university symphony orchestra.

After moving to St. Louis, Bill served his residency in radiology at City Hospital No. 2 and Homer G. Phillips Hospital under the guidance of Drs. E. W. Spinzig and L. R. Sante. At this time he met his future wife, Para Lee Batts of Waco, Tex., who was to become a head nurse at Homer G. Phillips. Completing his residency, Dr. Allen was certified in roentgenology by the American Board of Radiology in 1935, thus becoming the first black radiologist in this country to be so certified. In 1939, after a close association with Edwin C. Ernst, Sr., M.D., he was certified in radiology and immediately joined the American College of Radiology. He was elected to Fellowship in 1945 and for many years was the only black Fellow on the roster of the College.

Bill has long been actively involved in organized medicine on all levels. He is a member of both the St. Louis Society of Radiologists and the Missouri chapter of the College, where he serves on the Board of Directors. Dr. Allen also holds membership in the National Medical Association where he has served with distinction as vice-president and as chairman of the Council on Scientific Exhibits, the Radiological Society of North America, the Society of Nuclear Medicine, and the American Society of Therapeutic Radiologists. He is presently a member of the College's Commission on Public Relations, of which he is the secretary, and also a member of the Commission on Radiation Therapy.

MANY TALENTS

Bill is noted for his skill as a physician, an administrator, a teacher, an organizer, and a humanitarian. He was director of the department of radiology and director of the radioisotope laboratory of Homer G. Phillips Hospital. He was also director of the department of radiology of St. Mary's Infirmary and People's Hospital, where he served as chief of staff. He is at present radiotherapist to the St. Louis University Hospitals, consultant in radiology to the Missouri State Crippled Children's Service, associate clinical professor of radiology at St. Louis University School of Medicine, and assistant clinical professor of radiology at the Washington University School of Medicine. From 1950 to 1959 he was a consultant in radiology to the University of Missouri.

Dr. Allen's greatest fame has come as a tribute to his organizational ability. In 1933 he organized one of the first approved American training schools for black x-ray technologists at St. Mary's infirmary. He later established the internationally renowned School of Radiologic Technology at Homer G. Phillips Hospital. Here he also created one of the first approved residencies in radiology in a predominantly black institution.

To advance the study of radiology, he has provided scholarships for students from Haiti, Nigeria, Liberia, and South Africa. During Dr. Allen's visit to Liberia in August, 1972, he was greatly concerned when he learned that there was not a single supervoltage unit in all of western Africa. He is presently actively engaged in a project to install a Cobalt 60 unit in the John F. Kennedy Memorial Hospital in Monrovia, Liberia.

ILLUSTRIOUS CAREER

In the course of his long career Dr. Allen has received numerous awards, including the Special Silver Plaque Award of the St. Louis branch of the NAACP, the Outstanding Service Award of the Homer G. Phillips Hospital Intern Alumni Association, the St. Louis Argus Newspaper Distinguished Public Service Award, the Outstanding Service Award of the St. Louis unit of the American Cancer Society, the Distinguished Service Award of the National Medical Association, the Howard University Distinguished Alumni Award, and many others. Dr. Allen is also on the St. Louis Boards of the Tuberculosis and Health Society and of the American Cancer Society. In addition to serving on the editorial board of the Journal of the National Medical Association, he has published over fifty articles in national journals.

Bill is justly proud of the section on radiology of the National Medical Association which he and eight other radiologists established in 1949 and of which he was the first chairman. The section now boasts over 150 members, most of whom are Diplomates of the American Board of Radiology and members of the College. In his role as a leader of this organization Dr. Allen initiated a successful effort to bring about a closer relationship and understanding between black radiologists and the American College of Radiology and pursued it to its present satisfactory and pleasant conclusion.

CLIMBING THE LADDER

Dr. Allen has faced many obstacles in the course of his career. One such problem arose in 1939 when he entered active military service as the first black officer from St. Louis and one of the first in the country to volunteer. Even though Dr. Allen was a Diplomate of the American Board of Radiology, he was assigned as a battalion surgeon with an infantry regiment. However, when the late Byrl L. Kirklin, M.D., Secretary of the American Board of Radiology, learned that a Diplomate was being used as a battalion surgeon, he made strong protests to Washington and after much difficulty Dr. Allen was transferred to Ft. Huachuca, Ariz., where he was appointed chief of the x-ray service of the 1500 bed NSC Regional Hospital.

At this post he organized the Ninth Service Command WAC School for x-ray technicians and gave special courses for medical officers who later served abroad. After receiving several decorations he went onto inactive duty with the rank of lieutenant colonel and was appointed a consultant in radiology to the Secretary of War, one of the two black officers in this country so honored.

Those who have had the privilege of working with Dr. Allen look up to him with respect and affection for his critical though generous mentality, his youthful vigor, and his spiritual maturity. A man of singular charm and modesty without an enemy this unassuming physician and humanitarian richly deserves the Gold Medal, the highest award that the American College of Radiology can bestow.

THE CLOCK STRIKES 12

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to my House and Senate colleagues the following excerpts from an article from the February 1974 issue of Field and Stream by noted conservationist writer, Michael Frome, in which he offers an eloquently expresed tribute to our beloved former colleague, the late Congressman John P. Saylor:

THE CLOCK STRIKES 12

(By Michael Frome)

John P. Saylor is gone. He died last October 28 of heart failure, three months after celebrating his sixty-fifth birthday and after almost a quarter-century in Congress. I can not let him go without a farewell salute, for every reader of FIELD & STREAM, indeed, every American who enjoys and loves the outdoors, has lost a friend and champion.

His constituents in mountainous western Pennsylvania sent Mr. Saylor to Washington for a total of twelve terms. Obviously he represented his district well in order to receive their continuing vote of confidence (especially as a Republican running in a predominantly Democratic area), but the truth is that he worked for a far broader constituency. He was a *national* Congressman, a powerful, creative, and effective force at the center of nearly every major conservation battle of the past twenty years.

Mr. Saylor's base of action in the House of Representatives was the Committee on Interior Affairs, where, through the process of seniority, he became the ranking Republican member. I recall his commenting a number of years ago, that of about forty members on the Committee, only six were from the East. There were absolutely no Easterners on the Senate Interior Committee. The Western power bloc in Congress, attuned to the voices of mining, oil, timber, water development, grazing, and such special economic interests, had the Interior Committees locked up in both houses.

"Western politics have long been imbued with the concept that natural resources are to be used, and used profitably," Mr. Saylor noted. "One of the nice things about being an Eastern member of the Committee is that the Interior Department doesn't have anything in my district. The Forest Service doesn't have anything in my district either. I have no Indians in my district. I can look at propositions as they are presented and call them as I see them."

To call them as he saw them in behalf of the public interest was fundamental to him. Mr. Saylor had the courage to take strong, forthright, and completely independent positions. This was the genius of the man. Though a loyal Republican, he never hesitated to press his own views on a particular piece of legislation. His choice was always decided on the basis of principle, rather than partisanship, regardless of the consequences to himself.

I was privileged to enjoy a warm personal relationship with Mr. Saylor, or "Big John," as he was known among his colleagues in the House and his friends in Washington. He was a towering man, standing six-feet-four, robust and yet wiry, a vigorous, powerful presence in any group. He was blessed with a sharp wit, a sparkle, a willingness for combat. He may at times have appeared caustic, but I think this was a defensive cover that came from fighting so many uphill battles against tough adversaries. After all, for years he was the counterbalancing influence in the House Interior Committee to Wayne Aspinall, the domineering Democratic chairman (who finally went down to defeat in the 1972 election).

As I knew Mr. Saylor, he was utterly fearless and tireless. He knew how to work within the system and believed in it. Hundreds of bills are introduced into each Congressional session, few are passed; but when you look at the landmark conservation legislation of the past two decades—including the Wilderness Act, Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, establishment of the North Cascades National Park, and the law prohibiting shooting wildlife from airplanes—then you have the evidence of his influence, character, and determination to assure a healthy environment for all Americans.

His first big fight, the one that propelled him into the front ranks of conservation, was the struggle of the 1950s against construction of the proposed Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument, Utah. Most Western Congressmen favored the project. It marked the first serious challenge of their pet agency, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the first time that national media focused broad public attention on a seemingly regional resource issue. In 1956, after much debate, Congress eliminated Echo Park from the Colorado River Storage Project.

The crux of the matter was not simply the integrity of Echo Park, but of all national parks, wildlife refuges, and other natural preserves. By midcentury, the material needs of a rapidly growing population had darkened the prospects for continued existence of the wild places. The conservation victory at Dinosaur demonstrated that people indeed are concerned with more than material values.

On July 12, 1956, Representative Saylor declared on the House floor: "We are a great people because we have been successful in developing and using our marvelous natural resources; but, also, we Americans are the people we are largely because we have had the influence of the wilderness on our lives." Those words were part of his statement introducing the first Wilderness Bill into Congress.

It was uphill all the way. At first it was impossible to get the executive branch of government to take the bill seriously. Then, after the Interior and Agriculture Departments and the Bureau of Budget submitted favorable reports, the House and Senate refused to act. The Senate did more than the House; it held hearings during two Congressional sessions. The House held only short hearings during one session, but Mr. Saylor and his supporters couldn't even get the transcript printed.

He never gave up. "I cannot believe that the American people have become so crass, so dollar-minded, so exploitation-conscious that they must develop every last little bit of wilderness that still exists," Mr. Saylor declared in 1961. That was the year President John F. Kennedy urged enactment of a wilderness preservation bill. And finally it was passed in 1964, eight years after the first bill had been introduced.

Meanwhile, Mr. Saylor helped to establish the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission in 1958 and served as a Commission member. From this effort emerged the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a program that gave him great pride. The Fund has been virtually the sole source of land-acquisition money for national parks, forests, recreation areas, and seashores, but also has been a major stimulant to state, local, and regional governments to expand their recreation programs.

He would often express himself in such colorful language. Here are just a few samples on key resource issues, excerpted from statements on the House floor, speeches before conservation groups, or other published documents:

On the mining act of 1872: "The Constitution of the United States is nearly two hundred years old and it is still a sound, workable document. The Mining Law is nearly one hundred years old and it is an abomination and insult to the people of the United States."

On timber: "The Congress, in refusing to debate the infamous Timber Supply Act, maintained our national policy of protecting the public forests from the ravages of the timber-cutting industry. The effect of President Nixon's 'directions' to the Agriculture, Housing, and Interior Secretaries was to do by executive fiat what could not be done legislatively . . . Conservation, environment, ecology—that is, the public's concerns—are to be subservient to the pressures of the logging and lumber industry."

On the Alaska pipeline: "Why the rush? This oil has been in the ground for a billion years. It has been discovered in the last twenty-four months. Because a few companies have invested a lot of money is no reason to lay down and play dead."

On grazing: "These bills (sponsored by former Representative Aspinall and former Senator Gordon Allot, both of Colorado) seek to give a twenty-year renewable right to graze the public lands with little or no limitation placed on how the grazing would be performed. Under the Aspinall-Allot proposals, ranchers would be compensated for any reduction in grazing privileges. This is the antithesis of the free-roaming, cowboy, western, frontier spirit. It is the guaranteed-income plan for stockmen."

On predator control: "The war on predators has been waged with little scientific knowledge of their beneficial roles, or with little moral or ethical consideration for man's responsibility in conserving natural life as an integral part of the environment . . . The operations of one division of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, sanctioned and sheltered by one administration after another, are sinister and contemptible. Yet it continues unleashed and virtually unchallenged."

Mr. Saylor had hoped, with the advent of a Republican administration, to be named Secretary of the Interior. It would have been the culmination of his public career. Certainly he had the background and qualifications to make an outstanding Secretary in the Age of the Environment. He was too independent, too committed to the public interest to be included in an administration marked by conformity, indecision, political expediency, and liaison with the special economic interests. If Walter Hickel lasted twenty-two months, it is hardly likely that John Saylor would have lasted out the first year.

Nevertheless, his name will be remembered long after those in executive policy positions are gone and forgotten. He left his mark on Congress and on natural-resource policy as did few men of his time. He takes his place in history alongside Gifford Pinchot, another Pennsylvanian, and Theodore Roosevelt as one of the Republicans who blazed conservation trails.

John Saylor was not a liberal in all things. He may have received the John Muir Medal from the Sierra Club, but he also received the Distinguished Service Award from the ultra-conservative group, Americans for Constitutional Action. This underscores a point that I have made repeatedly in this space: conservation belongs to no party and to no single point of view. Conservation is open territory, with plenty of room for all.

Representative Saylor gave a new dimension to the politics of conservation. He was a prophet in his own time, one of the few men in Washington who foresaw the inevitable onrushing environmental crisis, the need to husband our diminishing stocks of natural resources.

My personal appraisal is that he was impelled by good old-fashioned American patriotism. He was deeply involved, for example, in efforts to save the landscape in and around Washington. He saw the capital area as a shrine of the nation, a model to display before the world. A few years ago, he helped block the Democrats in power from giving away the marshes on the Virginia shore of the Potomac below Washington, which they thought should be filled in for high-rise development. More recently he helped stop the Republicans from giving away the Federal interest in the waterfront of historic Alexandria, George Washington's home town, for much the same purpose. He was the prime mover in Congress in the establishment of Piscatawny Park, embracing seven miles of the Potomac River on the Maryland shore, in order to preserve the vista from Washington's mansion at Mount Vernon.

The loss of such a leading figure is always a tragic blow, yet compensated by the legacy and lessons which he leaves behind. John Saylor rowed upstream against the Watergate tide. He showed that politics could be used for good purpose. Democracy like the use of the outdoors, is not simply a right but a responsibility. The best tribute that outdoorsmen can pay to the memory of this fallen friend is to become involved, participating at some stage of life in some form of the political process. Alas, we no longer can say, "Let Big John do it."

A CASE IN POINT

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, for all the fact that some folks think Washington, D.C., is the center of the universe, I regularly and consistently turn to the newspapers in the Fifth District of Virginia for the balance and perspective which is, to me, so notably lacking in the national media.

No better example exists than the lead editorial appearing in the Lynchburg, Va., News for Tuesday, February 5, 1974. While some in our immediate vicinity wring their hands over the high cost of national defense, the writer of this piece has displayed a high degree of perceptiveness, not only in identifying the problem, but in interpreting Washington reaction.

I include this editorial in the RECORD, and commend it to my colleagues:

A CASE IN POINT

Two giant SS19 missiles each carrying several warheads were fired from a site deep within the Soviet Union recently to a target area in the Pacific some 1500 miles away. This is the distance these weapons must cover in time of war.

Washington was not caught unawares. Defense Secretary James Schlesinger reported last August that the Soviets had begun testing their new multiple warhead system. Last weekend was the first disclosure, however that they were being tested under combat conditions.

There was, of course, no outcry in Washington. The Reds were not denounced for flexing their muscles in an attempt to bully us into giving away even more concessions in the second round of strategic arms limitations talks. During the first SAL talks, the U.S. gave the Soviets a big numerical superiority in offensive weapons. According to the latest U.S. estimates the Soviets now have 2,359 strategic missiles to our 1,710. Moreover, the Soviet missiles are on the whole much larger than ours, capable of carrying heavier payloads. In addition the Soviets have developed new attack bombers (we have not), and have modernized their fleet to the point where it can now effectively challenge the U.S. Navy for control of the seas. Two of the new Soviet missile subs are now stationed off the East Coast of the United States.

The foregoing by itself is neither new nor particularly interesting. The Soviets have been engaged in an arms race for years while the U.S. arsenal has remained at a standstill. Nor does the fact that the Soviets have surpassed us in nuclear capability seem to disturb Washington. What does seem to disturb that part of Washington called the U.S. Congress is the fact that the Air Force is planning to conduct similar tests with our Minuteman missiles.

These tests will be conducted over a two-year period from underground silos in Montana. Already Senate liberals are "viewing with alarm" and charging that the tests are not needed, too expensive, and an attempt to threaten the poor, peace-loving Russians who are trying so hard to achieve detente.

Typical of the Washington criticism was the speech last week by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. Mansfield said that while the Nixon Administration has not said so, he got the "distinct impression" that one of the reasons for the tests was to bring pressure on the Reds during the SAL talks.

"At a time when we are endeavoring to bring about international peace, the inland testing of such missiles seems to be entirely unnecessary," Mansfield told the Senate, adding that "The use of this weapons system in our international negotiations is untimely and unnecessary in my estimation."

He made no such criticism of the tests the Reds have been conducting and are continuing to conduct.

While admitting that the Air Force had authority to conduct the tests, and also admitting that they posed no threat to safety, Mansfield urged the Senate to "take a stand in opposition through the appropriation process"—meaning: threaten the Air Force with cutting back its funds.

Mansfield stated flatly that there was no need for the Minuteman tests because the missiles have proved highly successful in tests fired over water. The Air Force contends that the tests are needed to judge the accuracy and performance of the missiles under combat conditions. Because there is no margin for error in a nuclear war, it is necessary to test the missiles, their crews and backup squadrons under actual operating conditions. The Minuteman ICBM is the backbone of our nuclear defense.

It could be that Mike Mansfield, the former professor who represents the tiny state of Montana and the Democratic majority in the Senate, knows more about such things than the Chiefs of Staff and the Air Force. It appears more likely, based on his past efforts to downgrade U.S. defenses and pacify the Communists, that he is alarmed that the tests might anger the Reds and shatter a "detente" which has been maintained so far by U.S. concessions. It disturbs him, apparently, that the U.S. is taking action to protect itself against the rapidly overwhelming Soviet nuclear superiority—even at a time when the Soviets are conducting similar tests!

The attitude of such people is simply incomprehensible. They express no concern, no alarm over the Soviet record of broken treaties, invasions, repressions, brutalities, blackmail . . . The Soviet genocide in the Baltic states, the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the oppression of Jews and intellectuals—none of these trappings of despotism seems to phase them. They profess complete faith in Soviet good will!

Now you can't excuse such people as being naive nor regard them as uninformed. They know. But they seem not to care and some even to welcome a world in which such conditions are the norm. They seem ready, and some even anxious, to live under tyranny—perhaps to exercise a little of it themselves?

THE ROLE OF PARKS IN THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of the potential tragedies springing from the energy crisis will be averted if we get the message to our constituents that the tourist business will, indeed, be alive and healthy this summer. In short, we need to turn what seems to be a negative situation into something which is really positive.

In an effort to encourage and promote tourism in the face of the energy crisis, I wish to enter into the RECORD the attached remarks by the Honorable Ronald H. Walker, director of the National Park Service, who spoke recently to a Jackson, Miss., conference on "Tourism and the Energy Crisis." Mr. Walker takes an interesting look at the role of the Park Service in the energy crisis but, beyond that, he emphasizes the positive role of the vacationing public.

The remarks follow:

THE ROLE OF PARKS IN THE ENERGY CRISIS

I welcome the opportunity to be here today. Since we are all in the same boat, we had better all try to row in the same direction. I thank the sponsors of this meeting for a real public service.

In the National Park Service we have tried to think positively about the so-called energy crisis. I realize that unlike most others represented here, we don't have to show a profit for a group of stockholders. However, in my view, there may be some important longer-range changes that may ultimately benefit parks, park users, and the way parks are used and enjoyed.

Our obligation—with or without ample supplies of energy—is to conserve the natural and historic heritage of this nation so that it may be enjoyed by this and future generations of Americans.

I'm sure that there are a few park superintendents who see in a reduced volume of visitors the chance to get at projects long deferred for lack of money and manpower. Projects that will help bring their parks back to the standard of excellence that is the hallmark of the National Park Service.

We have grown tremendously in the last decade. We acquired 79 new areas. Our visitation went up about 100 percent. Many of those new areas are not now up to standard. One of my primary objectives as Director is to make sure that they meet the standard—and soon.

But, like everything else, parks don't exist in a vacuum. I know full well that many communites depend on parks to generate the tourism revenue that is the difference between economic success and failure. Many private facilities were developed to meet the needs of National Park visitors.

So I want to go on record here today by stating that the National Park Service is not going to sit back just doing its own thing and let the rest of the nation take care of itself.

We will take every opportunity to catch up on the work backlog. But we will also do everything we can to help maintain a viable tourism industry in this country.

In my first year as Director I spent about 40 percent of my time in the parks—getting to know them and getting to know the very dedicated park personnel who run them. I think we have about the most dedicated, enthusiastic and energetic employees in government. And if there are solutions to some of these new energy related problems we are going to find them.

Now let's get down to a few cases:

There are indications that some of our more remote parks will suffer some decline in visitation. How much we don't know.

But it seems equally obvious that other parks—those parks close to large population centers—will see sizable visitation increases.

And I am sure that those parks in or near large cities will be positively flooded with visitors.

I'm sure that many Americans don't realize that there are 200 National Park System areas located within 100 miles of a metropolitan area. These are areas that can—and will—be visited with less than a tankful of gas.

So, while there may be some reduction at places like Yellowstone I suspect that Yosemite and Great Smoky Mountains—both close to large population centers—may hold their own or even increase. The C&O Canal outside Washington, Cabrillo National Monument in San Diego and Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia will see more visitors than they have ever seen before.

Just recently I participated in a land transfer in New York City, one of the development steps for creation of Gateway National Recreation Aera. This new area in New York Harbor is a timely development, providing a close to home recreational opportunity for more than 20 million urban dwellers. We have a similar development in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco.

These, and other close-in areas, can be visited by existing and traditional transportation systems. I think we will be looking backward to the revival of old transportation traditions in the other parks as well.

Last summer my family and I spent some time—a wonderful time—in Grand Canyon National Park. Right in the middle of the visitor service complex stands the railroads station. It is now used, I was told, to receive only an occasional freight shipment.

Many other parks have similarly good rail connections. I hope that Mr. Lombardi of Amtrak may be able to give us an encouraging word on the revitalization of these facilities later in the convention.

It is interesting to note that in Los Angeles, where a great many of our visitors to all western parks live, efforts have begun to promote travel by public transportation.

For example, an article in the December edition of Los Angeles magazine says that new Amtrak package tours reveal "how old-fashioned and leisurely a winter vacation really can be." This would certainly apply to summer as well.

"Gas shortages," says the magazine, "could bring back a long ago era of visiting Yosemite by public transportation—this winter by Greyhound" from Los Angeles.

We are also considering encouraging concessioners in parks to promote package tours that would feature public transportation to the park, chartered bus service to points of visitor interest in the park, and which would encourage non-consumptive activities such as cross-country skiing, nature hikes and the like.

In Washington, D.C., rather than trying to discourage travel to Shenandoah National Park, for example, we are studying how National Capital Parks can best promote events and experiences within urban area parks which should tempt many people to stay home and get many of the same experiences they would otherwise have to drive three or four hours for. We would like to provide an alternative to travel rather than just saying "*don't*" when perhaps most people *can't* anyway. Why not try to turn what seems to be a negative situation into something which is really positive?

There are many ways we can help save gasoline for visitors once they get to the parks, or even before they get there. Our campsite reservation program—just completing its first year trial run—could avoid gas wasting trips to campgrounds already full. Likewise, it could avoid trips from campground to campground seeking space for the night.

We are considering other types of advance reservation for all kinds of facilities that would help eliminate needless travel within the parks.

Most parks close to urban areas do a lot of week-end business. On week-ends most urban transit companies have most of their equipment standing idle. Why couldn't these buses be used to get people to and from parks within 100 miles of the city?

If concessioners in the parks could be encouraged to rent camping equipment we could eliminate the need of a car to carry tents, stoves, etc. and encourage further use of mass transit to the parks.

We could also increase the availability of rental bikes, horses, canoes, and other energy savers.

This list is almost endless and we are continuing to develop it as fast as we can.

I am convinced that a very positive development to come from the energy crisis—an opportunity if you will—will be a change *in the way people* look at and enjoy the parks.

For years many thoughtful rangers and park superintendents have felt that too many people are so tied to a schedule of 500 miles a day that they never take time to really look at the park they happened to be in. Some stop only long enough to buy a scenic post card for their scrapbook. As in most things in life you get out of parks what you put into them.

The automobile is a great vehicle to get you to a park, but it can be a prison once you get there. Maybe now instead of trying to visit six or eight parks in a three week vacation, the vacationing American may have to spend most of his time in one or two. And believe me there is a quality experience away from the highway.

I think in this area all of us have much to learn from the younger generation. In most of the parks I have visited, especially out west in Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Yellowstone, Grand Teton, young people are there in ever growing numbers traveling by motorcycles, hitchhiking, walking.

They want to get out of suburbia. They want a park experience, a wilderness experience. And to them the trailer filled campsites in the parks aren't much different from the environment they are getting away from.

Most of them feel that with the pop-up, fold-out, walk-in luxury of some styles of modern camping that we are bringing with us the very things we seek to leave behind when we go out to "get away from it all" in the parks.

So they are moving out, moving back into the pristine back country areas, camping out and hiking and leaving their mechanized transportation behind. Now comes the energy crisis and a lot of us "older folks" are going to have to follow their lead. We're going to have to hoof it, too. I remember last September a travel writer on the porch of the Jackson Lake Lodge pointing up at the Tetons and asking, "Do people go into those mountains?" Many of us don't know what's out there beyond those parking lots. The kids come back and say, "Don't worry. Try it. You'll like it." I think we will.

Parents of the younger generation today didn't have the affluence or the free time in their youth to get away and do the things the kids are doing today. A lot of it is new to us. We've even heard the three-day weekend is just around the corner. We all may soon have more recreation time.

People are going to find it difficult to transport all the comforts of home to the park campground. They are going to realize soon, I think, that they aren't getting away from anything.

To really get away then they are going to have to venture further than that 100 yard perimeter of the parking lot back into the woods where they cannot only have a wilderness experience but a recreational experience as well. With a little education on wilderness hazards most anyone can feel comfortable on back country trails.

So maybe, in still another way, this energy shortage will prove to be a blessing in disguise. To say nothing of the exercise most of us need, we may find a whole new world out there.

Even in the most beautiful of parks there is a limit to how far you can walk. Fortunately the Park Service has already done a lot of work on people movers in tho parks.

Once you get to Yosemite, for example, you can park your car for the duration of the stay. A free shuttle bus will take you all around the valley. Horses and bikes are available, too. Similar buses are now in operation at Everglades, Mount McKinley, Mesa Verde, in Washington, D.C., Lyndon Johnson Birthplace in Texas and will begin operation this Spring along the south rim of the Grand Canyon.

We have already selected 21 parks where shuttle bus service can be established in a short time with reasonable effort and cost.

There will be many new worlds for a lot of people because of the energy crisis. We are now faced with a lot of crash projects because as a nation we have developed some lazy energy habits we will now have to shed. I hope that we will develop a little more foresight as well.

And, I would like to point out that some of the nation's leaders were giving us warning of what is to come. Back on June 4, 1971, for example, President Nixon warned the nation that just because we had been able to double our energy consumption in the past twenty years, we could not assume "that sufficient energy will always be readily available." Not many of us listened.

I hope people are listening now. For those who hope to continue to enjoy the nation's heritage of parks and historic sites I would like to sum up and suggest the following:

1. Trains, buses and planes go to or near many National Park Service areas.

2. There are 298 areas in the National Park System; one or more probably close to your home.

3. Seeing one park well is better than superficial visits to several.

4. Tours, car pooling, charter buses can help you get there.

5. Once in a park, mass transit, the bicycle and footpower can help you get around.

I am sure that American ingenuity will come up with even more ways to get to the parks. And I am positive that whichever park you get to we will be ready to help you enjoy the experience, to learn from it and to be a better person and better American because you have been there.

In the natural parks where nature both teaches and inspires or in historical areas where the strength of a nation passes from generation to generation the National Park Service wants to share with all the national birthright.

Thank you.

WASHINGTON CREDIT UNIONS PROVIDE HELP FOR POOR

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when Sargent Shriver served as the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, he told me that credit unions were one of the most effective tools in the war on poverty. He pointed out that low-income credit unions were helping many families to better themselves and had encouraged habits of thrift where none had existed before.

Among the most outstanding low-income credit unions in the country are those operating in Washington, D.C. Although these credit unions received some Government funding to help meet managerial expenses, all of the lending funds were achieved through member savings and shortly even the subsidized managerial funds will be withdrawn in a plan to enable credit unions to operate entirely on their own.

The December 4 issue of the Washington Post carried an outstanding article about the low-income credit unions in Washington. Rather than place the article in the RECORD at the close of the first session, where because of the press of closing business it might be overlooked by Members, I have withheld the insertion of the article until today so that every Member will have the opportunity to read the article. Hopefully it will lead to additional low-income credit unions in other congressional districts throughout the country:

NEIGHBORHOOD CREDIT UNIONS AID POOR IN CITY

(By Barbara Bright-Sagnier)

Last year Amiel Summers lost his job. For 10 months he and his family lived off savings while he learned the real estate business. Then money ran out. The rent was overdue and his first commission from a house he'd sold would not come through until December.

"Last year I'd been helping underprivileged people solve their problems," said Summers, 50, previously a counselor for Training Corp. of America, a Job Corps contractor. "This year—ker-plunk—I found myself with problems of my own."

Summers knew he couldn't get a loan from a bank or loan company. "I'm strictly on commission," he said, "and no one was interested in how productive I'd been in the past had I gone to a conventional lender, it just wasn't there."

But from the People's United Community Credit Union, Summers, who lives at 1815 Kalorama Rd. NW., got a loan for $250 to pay his overdue rent. He will repay it in 12 installments at 12 per cent interest prorated monthly on the unpaid balance, or $22.21 per month.

Amiel Summers is one of thousands of District residents who have turned for financial aid to the 10 community savings and lending cooperatives that are part of Washington's American Federation of Community Credit Unions.

Traditional banking and lending organizations have long held that low-income wage earners are a bad credit risk, said William G. White, managing director of the D.C. Credit Union League, Inc. "The poor are generally forced to pay higher interest rates if they want to borrow money," he said.

It was to remedy this situation, said White, that the Credit Union National Administration broadened its charter base in 1964 to allow for the establishment of community credit unions.

Most credit unions—financial cooperatives that do business only with their members—have been set up in industry, government, business or commerce, said White, and the common bond of their members had been where they were employed.

Community credit unions, on the other hand, drew their membership from the residents of a single neighborhood. In 1965 the Office of Economic Opportunity struck on the community credit union idea as a method to alleviate poverty in inner-city neighborhoods. By channeling OEO funds through the District's anti-poverty agency, the United Planning Organization, 9 community credit unions were set up. With the addition of Peoples' United, the newest financial cooperative, the number grew to 10.

"Through the community credit unions, the poor man or woman has a place to save where nickel and dime transactions will not be ridiculed," said Richard Saul, research specialist at OEO who has worked with community credit unions since 1967. "He also has a place to borrow where the interest rates are as low as those enjoyed by the middle class."

"The credit unions have a vital role to play in the community," said White. "They are the one avenue available to the poor to avoid the high-rate money lender. This is the one bright hope of people having an opportunity to help themselves."

Underemployed, often poorly educated, sometimes on welfare or public assistance programs, the poor were often able to get credit "only through loan sharks," said White. Their inability to get credit at rates paid by the middle classes complicated the poor man or woman's attempt to raise his standard of living, he said.

"It's the unfortunate truth," said Joann Kelly, administrative secretary for 15 years at the credit union league, "but the situation has been like the old saying: 'Them's that has, gits.'"

Banks generally discourage the low-income earner, who might need a small loan to buy a refrigerator or a television set. "A one-year loan for under $1,000 would be unprofitable," said Odd Blorstead, vice president in charge of installment credit at Riggs National Bank. The Bank of Bethesda, for example, does not make loans under $300, according to William D. Poling, bank vice president.

Small loan companies, however, may hide the annual percentage rate, said White, unless the credit seeker can read and understand the fine print.

The District has strict laws for small loan companies, said White, allowing 12 percent annual interest. But in Maryland, a loan company may charge 36 per cent annual interest for small loans up to $300, and in Virginia, the allowable interest rate is 30 per cent. Discount loans, in which the interest is paid off before the principal, can carry 24.81 per cent interest rates in Maryland.

If a person buys an automobile and must finance his insurance premium, the interest rate in Maryland may be 58.8 per cent for the first $120, and in Virginia 53.93 per cent for the first $150.

White said he was quoting from figures published in an official credit ratebook by the Financial Publishing Co., Brookline, Mass.

"If you don't know these things, you're at their mercy," said White. "And most people don't."

Shirley A. Grasty, managing director of the 10 UPO-subsidized credit unions, said the low income borrower often turns to the community credit union as a last resort.

She told of a woman who worked as a maid who had borrowed $300 from a Maryland loan company, and after 15 payments of $17.71 each still had $253 of the debt to repay. Apparently she had missed some payments, the credit unions director explained, and had been charged penalties for late payment as well as the 36 per cent annual interest rate.

The woman's employer, who learned of the situation when the loan company began harassing the maid at work, contacted UPO, which referred the call to the Far East community credit union.

Shirley Grasty, who prefers to be called Ms. Grasty, said the woman was able to borrow money to pay her bill in a lump sum and repay the credit union through monthly payments at 12 per cent interest.

Persons eligible for community credit union membership, according to Ms. Grasty, are those who live or work within the community boundaries, own a business there, or belong to a church, club or other organization within the community. They may join by paying a 25 cent membership fee and contributing to a $5 "share," or savings.

The UPO-sponsored community credit unions in the District are: Peoples' United, which serves the Adams-Morgan area; Hospitality, in the near northeast; Armstrong, in the N. Capitol Street area; Friendship, in the southeast; Far East, in the far northeast area; Anacostia; Fides, in the Shaw area; Southwest, in the newly developed Southwest; Change, in the upper Northwest, and Central Cardozo, which serves Cardozo Heights.

Far East is the largest with a membership of 2,452 persons. Hospitality with 2,144 members has the largest savings ($494,643.06) and loans ($438,021.23). Hospitality has recently broken ground on its own building.

Among the 10 credit unions, the average share per member is $128; the average loan per borrower is $569. The ratio of loans to shares, or money loaned out as compared to money in savings, now stands at 88.6 per cent, according to the American Federation's consolidated report ending Sept. 31, 1973, and certified by John Henderson & Company, certified public accountants.

From their beginning in 1965 to September of this year, the community credit unions loaned $12, 402,245.95 to 33,086 member-borrowers, the 1973 report shows. The savings balance of "shares" at the credit unions as of September was $2,500,662.47, accumulated by 19,451 members and earned 4 per cent dividend yearly.

"We're trying to get 90 to 95 per cent of the money out in loans," said Ms. Grasty. "That was why we were created."

"Most people join us to get a loan," she said. "It's up to us to build the thrift part". Without savings, she explained, there would be no money available for loans.

Loans may be made, according to the charter, "for any provident purpose." Which Ms. Grasty said generally means for household appliances, home repairs, cars, medical expenses, taxes or to consolidate bills.

Cornelia Mitchell, of 921 Potomac Ave. SE, borrowed $89 to buy a storm door. Hannah Nelson, of 760 13th St. SE, borrowed $900 to consolidate her family's bills, which made it possible for her and her husband to pay cash for a new living room couch. Mrs. Mitchell and Mrs. Nelson are members of the Hospitality credit union, and of the Homeowner's Equity, Inc., a special home improvement loan arrangement for persons who bought their homes under the HUD 235 program, which insured home mortgages for persons of low or moderate income.

Walter Pierce, of 1892 Ontario Place, borrowed $250 to pay for use of the Wilson High School stadium during the Adams-Morgan Football Classic sponsored by the Ontario Lakers sports club. Harvey Carpenter, of 1910 Kalorama Rd., borrowed $250 to pay for Christmas shoping and to buy some equipment for the day care center he owns at 2326 Ontario Rd.

The advantages of the community credit union, said real estate salesman Summers, is that members of the loan committee "are people from the community who understand your situation, because they may have been there themselves."

"Poor people miss out on a lot of opportunities because they don't have capital," he said. "The community credit union helps them because they can get capital, and fairly quickly."

Frank Gross, 19, of 4032 20th St. NE, had been denied credit at several lending institutions before he turned to the Peoples' United credit union, he said.

"They said I was too young, or since I'd never had credit, I couldn't get credit," said Gross. "Or else they said my income was uncertain since I'm a student."

Gross said he takes home about $156 weekly as a student fireman and from partime work as a mailbag handler at a Maryland warehouse. He said the Peoples' United credit union had loaned him $250 to buy his girl an engagement ring for Christmas.

Credit union members may need financial counseling, as well as a loan, said Ms. Grasty. "They may need to change their spending habits. Some people think that the fact they're in debt is a crime. We have to build thier confidence so they'll tell us about all their debts. Being in debt is a problem, but it's not a crime."

About two-thirds of the credit unions' members get a weekly pay check, said Ms. Grasty, but the other third work part-time or subsist on welfare payments. "We're challenged by the OEO to take people for loans who have ben turned down by others," she said.

Last year, the credit unions made 757 loans (amounting to $193,474) to persons whose income was in the zero to $3,000 per year bracket, Ms. Grasty said, persons who bankers agree would probably have been denied credit at thier instituions. The credit unions made 545 loans to persons earning between $3,000 to $4,000 per year and 553 loans to persons in the $4,000 to $5,000 per year bracket. The largest number of loans, 810 were made to persons earning between $5,000 and $6,000 per year.

Much of the credit union program, said Ms. Grasty, is education in economics. The average borrower, she explained, does not know that if he buys a $298 television set with a loan from the credit union at 12 per cent a year, he pays $28 less than if he used the revolving charge accounts of department stores such as Hecht's or Sears. Most retail stores explain their interest rate as 1½ per cent per month, which amounts to 18 per cent annual interest rate.

Many of their members seek to consolidate their bills, said Ms. Grasty, in which case the credit union will contact the creditors to arrange a reduction in the monthly payments and eliminate the finance charge.

In dire cases, the credit unions recommend bankruptcy, but Ms. Grasty can recall only 25 bankruptcy petitions within the last three years.

With some members, the training in economics doesn't take, admitted Ms. Grasty. "We do lose some, who fall back into their old habits. If a personal talk doesn't help, explaining to the member now he or she is hurting their own organization, we turn accounts over to collectors."

Collection agencies then keep 50 per cent of the defaulted debt. "But half of something is better than 100 per cent of nothing for the credit union," said Ms. Grasty. "We feel we have an obligation to our members to keep the credit unions solvent. We consider ourselves community, but we're not pushovers."

Only 1.4 per cent of the total loans have been lost in the eight years the credit unions have been operating, Ms. Grasty said, and loans amounting to $228,108.23 have been turned over to collectors.

The current delinquency rate for the 10 credit unions stands at 9.2 per cent, but Ms. Grasty said she is not alarmed, since this includes many who have missed only a payment or two. "These are hard times," she said.

White said the average national credit union delinquency rate is 2.3 per cent. The loan loss ratio, he said, is .28 per cent.

Both figures are considerably lower than the District credit union figures, but White said the community credit unions in the District were the most successful in the United States. He said D.C. Credit Union League officials had felt "a personal commitment" to train and assist the credit unions.

"As a group, they are the most solvent. They have half the assets of all the 250 community credit unions sponsored by or related to OEO," said White.

Since 1970, the credit unions have worked toward becoming self-sufficient, said Ms. Grasty. Hospitality and Armstrong now require funding for only 20 per cent of their operating expenses, she said, and the other credit unions range from 60 to 70 per cent self-sufficiency.

Last year, the United Planning Organization funded the credit unions with $256,574—about half their operating expenses. In 1970 the funding amounted to $300,000. The funding has gradually decreased and at the same time our expenses have gone up," said Ms. Grasty, "which means we're paying more of our own way."

In 1971 the credit unions, which had already been selling some food stamps, absorbed more of the city's food stamp distribution into their program to reach potential members among the poor and to earn the 75 cents per transaction as the food stamp agent.

Although the average credit union takes 50 per cent of its profits for operating expenses, said Ms. Grasty, the community credit unions now take 65 to 70 per cent.

Expenses are higher, she said, because the community credit unions as part of their UPO sponsorship, are obliged to train community personnel. About 70 per cent of the staff have been trained on the job, she said, occasioning a high turnover rate when the trained personnel go on to higher paying jobs.

EDUCATION AND ATHLETICS

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, all too many of us have heard, and perhaps used, the cliche that a competitive loss "builds character." We see ourselves winning or losing battles, athletic and otherwise, in terms of the moment, the competition, and seldom reflect on the overall effect that the struggle has on our lives.

Today, in the face of rapidly increasing costs, many are questioning the value of intercollegiate athletic competition. Usually the question is raised in terms of "so much being spent for so few." In this debate little attention is given to deepening our understanding of the broad role which athletic competition plays in the life of all students, in the life of the university community, in the lives of those who follow athletics.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding look at the role of athletics in the educational experience. In the following article the author notes that the "test of legitimacy—of an educational task—is the contribution . . . to education." Dr. Ping analyzes the role of athletics, especially intercollegiate athletics, in the educational experience and finds a significant contribution to not only the athletes involved but to the entire university community.

I take the liberty of bringing this fine speech to the attention of my colleagues not only for the genuine understanding that it brings to the role of athletics in college life, but for the insights that it gives also into the human spirit—and therefore, to the role that the challenges which we face daily play in the development of our own spirit.

I am proud that the remarks which I bring to your attention were delivered at a very fine university in Michigan's 10th District, Central Michigan University at Mount Pleasant. With administrators like Dr. Ping guiding the affairs of the University I am confident that it will continue to provide not only a quality education but growth to the human spirit. I commend Dr. Ping's remarks to your attention:

(Dr. Charles J. Ping assumed the position of provost and Vice President of academic affairs at CMU in 1969. Prior to coming to CMU, Ping served as vice president and dean of the faculty of Tusculum College in Tennessee. He joined the Tusculum faculty in 1966. In 1968 he was named acting president of Tusculum. Ping was a member of the Alma College faculty from 1958 to 1966. For a short time he served as a line coach for the Alma football team. Ping earned his B.A. degree from Southwestern at Memphis, the bachelor of divinity degree from Louisville Presbyterian Seminary and the Ph.D. degree from Duke University. Following is the text of a speech given by Ping at the annual football awards banquet November 27 on the CMU campus. The banquet honors the football team, coaches, seniors and outstanding players.)

I have a love for athletics. As a player, as a coach and as a spectator, sports have been a source of constant delight in my life. This is a bond I share with my father and now, in turn, with my son and daughter.

My life is richer because of athletics, but I am troubled. I am troubled by the stories from Louisiana, Oklahoma, Florida, and Hawaii. I am troubled by what I believe to be fair and accurate criticism of athletics—criticism such as—(1) costs—All resource allocations are value judgments. Behind the actual dollar figures for athletics are unexamined value judgments to the effect—this is necessary, this is important, and something else is less important. (2) racism—while there is a great deal of subtle and unthinking prejudice manifest in athletics; (3) sexism—This is overt; it takes the form of an indefensible distribution of support for athletic programs. Such discrimination mocks the claims of a university to be a community; (4) The catalogue of ills could be expanded—recruitment practices, dehumanizing and brutalizing drils, exploitation.

As troubling as the facts are, much of reaction to scandal and criticism is even more troubling. Corrections are long overdue. The status quo is not acceptable. We may be on the threshold of a convulsion in intercollegiate athletics equal to the trauma which led to the establishment of the NCAA. The common themes used in defense of intercollegiate athletics by university administrators and leaders of the athletic establishment are infuriating, and, ultimately, more destructive than the attack. To rationalize intercollegiate athletics as an end in itself is to lose an essential perspective. Athletics are a part of campus life, a dimension of an educational environment.

As a university, we do not have an educational program along side housing programs, student services programs, and athletic programs; we do not have an educational program because we are an educational program. Education is not an aspect of university life; education is the basis for that life, the reason for the bringing together a varied collection of students, professors, clerks, janitors, accountants, computer programmers, administrators, librarians, coaches, physicians, cooks and counselors. Whatever our tasks in the university, wherever there is an investment of human or material resources, the test of legitimacy is the contribution of that investment to education. Time, decisions, activities, allocations are all subject to this test.

The end sought is human development. Thus, the campus provides setting and occasions for the maturing of understanding, of language, of conceptualization and of skill. Beyond the cognitive, the processes entail nurturing the human capacity to respond to others, to feel and to express, and most importantly, to make judgments and to value.

All that we do as a university must conform to this standard of purpose. When applied to the athletic program the conclusion must be clear. The countless hours of effort, the investment of life energy by coaches and players, the thousands and thousands of dollars expended annually in equipment, supplies and expenses, the huge capital investment for facilities must have as their end human development.

The balance sheet on this investment would be read differently by various members of the university community. I cannot be sure what conclusions a careful analytical study would reach. But of this much I am confident—athletics can provide rich and varied educational experiences. It is this fact, and this fact alone, which ultimately justifies university involvement in athletics.

What are these educational values? A typical list would include discipline and character. Now discipline I can understand, but character is puzzling because it is so often associated with losing. After a disastrous season some years ago, I listened with my teammates to a banquet speaker wear out the theme of character. We were ready for life, he insisted, after that 1 and 8 season.

I remember thinking—what nonsense! If the season we had just finished developed character, who would want that kind of character! Discipline and character have worn thin as themes and I think much more can be said.

One of the most important human experiences is a sense of belonging, the establishment of a group relationship which commands the human response of person with person. Our lives are a steady succession of half-formed communities—of clubs and fraternities, of interest groups, of business or professional associations—which seem so often to lack intensity and power. Only rarely in life do we have a meeting which establishes a genuine community, a commonness in which we surrender a part of our individual self interest and join with others.

Some of the most vivid experiences of belonging in my life are associated with teams and teammates. This is not always true; the experience can be empty of meaning and value; but when it is real, the experience of a team is remarkable. What creates this sense of belonging? Is it a product of hard, sustained work together? Is it perhaps a sense of an intense loyalty to a common goal? Is it shared satisfaction and achievement? Perhaps no one who has had the experience would exclude any of these suggestions. Almost by definition, when you have a functioning team this sense of belonging holds.

It would be wrong, however, to identify this experience too narrowly. Team sports represent only one form of potential for community on campus. This realization of community for many comes through drama, or debate, or music, or campus publications. One of the sad commentaries on academic life is the fact that community is seldom realized as a product of consciously shared intellectual interest. Whatever the form, brief and fleeting though it may be, the experience of community enhances and develops human potential. It teaches through experience the important lesson that one man is no man and that man is more fully human with man.

Secondly, athletic competition occasions a sympathetic experience. The experience drives perception beyond the commonplace to the dramatic. The experience is sympathetic in at least two senses—one, the sense of being consonant with or congenial to, and two, the sense of a reproduction of the same vibrations, such as, sympathetic sound.

Most of life follows a pedestrian and commonplace pattern. The tingling feeling of tension and excitement is rare, all too rare. While the ordinary is not necessarily dreary or dull, the moments of true drama in life are precious. Such moments stretch and enlarge life.

Drama moves through conflict and tension to climax. The conflict engenders tension. With the acting out of the tension there is a sharpening of awareness and dynamic energy. The forces in conflict move toward climax and catharsis.

All who imaginatively penetrate the experience participate in this struggle. For the actors, the dramatic tension is something they must feel. An athletic contest can be a sympathetic experience for participants and spectators alike. Even though it is only a game, the charged air, the sense of conflict and the resolution of conflict, the joy and the anguish, have an electric effect on all who are caught up in the moment.

If this is the sole form of the experience on campus, then the educational life of the campus is impoverished. But that athletics can provide one experience of excitement filled with drama is demonstrated over and over again. Once you have experienced drama, never again will life be quite the same. The memory and capacity are part of your life. Having stretched life under the force of drama, life can never again quite come back the same shape.

Thirdly, athletics release, at least momentarily, the human capacity for high emotion and an uninhibited sense of joy. We chain and gag so much of life, that only in those few moments when we lose ourselves in excitement do we experience "the ideal of truly exurberant, alive, and world affirming man" (Nietzsche).

In recent years one recurring topic of discussion in education has been affective or expressive learning. What is meant by these terms is not clear. Much of the literature discussing the subject of affective learning is marked by a fluffy quality. Like cotton candy, the substance looks good and smells delicious but when you take a bite there is nothing there to chew and the discussion dissolves into a sticky residue lacking both substance and form. Yet I think the explorations of affective or expressive learning have exposed a void. As an educational program we are so preoccupied with cognitive learning that we may waste human potential. We have fostered a climate in which education becomes a grim and joyless experience. The fact is documented by people's faces and attitudes. It is reflected in the words we use—"requirements," "assignments." As I read student reactions, undergraduate experience becomes an obstacle course. A series of hurdles are to be passed or jumped or climbed. There is little joy in the task. Where is the sense of delight in coming to know which should mark such an experience?

The German philosophers of his day, according to Nietzsche, could not dance, and, therefore, could not philosophize:

"Thinking seems to them something slow and hesitant, almost a labor, and often enough 'worthy of the sweat of a noble man,' but never something light, divine, something closely related to the dance and to playful high spirits. 'Thinking' and 'taking something seriously,' 'taking it gravely,' are to them the same thing . . ." (Beyond Good and Evil, Friedrich Nietzsche)

To reach beyond oneself. To know you have become something more is an experience full of satisfaction and happiness. Conditioning and training produce such an experience. The feeling of well being is common to the well conditioned athlete. The experience is described by the feeling of leaving a locker room bruised and tired but somehow fulfilled. This experience of joy is not a matter of constant pleasureful moments, but of drudgery and pain and stress and strain. The joy is the satisfaction of becoming something more. To know this is to experience the meaning of development and to experience the only effective motivator for learning. If we could find some way to carry this experience over into the classroom, if we could reproduce a sense of delight in becoming some more, education would take on new life and force.

Ours is a culture which inhibits expression and a system of education which cripples emotion. We all too seldom dance. Dance as a form of expression is awing in its capacity to express and develop human emotion. Many other cultures use dance for joy or sorrow or excitement or zeal. The Greek novelist, Kazantzakis, created a memorable character in Zorba the Greek; Zorba, whose love of life, whose sense of the earth, was expressed not by words so much as dance. It may be that athletics fills the void created by the absence of dance. Ours is a culture in which men seldom touch or embrace in a free expression of joy and happiness. Yet it is a rare athletic contest without this experience. Tears come hard to most men, and when they come, are hidden in embarrassment. Yet there is a freedom to cry as well as embrace on the athletic field.

The nurturing of the expressive sense is one of the key justifications of an athletic program. Athletics for many serves as expressive movement. How uninhibited is the massed team as they huddle before a game. There is release of human potential in that movement. Only rarely in life do we feel free to express ourselves. What seems more natural than the crushing bear hug in the end zone. The embrace is an expression of joy welling up. How open the tears and how freely the tears can flow. I have a vivid memory of a rugged line backer—a tough, hard, aggressive, strong man.

The picture in my mind is his running to the sidelines with tears streaming down his cheeks after the other team had scored a fourth touchdown; he came to me, grabbing my arms and shouting, "Coach, what can we do?" There was nothing odd in the freedom with which he expressed his emotion and yet I suspect seldom in the rest of his life will he feel free to express himself as he did that day.

Without the driving force of strong feeling, little will be undertaken in life and even less accomplished. To experience and to express strong feeling—this is a contribution to human development. Frank Broyles spoke at a coaches' clinic in Michigan some years ago. He was describing the Arkansas Monster Man defense. "You gotta believe—you gotta feel it"—over and over again he repeated the words. I thought for a moment we were going to have an altar call when he was finished. But what made it a vivid and poignant experience for me was the contrast with the experience of the previous day. Just the day before I had been working with a philosophy seminar analyzing Hegel's philosophy of history. The class discussion had not caught fire. What I had been unable to interpret to my philosophy students, Coach Broyles had effectively conveyed to that audience of coaches. Before he was finished Frank Broyles was unconsciously paraphrasing Hegel. The course of world history, Hegel argued, is the gradual unfolding of the idea of freedom in the state. This is the end but the moving force, according to Hegel, is passion, where "the whole will and character is devoted" to the realization of the idea. Hegel wrote and Frank Broyles interpreted: ". . . nothing has been accomplished without an interest on the part of those who brought it about. And if 'interest' be called 'passion'—because the whole individuality is concentrating all of its desires and powers, with every fiber of volition, to the neglect of all other actual or possible interests and aims, on one object—we may then affirm without qualification that nothing great in the world has been accomplished without passion."

A realization of community, a sympathetic experience of drama, a sense of high emotion and joy, this is a large task and one concerned with the development of basic human potential. But the critic says, "After all, it's only a game and all the men merely players . . ."

SAT SCORES: WHAT HAPPENED TO THE BEST AND THE BRIGHTEST?

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22 of this year, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article describing the decline of SAT scores during the last 10 years. Anyone who has followed the progress, or lack of progress, in public education was not surprised. The teaching of reading, English composition, and mathematics has been steadily downgraded during that period, albeit under the guise of various "innovative and relevant programs." In an article in Saturday Review/World, for February 9, 1974, Mr. Fred M. Hechinger analyzes some of the causes for the decline in scores. In general, his points are well made. However, when he blames the low scores, in part, on the effect of various national crises, I think he has missed the point. All too many teachers have made a career of teaching the "news of the day," instead of the basic subjects they were hired to teach. Too many people in our schools have spent time expounding on "situation ethics," instead of attempting to teach measurable norms of social and intellectual standards. Our educators have taken the easy way out, which has compounded the problem of a TV generation that wants everything "now."

The article follows:

SAT SCORES: WHAT HAPPENED TO THE BEST AND THE BRIGHTEST?

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

According to popular as well as psychological folklore, each new American generation is not only taller but also smarter than any of its predecessors. Thus it was not surprising that the monitors of the 1960s youth culture proclaimed adolescents of the era as the best and the brightest.

Against such a background, what is the country to make of the recent disclosure by the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) that high school students have been scoring steadily worse on the Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SATs) administered to most college applicants? The initial reaction to the news that the scores have been in a ten-year downhill slide is one of shock and disbelief.

The tests, which the Educational Testing Service at Princeton, New Jersey, administers for the CEEB, are the pride of objective testing. The separate scores for verbal and mathematical aptitude run from a low of 200 to a maximum of 800. In 1962–63 the mean scores had been 478 (verbal) and 502 (mathematical); in 1972–73 they were 445 and 481 respectively. Over one million students took the tests last year.

"At first, the news hit me square between the eyes," said Ernest L. Boyer, chancellor of the State University of New York. "The experts had told us not only that the kids were brighter and more sophisticated, but also that the difference constituted something like a quantum jump upward."

After the initial shock, however, Boyer and other observers began to raise questions—about the tests and the schools as much as about the youngsters. Even though none of the questions have as yet been satisfactorily answered, they are the beginning of an appraisal without which these startling statistics could be grossly misinterpreted and abused. For the anti-youth forces, who have been waiting for an opportunity to cut the kids down to size, the new statistics are an invitation to vindictiveness.

Because any hasty, unproven conclusion that "they don't make either the kids or the schools like they used to anymore" could set off another round of acrimonious controversy, a sensible reaction would be to raise some possible explanation for dispassionate discussion:

More is worse. The dramatic increase in college applicants during the 1960s should have been expected to lower the scores, particularly since a greater proportion of the new candidates came from the lower socioeconomic sector. If James S. Coleman is right in saying that home background is the most important factor in school *achievement*, then it is more than likely that the environment would also affect a student's *aptitude*. Indeed, CEEB statistics also confirm that students from high-income families score higher on the SATs.

Tempting as it is to accept the demographic logic of that explanation and to drop the matter, the answer turns out to be less than airtight. One informed CEEB source points out that the number of test takers actually had stabilized at about one million several years ago. Yet the decline in the scores continued. Clearly, other possible contributing factors must be considered.

The McLuhan generation. The new generation's minds have been shaped far more by the electronic than by the print media. Children today see and hear more (and understand at least some of it at an often frighteningly early age), but they read less and have less time for reflection. After his first year of teaching English in a middle-class section of Brooklyn, a young man complained: "If I give them fifty pages of overnight reading, I have a revolution on my hands."

The other side of the coin was revealed in the sudden, startling comment by our own son when he was only five years old: "You're nicer than the average mummy." On investigation, it turned out that he had been a steady viewer of television's Yogi Bear, who "is smarter than the average bear."

High school students have grown up amid a steady onrush of national and international crises that call for sophisticated responses, and amid an equally steady decline in measurable norms of intellectual and social standards established by society and school. Such uncertainty makes it harder to answer objective questions.

Non-verbal classrooms. The schools have adjusted to the new style by sacrificing much of the analytical part of learning to mere spontaneity. Under the onslaught of critics who consider all drill autocratic, teachers have moved away from parsing sentences, analyzing ideas, and preparing outlines. Modern language enrollment has declined sharply. Yet those are the activities that sharpen the talents that lead to high SAT scores.

In 1960 Dr. Albert Upton, professor of English at Whittier College, subjected 280 freshmen to a regimen of examining the relationship between "words and things." After eight months of such training, the students' I.Q.s had been raised by an average of ten-and-one-half points. SATs are related closely enough to I.Q. tests to make it qutie likely that a decline in the schools' emphasis on the analytical skills may lower the scores of even bright and sophisticated students.

The easy way out would be simply to charge that the tests have not kept pace with a changing generation of youngsters. While that is probably true, it evades the real issue—how damaging a retreat from analytical, print-oriented schooling will be in the long run. The greater sophistication of the Now Generation, with instant experience and instant reaction, could be an enormous asset. But unless its experience is cross-fertilized with the deliberative and analytical skills of the pre-electronic age, that generation may go intellectually soft—all heart and little mind.

Nothing quite so alarming need yet be indicated by the decline in the SAT scores. The trend does not necessarily prove that the new generation is not as bright as its admirers had thought. But it does suggest that the alignment between students, schools, society, and tests may no longer be in balance. A simplistic response would be to fiddle with the tests; a more fruitful approach would be to try to learn more about the relationship between young people and the intellectual environment that dominates their education and indirectly affects their aptitudes.

CLASS WAR OVER TUITION

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA). JIM has served with distinction on the Committee on Education and Labor since 1959. With the beginning of the 93d Congress he assumed the additional responsibility of the chairmanship of the Special Subcommittee on Education—with specific jurisdiction over matters affecting higher education, including student financial aid programs.

The untiring efforts JIM O'HARA has put forth in his new role of chairman of this subcommittee has commanded the admiration of his colleagues on the committee and of educators across the Nation. He has spent months methodically deepening his knowledge of the very significant matters within his subcommittee's jurisdiction. We can already point to specific improvements in the student aid programs as a result of his diligence and work.

I am, therefore, quite pleased to note that JIM O'HARA is receiving very appropriate praise from other sources for his great and untiring efforts. Yesterday a column appeared in the New York Times which discussed a very controversial issue in the field of higher education, and that column gave JIM O'HARA due praise for his efforts to focus national attention on this matter. I include the New York Times column at this point in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1974]

CLASS WAR OVER TUITION

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

Many of the cures currently prescribed for colleges' fiscal troubles threaten to turn higher education into an instigator of class warfare. The irony in this prospect is that for nearly three decades American higher education has been a major force for the eradication of class differences and hostilities. It has notably narrowed the gap, both in aspirations and opportunities, between haves and have-nots, between privileged and underprivileged youths.

Through a dramatic expansion of educational access across class lines, the post-World War II G.I. Bill of Rights set in motion a trend that substantially reduced the risk of class conflict. The subsequent massive expansion of free or low-tuition public campuses signaled what seemed the permanent removal of economic and class barriers from college gates.

Those gains are now in jeopardy. College costs have followed the general inflation. The annual all-inclusive bill for each student now approaches $5,000 at many private universities and $2,000 or $3,000 respectively for state residents and out-of-state students in public institutions.

Yet prestigious national panels of educators, economists and social planners are advocating a policy of charging higher tuition at the public institutions. They argue that the private sector's survival is threatened by competition from low-cost public education; that a greater part of the cost for public higher education ought, for this and other reasons, to be charged to students; that affluent families reap excessive benefits from tax-supported low tuition; and that middle-class students are well able to shoulder a higher tuition burden.

Such contentions perpetuate a popular myth about American society—that the majority of families are affluent and that, except for the aberration of poverty, ours is essentially a classless nation composed, in the main, of one all-inclusive middle class.

That myth bears looking at against the statistical background provided last week by the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education. The income of families of youths in the 18 to 24-year age group divide as follows: 23 per cent are at poverty level, below $6,000; almost 58 per cent fall into the $6,000 to $15,000 bracket. That leaves fewer than 20 per cent of all families with children of college age at $15,000 and above.

Viewed against such realities, the demand that "the middle class" carry a larger scale of the tuition burden appears in a different light. Representative James G. O'Hara, Democrat of Michigan, who has been leading the battle against higher tuition in public institutions, said: "From the point of view of the Detroit auto worker who is making over $12,000 a year now and has to moonlight to make ends meet—from the point of view of the schoolteacher or the cop or the accountant or the salesman who has seen meat priced out of his life-style it doesn't make sense blithely to suggest that he ought to be forced to pay more of the money he doesn't have to send his kids to college—in the name of removing financial barriers."

While such hardship pleas have less force for the 6.5 per cent of families with college-age children in the over-$25,000 bracket and even for most of the 12.7 per cent in the $15,000-to-$25,000 group, the charge that they are getting a free ride should be measured against the fact that these families also pay higher taxes to support public campuses, whether or not their children use them.

The commissions and panels concerned with social and educational policies, though generally liberal and public-spirited, are largely recruited from among the affluent. Their view of the nation as basically one happy, classlessly middle-class family is well-intentioned but misleading. They tend, in the fine tradition of *noblesse oblige*, to react responsibility and sympathetically toward the poor. All their proposals include generous, and entirely necessary, provisions for free education and subsidies at the poverty level.

What makes their proposals vulnerable seems an inadequate understanding of the thin line that divides much of the working and lower-middle class from the poor. A minor financial disaster can push those on the plus side of the line back into poverty. There is growing concern that higher college tuition could become just such a disaster.

Such a course could have a corroding influence on the already deteriorating relations between the poor and the lower-middle-class. If the children of the former are encouraged to attend college tuition-free or even on a subsistence subsidy—as they ought to be—then hard-pressed middle-class families are likely to react in anger and political vindictiveness.

It is risky to tamper with low-cost higher education which has been a phenomenally sucessful engine for creation of a harmoniously upward-mobile society. In addition, if the high cost of college-going compels those with limited means to commute to colleges near their homes, simply because they cannot afford room and board in addition to higher tuition, then the residential campuses will quickly turn from melting pots into class-bound, rich ghettos.

To oppose pressures for higher tuition in public colleges is not to abandon the private institutions, whose continued strength is essential to academic diversity and independence. A combination of grants to institutions and scholarships to students can shield these colleges against both runaway tuition inflation and the loss of all but rich students to the low-cost public sector. Such subsidies coud keep the college gates and the competition for students wide open, without the threat of institutional and social class warfare.

OMB WANTS TO CONTRACT OUT THE GOVERNMENT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I recently spoke before Federal civil service employees in California concerning a massive shift in Government policy. This policy, presently being developed by the Office of Management and Budget—OMB—would contract out functions presently being performed by civil service personnel to major private contractors. I would like to insert for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues the text of my remarks on that occasion.

The conceptual basis of the OMB proposal is that employees of large private contractors are more efficient than civil servants. Thus, by contracting out, Federal personnel costs would be reduced thereby saving the taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars. This would be a praiseworthy undertaking if the public could be assured that these savings would ever be realized. However, the performance of large private contractors, ITT, RCA, Westinghouse, General Dynamics, Litton Industries, Lockheed, et cetera, on Government contracts has not been particularly noteworthy. These corporate giants, who would derive the most benefit from the OMB proposal, are the architects of the TFX, the Mark 48 Torpedo, and the C–5A, to list only a few benchmark examples of contractual effectiveness and efficiency. I do not believe, as the public record clearly indicates, that the taxpayers would ever benefit from turning over civil service functions to these companies.

Further, the principal architect of the contracting out proposal is Mr. Roy Ash, Director of OMB and former chief executive of Litton Industries. While at Litton, Mr. Ash was instrumental in the formation of the National Council of Technical Service Industries, the major lobbyist in Washington for firms that provide personnel to the Federal Government on a contractual basis. Further, Litton Industries, Mr. Ash's former employer, would be one of the major bidders on Government contracts resulting from the OMB proposal.

The text of my remarks follow:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN WALDIE

I would like to talk with you this evening about a little known, but perhaps the most powerful agency in the Federal Government. Most citizens surely know what the letters HEW or DOD or even HUD mean, but how many can quickly say that OMB stands for Office of Management and Budget?

Nevertheless, it is clear to me that OMB through the enormous power that it wields in drawing up a 300 billion plus dollar budget is in a position to actually dictate policy to many agencies of the Federal Government and no group of Americans is more directly affected by the power of OMB than Federal employees.

For example, Civil Service Commission officials have to first clear their statement through OMB before they can testify before my Congressional Subcommittee on any retirement legislation, health insurance premiums, leave requirements or any other matter that might even remotely relate to money. In effect, it is OMB which writes the testimony and decides policy and it sends its messenger boys from the Commission down to testify.

In fact, if OMB doesn't have the time to clear a statement, then Civil Service Commission officials can only answer questions (and then rather timidly) but under no circumstances would they be allowed to alter even one word of a statement. But ask OMB to testify on a subject, and the word is sent down from on high that it is the Civil Service Commission that is responsible for the matters under the Subcommittee's jurisdiction. One of my major goals for the next year is to break through this barrier and get to the real decision maker of policy affecting Federal employees.

But in general, OMB will essentially remain isolated, and almost totally unaccountable to the millions of people over whose lives it wields enormous power and control. Indeed, it was probably to maintain this high degree of unaccountability that the President waged such a bitter fight to assure that the Director of OMB would remain not subject to Senate confirmation.

Before going on to look at just how OMB decisions affect every Federal employee in this country, let us first look at its Director for a moment—the person that the President insists upon appointing with no questions asked.

For a little more than one year now, OMB has been run by Roy Ash, the former Chief Executive Officer for Litton Industries. All of us in government know about Litton—you know, it is the company that has millions of dollars worth of government contracts, but always seems to be in court demanding more money after enormous cost overruns. I am told that when Ash was head of Litton, he rarely left his Beverly Hills headquarters to visit subsidiaries. Now he sits in Washington deciding which programs will get what without ever having seen any of them in operation.

Now Ash has long been the opinion that it would be best if government work, now performed by hundreds of thousands of career civil servants, were turned over to private contractors on what amounts to a cost-plus basis. That kind of attitude is quite understandable if you are the head of a company which stands to be a major beneficiary of any increased contracting-out. But it is totally irresponsible, and smacks of conflict of interest, when that individual is put into a position to directly implement his philosophy—and again, all with no questions asked, and with little, if any, accountability.

Perhaps the best example of the Ash philosophy is contained in a recent OMB proposal which I disclosed just before Christmas.

In September of 1973 OMB made a proposal to all the branches of the military calling for the contracting out to private industry of much of the operational support services now performed on military bases. These conversions would include: hospitals, civil engineering, supply, transportation, law enforcement, food service, commissary and other service, special services, transient aircraft maintenance, and such administrative functions as postal service, reproduction, computer operations, and audio-visual services.

I have in my Washington, D.C. office the response of the Air Force to the OMB proposal. That response indicates that the Air Force will reluctantly accept a reduction of 88,000 civilian personnel, if called upon to do so by OMB, but the Air Force further indicates that OMB's cost-saving rationale for the contracting out is "grossly overstated."

That 88,000 reduction is ⅓ of all the civilians working for the Air Force. Although I have requested the OMB proposals to the Army and Navy, they have been denied to me on the grounds that they are internal memos, and no final decision has been made. But, we do know from the OMB proposal that "similar" proposals were made to those services. So allow me a moment to detail exactly what a ⅓ reduction of military civil service personnel would mean just to California.

It would mean the loss of almost 50,000 civil service jobs in California alone, including 5,000 in Los Angeles County, 6,500 in the Sacramento Area, 7,000 in San Diego County, 9,000 in San Francisco Bay, and perhaps 2,500 in San Bernadino.

It would cause enormous disruption in the communities in which these people work. For instance, Federal Impact Aid to Education would be severely affected. Again, using California as an example, school districts could lose up to 9 million of the 75 million they now receive to offset the burdens that federal installations place upon any community's school system. Real Estate markets would be depressed, and about the only businessmen who would be happy would be the moving van company executives.

But wouldn't it save the taxpayer money? The answer is very simple—NO!—and we have the record to back us up on it.

While OMB asserts that contractors are more efficient than civil service operations, GAO audits of personal services contracts have indicated that the net effect of these contracts has generally been a higher cost to Government for services that have been, and could have been, provided by regularly appointed Federal employees.

I guess we all know the game. Once the decision is made to contract out, the award of the contract is based upon the lowest bid received. Then once the contract is let, somehow those initial cost figures start to skyrocket until after a few years the taxpayer is paying through the nose. But once the original decision is made, it is practically irreversible—when was the last time you heard of a contracted-out service returning to "in-house" status?

I should also point out that the OMB proposal had one other interesting aspect—all the work on one base must be contracted out to only *one* contractor, thereby eliminating any possibility that small, specialized companies could compete for a portion of the work. It isn't too hard to imagine who will benefit from such a provision—the giants like Lockheed, RCA, ITT, and yes—of course, Ash's former company, Litton Industries.

If this OMB proposal isn't bad enough, and doesn't convince you that there is a trend starting, let me quickly tell you that the Social Security Administration—long adjudged by competent outside authorities to be perhaps the most efficiently and effectively run of all Federal agencies—is also evidently in line for some contracting out. This OMB plan, now circulating within high levels of the Social Security Administration, would contract out thousands of jobs throughout the nation. The author of the plan? F. D. DeGeorge, a former executive at Litton with Roy Ash.

The writing is on the wall, then. If Roy Ash and his friends had their way, OMB would try to contract out the entire government—including, I'm afraid—the Congress. But these men, imbued as they are with their big business bias, do not have to carry the day—if we fight them.

And we can fight them by getting together all the facts, bringing them to the attention of every member of Congress, and keeping the heat on until OMB has to back down.

THE ENERGY EMERGENCY CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last evening, by a 7 to 7 vote, the Rules Committee rejected a request from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to permit immediate House consideration of the energy emergency conference report, waiving all points of order.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate today that I think the decision made by the Rules Committee was both responsible and wise. In the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 we adopted a provision to require that conference reports must lay over 3 days before they may be brought up on the floor. That provision was incorporated in our rules in 1971 as clause 2(a) of Rule XXVIII, and it reads as follows:

It shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until the third calendar day (excluding any Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday), after such report and the accompanying statement shall have been filed in the House, and such consideration then shall be in order only if such report and accompanying statement shall have been printed in the daily edition of the Congressional Record for the day on which such report and statement shall have been filed. . . .

Mr. Speaker, we adopted this rule to protect the interests of the entire House. In the past, conference reports were often brought to the floor without allowing Members sufficient time to even read them. In the case of the Energy Emergency Act conference report, we have a bill of sweeping significance and importance—a bill which is both complex and lengthy, running nearly 100 pages. I think it would be a travesty on the rules of the House for us to permit this conference report to be brought to the floor on the day after it has been reported, without giving Members adequate time to fully study it.

Another rule which would have been waived under the proposed request was clause 3 of rule XXVIII which states that a conference report, and I quote, "shall not include matter not committed to the conference committee by either House." Again, in the energy emergency conference report, we have an instance where this has been done with respect to substituting a price rollback for the windfall profits prohibition. I think Members are entitled to have sufficient time to study the merits of this entirely new provision, if indeed it should be granted special protection.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my vote in the Rules Committee last evening, and I would hope that my colleagues will agree that we must give this very far-reaching report the most careful consideration and scrutiny before bringing it up for a vote.

TRIBUTE TO MURRAY M. CHOTINER BY PROF. IRVING FERMAN

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 6, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, at page H585 of this RECORD are remarks I made to the memory of the late Murray M. Chotiner. I referred to the tribute paid him at funeral services at Washington Hebrew Congregation on February 4 by law professor Irving Ferman of Howard University. Professor Ferman's moving tribute is reproduced below:

TRIBUTE

I feel that I should focus in this this morning on the sides of Murray Chotiner which I saw most often and therefore knew best. Sides that were not political. It would be utterly futile for me, or anyone else to reconstitute for tribute all sides and facets of such a rich and diverse a person as was Murray.

Many of those whose suggestions I requested in framing this brief tribute . . . men and women who have been closest to him in politics, the legal profession and his personal life . . . felt, as I did, that to review Murray's political career would be superfluous. . . . Almost everyone already knows or thinks he knows that.

We felt, too, that it would be a disservice, since, for all its public notice, politics, in fact, was only one big part of the unique and fruitful life of our departed friend. Of course, none were more respectful of politics than he; none talked and participated more avidly. But, what of his pride and devotion to the law in all its aspects? And what of the totally private Murray Chotiner . . . . The utterly refreshing wit? . . . the friend, husband, father, grandfather?

To these questions, I can almost see Murray smile, wryly, and say, as he often did, "Irving, you professors should learn the facts of real life", then after another joking exchange, he would add, "Come on, let's talk law."

During my acquaintanceship and subsequent warm friendship with Murray, we talked exhaustively on many issues of the day; Most often Murray chose those of civil liberty import. And while I am, of course, well aware that to many the public image of Murray Chotiner was that of a controversial figure; I found long ago that he was, in fact, a lawyer of uncommon ability and broad knowledge. Those qualities, I believe, enhanced . . . without conflict, his more commonly known qualities as an astute and highly skilled professional political leader.

Observing him as he exercised his intriguing mix of superior talents . . . legal and political . . . called to mind what Chad Walsh wrote in the mid 50's:

"In the quiet study, the good politician sees a hovering ideal. It is the City of God. In smoke filled rooms he learns how far the City of Man is from that ideal. He must begin with the earthly city as it is. He does not despair."

About a year ago, as lawyers and as seekers for that City of God, Murray and I discussed at length the role of Citizen Police Review Boards in the context of urban problems and urban politics.

He brought to that conversation, as he did to virtually all of them over the years, the perceptive sense of a fine legal mind, ... and simultaneously the down-to-earth realism of a politician who knows his task to be the engineering of governmental and political reform without creating imbalance and disorder . . . in other words, real effective reform.

He spoke that evening of the necessity of designing a mechanism that would safeguard communities against the excesses of police action . . . while maintaining the effectiveness of their police force to provide order without which freedom is doomed. He spoke to the salient points of a dilemma that far too few in authority can comprehend: protection of the public; maintenance and concern for the efficiency and morale of police who must provide that protection; and practical means by which both could be effectuated simultaneously without infringing on civil liberties and the Bill of Rights.

In short, Murray demonstrated not only a keen awareness and considerable knowledge of a complex legal and social problem . . . . but he showed, inadvertently, his deep conviction in matters of such grave importance . . . and the fact that he was both a remarkable gifted lawyer and an astutely operational politician.

On another recent occasion, Murray spoke with me on the need of our country to move extensively and quickly in support of Black colleges. His concern was not only with the obvious social obligation, but characteristically he dwelt even more intensively and with greater particularity on the sort of political strategy that should be adopted to achieve this vital educational goal.

The talents Murray so casually demonstrated in numerous instances, such as these, were a mold of: the understanding of the political operation, intimate familiarity with its process, as well as its conception.

And, my fellow friends, and admirers of Murray, in these challenging days, we in our nation, must recognize those uniquely refined talents . . . the talents of the Murray Chotiners and the enormous potential for effective leadership of those who are blessed with those talents.

During many of our conversations . . . and being lawyers, he and I of course liked to talk . . . Murray also revealed perhaps both by instinct and by concept, a deep, perceptive comprehension that is unfortunately rare among intellectuals today. It is the knowledge, that no one man could ever capture the truth . . . that the truth is too elusive for any one human being to so capture because of the very limitation of his perspective.

Our friend, this unusual man from California by way of Pittsburgh had a significant part in successfully launching the careers of many public figures for over a generation . . . Congressmen, Governors, Senators, and even a Chief Justice and a President of the United States.

Yet, Murray Chotiner retained . . . and never for a moment relinquished his independence of thought, action and constructive comment.

There was never a phony fiber in his makeup. Murray Chotiner was both impatient and contemptuous of hypocrites, "Robot Yes Men", sycophants, and self righteous courtiers . . . in fact, all in our body politic and private life that reeks of falseness, stupidity and dead-beating.

Murray was a questioner, a superior organizer of men in behalf of causes and leaders in whom he believed . . . he was never self satisfied . . . his feeling for and understanding of people as such, never faltered.

His broad and deep understanding was the basis for a strong pluralist disposition. Murray felt instinctively the need to listen and to think through what his fellowman had to say, to write, to propose.

Two thoughts . . . or perhaps reflections about Murray that I would like to share with you.

Murray's strong pluralist disposition was reflected in a total lack of . . . and disdain for self-righteousness and hypocrisy. I mean, of course, the sort of self-righteousness reflected in what Harbert Butterfield said nearly a quarter century ago. . . .

"In this kind of world that I see on history, there is one sin that locks people up in all their other sins . . . the sin of self-righeousness."

Or, as St. Augustine taught in the beginning of human history:

"Great care must be taken, lest the mind believing what it does not see, fashion itself what does not exist, and hope and love what is false."

The second thought or reflection is, in essence this:

In Murray Chotiner the absence of self-righteousness not only cleared his eyes and mind for a more realistic recognition of the truth . . . it was reflected as it is in others of Murray's disposition, in an engaging and magnificent sense of humor, often times self deprecating and always a precious trait.

Murray had what Samuel Butler referred to when he wrote:

"A sense of humor keen enough to show a man his own absurdities, as well as those of other people, will keep him from the commission of all sins, or nearly all, save those that are worth committing."

Permit me to add, before closing, that one of the simpliest, yet most important of his personality traits, was reflected in his thoughtfulness and courtesy toward virtually everyone, colleagues, friends, and even foe.

The pressure and stress of work never caused to neglect a telephone call, to acknowledge a letter or in other ways to be unresponsive regardless of circumstances and individuals.

That kind of commitment to form and manner is an integral part of grace among those in power which too often is lacking in our public and private lives.

Courtesy is a quality of greatness . . . a sign of simple decency and human understanding.

An essential observation about Murray Chotiner . . . possibly THE essential observation, is that his sense of pluralism, his sense of humor, his sense of manner and courtesy did not ever dilute Murray's basic strength, his decisiveness. Too often, nowadays, we tend to mistake humor and courtesy for weakness. Murray demonstrated beyond question how to be strong and human, how to be decisive and yet gentle and understanding.

That, to me, more than anything else is the message I find so inspiring in the life of our friend Murray Chotiner.

Murray was, as his family and closest friends were well aware, a private man with a deep innerness. He was a sentimental grandfather. Dana and Cara were ever in his mind and heart. He longed for their company.

His dear wife, Nancy, brought to him a sense of renewal of life and thought and he found sustenance for happiness in the love of his two daughters, Renee and Julie.

His son, Ken, was his pride. A most promising lawyer now in California, whose talents portend a distinguished career in the years ahead.

Our conceptions of immortality are varied as there are people assembled here. We all agree, however, that the most significant immortality is in the impact we make on the lives of those around us . . . particularly those closest to us . . . our family and our friends. It is the most valuable legacy we can leave. Such a legacy is reflected in a magnificent and revealing essay Julie Chotiner wrote in her high school English class back in October!

This routine assignment was a test of the initiative as well as the creativeness and writing abilities of the young student. Each was told to select his or her Hero, then explain in essay form the reasons for esteeming that individual above all others.

Julie Chotiner, a bright, lovable, 16 year old, went beyond the customary idols of her fellow teenagers. She chose a grown man . . . her dad, Murray Chotiner. Julie confided that bare fact to her mother, noting more. Subsequently, she mentioned, in passing, that her composition had received a very high grade. That was more in November.

After Murray's hospitalization because of the accident, Julie asked her mother to deliver a "little message" to her dad at Sibley Hospital.

"It may make him get well faster and come back to us quicker," she said.

Nancy thanked the child, assured her of Murray's love and constant thoughts then rushed back to the bedside watch at Sibley Hospital . . . . Since Murray was hardly up to reading anything at that point, Nancy left Julie's "message" on his bedside table.

The next day. . . . Just last Sunday . . . when Nancy entered her husband's room, Murray was literally his old, ebullent self—but more so. Despite bandages, plaster casts, tubes and whatnot, he was joyfully waving Julie's message in the air . . . quoting passages at random, and declaring to one and all—Nancy, curious nurses and passing doctors. . . .

"Please read what my precious daughter has written. . . . I am a hero to my daughter . . . a Hero."

Nancy, overjoyed at Murray's happiness, read Julie's tribute . . . beamed through tears. . . .

"You are MY hero too, Murray . . . and Renee's and Ken's and the grandchildren's . . . and so, many others. . . ."

What a delightful Sunday that was for the Chotiners. . . .

"I feel great", Murray insisted, "Tell the doctor I want to get home to the children."

No eulogy to this most uncommon man could be more fitting . . . nearly as authentic . . . than Julie Chotiner's essay about her hero. . . .

And, because she wished it so, it is most appropriate that Julie deliver it.

AMERICAN GENEROSITY AND EX-IM BANK

HON. E. G. SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, since World War II, America has earned a reputation for its generosity, having contributed $150 billion to the developing nations of the world. Now, if we continue to follow the lead of the government-owned Export-Import Bank, we may earn a reputation for insanity.

American dollars, without the advice or consent of the American people, will finance an oil pipeline in the Middle East for those very nations who even today refuse to lift the oil embargo to the United States. This will happen unless we do something about it now—before it is too late.

The Ex-Im Bank has approved a $100-million loan to the Bechtel Corp., to pay for 45 percent of a pipeline from the Suez to the Mediterranean, so that the Arab countries can get their oil to Europe faster and more economically—$100 million, Mr. Speaker, for people who's recent actions are wrecking havoc on our economy.

Approval for this loan was made by the National Advisory Council which consists of—and listen carefully, because this is incredible—the Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Commerce, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. These Cabinet level and top-ranking administration officials, who daily make pronouncements about how severely the Arab oil embargo is hurting America, have decided to finance a project which is clearly not in the best interests of the American people.

U.S. participation in this project could balloon to 90 percent of the total project cost before all the financing has been arranged. Forty-five percent has already been committed by the Ex-Im Bank, and another 45 percent will come from another bank—either foreign or domestic. And if we follow the same insane logic that led to the approval of the $100-million loan, it could well be a U.S. bank.

No matter who puts up the other 45 percent, what is left for the Arabs to contribute? Ten percent, Mr. Speaker. The five benefiting Arab nations, those same nations that have tripled the price for a barrel of oil; those same nations that are demanding more and more royalties from American industry that developed their oilfields in the first place;

those same nations that are openly talking about nationalizing American industrial complexes in their countries; those same nations that probably have the highest per capita income of any nation in the world—those nations, Mr. Speaker, will contribute a mere 10 percent of the project cost—$20 million—while we dish out $100 million, or possibly even $200 million. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if those nations cannot afford to pay for their own pipeline, nobody can.

Mr. Speaker, it is time somebody spoke out about this. It is time the American people woke up. It is time they learned just what our Government is doing with our hard-earned tax money.

The contract for this insane Ex-Im-Bank loan has not yet been signed. Public pressure can still make a difference. Congressional pressure can still make a difference. Mr. Speaker, I urge you and the other distinguished Members of this body, in the strongest possible terms, to get to the Export-Import Bank and put a stop to this nonsense. Tell the folks back home about it; urge them to write to the Bank and stop this irresponsible demonstration of fiscal insanity. Moreover, I hope the Congress will take a long, hard look at the Export-Import Bank and its policies so that the American people can know just how it is serving the American interest.

ROLLBACK OF FUEL PRICES

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing today a bill to freeze and then roll back prices of crude oil and petroleum products which I first introduced on January 28, 1974. The bill has been cosponsored by Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PODELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ROE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. WOLFF, Ms. GRASSO, Mr. NIX, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Ms. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GUDE, and Ms. CHISHOLM.

It is evident from the numerous cosponsors of the bill that people throughout the country are angry at the recent substantial increases in gasoline and heating oil prices. They are especially angry because, at the same time that prices are rising, oil companies are making windfall profits. The people of the country are already suffering under the biggest inflation we have had since World War II. We in Congress cannot desert the consumer by permitting the recent increases in oil and gasoline prices to remain in effect.

These price increases have been accompanied by unconscionably high profits for the big oil companies. Annual profits of Exxon and Gulf increased by 60 percent in 1973 over 1972. The figures for the rest of the oil giants are slightly lower but still exorbitant. Increases in quarterly profits reported during the height of the crisis late last year were even higher—80 percent for Exxon for example.

My bill proposes to alleviate the inflationary burden on consumers in two steps: first, by immediately freezing prices of crude oil and petroleum products at the level in effect during a 2-week period ending January 19, 1974; and, second, by rolling back these prices within 30 days to the price levels in effect during the week ended November 1, 1973. Thereafter, the bill would permit only certain narrowly limited price adjustments to prevent any gross inequities or hardships.

A provision is included in the bill which is designed to help independent distributors and their customers by eliminating price differentials now suffered by purchasers of foreign rather than domestic oil products. This provision will aid the customers of independent oil distributors who recently have been paying exorbitant prices for products such as home heating oils. Independent oil distributors are now being forced to buy high-priced foreign oil products because of discriminatory allocations of domestic oil products by the oil companies.

Finally, the bill authorizes the President to issue orders designed to preserve the competitive viability of independent marketers, small retailers, and independent refiners within the oil industry.

Enactment of this bill would bring price relief to the consumer and would constitute a very significant step in controlling the runaway inflation suffered during 1973.

The text of the bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 is amended by inserting in section 203 the following new subsections:

"(k) Immediately upon the date of enactment of this subsection, the President shall issue an order to establish a ceiling on prices of crude oil and petroleum products at levels not greater than the highest levels pertaining to a substantial volume of actual transactions by each business enterprise or other person during the fourteen day period ending January 19, 1974, for like or similar commodities, or if no transactions occurred during such period, then the highest applicable level in the nearest preceding fourteen day period.

"(l) The ceiling on prices required under subsection (k) shall be applicable to all retail prices and to wholesale prices for unfinished, finished or processed goods.

"(m) As soon as practicable, but not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the President shall by written order stating in full the considerations for his actions, roll back prices for crude oil and petroleum products to levels no higher than those prevailing in the seven-day period ending November 1, 1973, in order to reduce inflation. Price increases announced after November 1, 1973, and made retroactive to dates prior to November 1, 1973, shall not be considered as having been in effect prior to such date for purposes of this subsection. The President may make specific exceptions from the rollback by written order to compensate for increased costs for crude oil and petroleum products produced or refined outside the United States, but in no event shall such exceptions allow more than a pass-through for increases in the costs of such commodities. Such orders shall state procedures and adequate public notice of any price exceptions and shall disallow any profit margins on any crude petroleum or petroleum products in excess of the margin applicable in the seven-day period ending November 1, 1973.

"(n) The President may, by written order stating in full the considerations for his actions, make such additional exceptions and variations to the orders required under this section as may be necessary to prevent gross inequities and hardships, and to encourage and preserve the competitive viability of branded independent marketers, small refiners, nonbranded independent marketers, and independent refiners, as defined in the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-159).

"(o) The President shall, by written order, issue rules to insure that all corporations or other entities engaging in sales of crude petroleum at the refinery level or petroleum products at the wholesale level reflect, in sales to any purchaser, the average costs of its foreign and domestic crude oil and petroleum products.

"(p) Section 406 of Public Law 93-153 is hereby repealed.

"(q) For purposes of this section 'petroleum product' means gasoline, kerosene, distillates (including Number 2 fuel oil), LPG, refined lubricating oils, or diesel fuel."

ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND AND THE ORDNANCE SCHOOL—THEY MUST REMAIN

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body have frequently expressed their commitment to the concept of an efficient all-volunteer armed services. If we are to successfully realize this goal, legislative and administrative actions must be directed toward maintaining high standards of training, retraining, and properly utilizing these skilled individuals.

I am deeply concerned about several recent actions of the Department of Defense which I feel will have an adverse effect on our defense capabilities. Since last November, rumors have been circulating concerning the possibility of the Army transferring the Ordnance School from the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland. Though the Defense Department has not formally announced a decision on this proposal, it is my understanding that they are favorably disposed to transferring the Ordnance School.

I firmly maintain that in defense, as well as all other sectors of the budget, we must exert every effort to conserve the Federal tax dollar. Unneeded installations must be phased out, but these decisions must be based on sound economic factors and proper analysis of the long-range effects. We must have an Ordnance School and traditionally it has been located at the Aberdeen Proving Grounds. I see no reason to move this installation unless it can be clearly demonstrated that considerable cost savings can be effected. To date, such documentation has not been unveiled. In fact, as my colleague, Mr. BAUMAN, from Maryland, has pointed out, it is very likely that the move will cost the Army more than it would if the school were retained in Aberdeen. In light of this, I join my colleague in urging congressional opposition to this proposed action.

In a similar vein, I am concerned about the Defense Department's decision, announced on Monday, February 4, to reduce Army Air Defense Nike-Hercules missile batteries deployed in the Continental United States. Within my district, this decision will eliminate 92 Army National Guard civilian technician positions. These individuals are highly trained and a valuable resource to our total defense effort. The men employed at these sites are civilians with permanent roots in the area. These decisions to abruptly close bases staffed primarily by "citizen soldiers" of the National Guard could have severe adverse effects on our recruitment and retention efforts unless we make every effort when a mission is outmoded to utilize these manpower assets to their greatest potential. I will certainly do everything in my power to see that these men are placed in jobs which will utilize their potential.

A SYRACUSE SENIOR CITIZENS GROUP WINS BATTLES FOR ITS MEMBERS

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for many, many years this Nation's senior citizens have been the forgotten members of our society. Now that is changing, primarily because the elderly are organizing and forming groups to fight for their rights, particularly the right to remain as contributing members of society. I am most fortunate to have one of the most effective of those groups in my district in Syracuse, N.Y. A recent article in the AARP News Bulletin, entitled "ACCORD: A Winner for Elderly in Syracuse Consumer Battles," described this group and its activities. May I share it with you:

ACCORD: A WINNER FOR ELDERLY IN SYRACUSE CONSUMER BATTLES

SYRACUSE.—One of the nation's most effective advocacy coalitions for older persons is being led here by an AARP member, Mrs. Grace Egelston.

Mrs. Egelston, 65, helped organize a group called ACCORD, which consists of 55 clubs and 19,000 members in the Syracuse area. She estimates about 3,000 AARP members are affiliated with ACCORD, which is the acronym for Action Coalition to Create Opportunities for Retirement with Dignity.

Public officials listen when ACCORD sounds off on issues such as housing, fire prevention and medical care. The elderly also get 10 percent discounts in 700 stores, ride buses at reduced fares, and recently were granted a reduction in telephone service charges.

With seed money from United Way, the Community Fund agency, ACCORD launched its effort to improve the lives of older people with 2,000 volunteers in 1969. In that first year, the organization collected 9,000 petition signatures for higher Social Security benefits; began a campaign to get reduced bus fares; and formed a car pool for older people in high-crime localities.

One of ACCORD's most successful projects was developed in 1970 by Frank Barlow, a 70-year-old former investment counsellor. He knew businessmen. Barlow had to prove to area merchants they could profit by discounts. Syracuse newspapers, radio and TV promoted Barlow's idea when he produced polls showing that older persons were eager for a discount project.

More than 12,000 retirees signed up for discount cards in a three-week registration period, exceeding Barlow's "wildest expectations." The number has since jumped to 16,000 card holders and 700 participating stores.

ACCORD's list of achievements doesn't end with the discount program. The group has also compiled 2,000 hours of home interviews to produce a computerized picture of the country's older population; formed a health inspection task force on hospitals and nursing homes which will recommend vital improvements; and conducted a fire safety campaign which educates older people on home fire prevention.

"Our success is proof that seniors can play a great role in changing their lives if they're given half a chance," says Mrs. Egelston, who is a retired teacher.

Chapters interested in forming a similar consumer task force should write to ACCORD, 264 East Onondaga Street, Syracuse, N.Y. 13202.

RECIPE FOR THE WORLD'S BEST VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess, I traveled to Israel to inspect its vocational education program, well-known for its excellence, in order to help prepare for the General Education Subcommittee's upcoming hearings on vocational education.

I would like to share with my colleagues some of the highlights of my investigation and am inserting below a brief summary:

RECIPE FOR THE WORLD'S BEST VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

1. Use serious machinery.
2. Get instructors from industry, not from Educ. schools.
3. Keep up with the latest industrial techniques.
4. Send instructors into the field, even overseas, to keep abreast of recent developments.
5. Make students carry full academic load in addition to vocational studies.
6. Keep teacher pupil ratio close to 10 to 1.
7. Create vocational schools right in the factories.
8. Be sure the project or product the student works on or creates will be needed and useable.
9. Build in the school the equipment that is needed and not available.

These are some ways that Israel created its vocational educational system to produce what that State needed most: skilled manpower, and in doing so has established the finest vocational-technical education I've ever seen.

Carl Perkins, the Chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, had informed me that the Committee's next order of business will be hearings on and consideration of the Vocational Education Act, and authorized travel to Israel and to report back findings there on matters relating to vocational education.

In proportion to the size of the two nations. I found the U.S. compared to Israel is far behind in vocational training. The Jewish people who for centuries have traditionally put trade and profession above manual skill now have in Israel nearly 60% of the 15–20 year old school enrollment in vocational education, and there are 2 to 3 applications for every opening.

Particularly impressive were ORT Singalovsky in Tel Aviv and the Boys' Town School in Jerusalem. The level of skill training is comparable to the Swiss apprenticeship program. The Equipment was complex, the pupils serious, the instructors working closely with the boys, and the plant appearance was clean and efficient. Boys' Town has done something this country may yet have to do to break through the poverty cycle of the disadvantaged. Boys Town takes the oriental Jewish youngsters from extremely deprived families that often live with 8 to 10 children in 2 or 3 rooms. This boy receives room and board at the school, along with others from families with established middle class values. Friendships are formed, and the poorer child can work and study without the handicap of unsatisfactory home environment. And it works. The boy from the low income family learns to make it economically.

These observations were made while schools functioned under most difficult conditions. Nearly a third of the vocational teachers were mobilized, and many of the students had gone to factories and farms to replace regular workers now in the military.

The new State of Israel found its principal raw material was manpower, and self-preservation has made it necessary to train and use this asset fully. With materials now becoming scarce in this country and even worldwide, perhaps the ultimate solution to the energy crisis is the training and utilization of the energy of our own basic raw material—the young people of this country.

One of the best examples of vocational-technical education in Israel is the medical instructional program associated with the Hadassah hospital in Jerusalem.

At the hospital we met with its staff who were involved in various areas of medical technical training programs: the director of the school of occupational therapy, the director of the school of nursing and others. Of particular interest to me was information provided by Dr. Eva Heitner, dean of the Hadassah Community College. Here community college and hospital are joined together to produce lab technicians, medical secretaries, medical librarians, medical photographers, and other paramedical personnel so badly needed throughout the Mideast. The curriculum is being contsantly updated to meet the changing needs of the country.

Heavily endowed by state and by private institutions, the total tuition is $250 annually. Many of the Yemenite and Moroccan emigrants are successfully involved in these courses, and newly arrived Russian emigres with previous technical experience are being retrained in Israeli techniques and methods.

Unfortunately, Dr. Heitner stated, the two year course is not transferable to the Israeli

University system, but we are working on the problem. The applicants are chosen from the top half of the high school graduates. There are about three applicants for each opening. Classes are given mornings and, for those holding down jobs, in the evening hours. The staff summed up their attitude: "The only asset we have is manpower, and those that come to us economically deprived must have outside help to provide our country with this badly needed material."

BUDGET DEFICIT INCREASES 11 PERCENT

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 4, we received the proposed fiscal year 1975 budget. This budget contains projected expenditures of $304.4 billion which is an 11 percent increase in Federal spending over last year, and it contains a built-in deficit of $9.4 billion which is more than double last year's deficit.

Review of this budget and others of recent years clearly indicates that deficit spending is becoming a permanent way of life, insofar as the financial operations of our country are concerned. It is estimated that the total national debt will climb to $346.5 billion by the end of 1974, and $359 billion at the end of 1975. The interest alone on this debt is approaching $30 billion annually.

This live today, pay tomorrow philosophy of Government finance cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely for tomorrow will surely come. We cannot sustain a burgeoning public obligation year after year without experiencing adverse economic effects. The rampant inflation that has afflicted our economy during recent years has been fueled in great part by unrestrained Government spending. There will be no brightening in the economic horizon until we take positive steps to reform our fiscal policies.

We spent a great deal of time discussing fiscal reform during the last session; our efforts culminated in the passage of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1973. I have every hope that final action on this legislation will be forthcoming in the near future. This will provide us with a mechanism for budgetary control; it will still be necessary to mold a new philosophy of Government spending—a philosophy which recognizes the limitations of Federal dollars and the need for curing our apparent addiction to deficit spending.

Mr. Speaker, let it not be said that the legacy left by Congress in the 1970's was that of a bankrupt estate and economic chaos. Let us exchange our well-intentioned words for positive action to reform our budgetary procedures and philosophy.

OPPOSITION TO INTERSTATE 66 AND THREE SISTERS BRIDGE CONTINUES TO MOUNT

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Emergency Committee on the Transportation Crisis, which has a long history of being together in opposition to the construction of unneeded roadways, held a press conference to again reiterate their opposition to Interstate 66 and the Three Sisters Bridge. I applaud their timely action and I join them.

This particular project has been consistently opposed by numerous citizen groups throughout the Washington metropolitan area. Indeed, when the Department of Transportation attempted to proceed with construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, the Federation of Civic Associations and many others went to court. The District Court stopped the project because the Department failed to comply with the laws requiring citizen participation and environmental considerations.

As the time goes on, I have found it increasingly clear not only that the citizens do not want this project, but that given the energy shortage in our world, it is the last thing we need. Increasing numbers have come to believe that it will result in the destruction of a scenic parkland and a segment of residential neighborhoods. Increasing numbers have come to believe that the construction of this roadway will bring additional unneeded automobiles into the city, thereby defeating our efforts to encourage the greater use of mass transportation. At a time when gasoline is short and expensive, when we need money for mass transportation construction and operation; and when 84 percent of the people voted against construction of the Three Sisters Bridge and its connecting freeway system as late as just 4 years ago, I simply cannot understand why anybody would encourage this kind of waste.

This money should be spent on mass transportation. It should be spent to make up the operating deficit of this and every other mass transit system in the country. It should be spent to encourage people to remain in the city by offering good alternative means of transportation instead of creating a system that encourages people to own one, two, or three cars to transport one person for a few miles.

With 80 to 90 percent of Washington air pollution caused by motor vehicle emissions and with the recent promulgations of the Environmental Protection Agency and the city government in an effort to comply with the Clean Air Standards Act, I would think, that at a minimum, we would impose a moratorium on all highway construction to accommodate private motor vehicles for at least 2 years after the Metro system is operational.

I hope that the Emergency Committee on the Transportation Crisis is once again successful. As one who has fought against these unwanted highways since 1960, I really welcome them and I urge that citizens everywhere in this area join with us in opposition to this kind of wasteful spending.

PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE IGNORES THE NEEDS OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, President Nixon appeared before this body and delivered his annual state of the Union message.

After carefully reviewing this message, one thing became immediately apparent to me. The message was totally devoid of any reference to the needs or problems of this Nation's 2.8 million farmworkers and their families. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor, the problems of these people are of particular interest to me.

The President's failure to address the problems of our farmworkers is deplorable—but in light of his past practices, his failure to acknowledge them is certainly not surprising.

If the President did discuss his policies with respect to the Nation's farmworkers, he would have to say that they have all been negative. During the past 5 years, the Nixon administration has been under constant attack for its failure to administer and enforce laws which protect farmworkers. In carrying out these practices, the administration has demonstrated time and time again its calculated and callous policy of totally ignoring the concerns and needs of the politically and economically powerless people in this country.

If the President were to mention the migrants and farmworkers in that part of the speech which he devoted to education, he would have to mention that he opposed the full funding of the migrant education program—a program designed to meet the special educational needs of the children of migrant workers.

If the President made reference to the farmworker in that part of his speech which he devoted to minimum wage, he would have to say that he opposed extending minimum wage coverage to all farmworkers and raising the present minimum wage for certain farmworkers from $1.30 an hour. He would have to admit that he evidently feels that farmworkers can afford to pay 1974 Nixon administration prices on 1930 Hoover administration wages.

If the President referred to our agricultural workers in that part of his speech he devoted to the health of our Nation, he would have to mention that he opposed the continuation of the migrant health program. He would also have to say that his new health proposal would do virtually nothing for the migrant farmworker employed for short periods of time at low pay in diverse geographical locations.

If the President discussed the agricultural workers in that part of his speech in which he talked about social security benefits, he would have to say that his administration has failed to vigorously enforce the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act and that his failure to effectively enforce this act has resulted in millions of dollars of lost social security benefits to farmworkers.

Mr. Nixon made no mention whatsoever of agricultural workers in that part of his speech which he devoted to manpower programs. The President could have mentioned how one of his former top aides deliberately planned to scatter and destroy the migrant programs authorized by title III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act, which are now under the jurisdiction of the Manpower Division of the Department of Labor. He also could have mentioned that the grantees of this program from all over the country have experienced nothing but trouble and frustration in obtaining the urgently needed funds to which they are legally entitled.

When he discussed the housing programs, Mr. Nixon made no specific reference to the housing needs of our farmworkers, and in this area the record of his administration has been particularly deplorable. He has requested no funds whatsoever for fiscal year 1975 for farm labor housing, and he has impounded almost $10 million in funds from previous years which are drastically needed to provide housing for hundreds of thousands of homeless migratory workers and their families.

Mr. Speaker, the total omission of any mention of the needs of the hardworking men, women, and children involved in harvesting the food which feeds the Nation is typical of the administration's callous attitude toward the underprivileged and powerless. Farmworkers are not looking for free handouts; they are among the hardest working of any group in this country. They are only looking to the Federal Government for fair and equal treatment, but they will continue to suffer until this administration acknowledges their existence.

ANIMAL HEALTH RESEARCH ACT

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded in support of H.R. 11873, the Animal Health Research Act. After determining that this was to be the last vote of the day, and after ascertaining through conversations with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that the resolution would probably pass by a substantial margin, I decided to forego the vote on final passage in order to catch my scheduled flight to North Carolina to comply with constituent business in my home district.

THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, when the Founding Fathers provided that the President, "shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union," they could scarcely imagine that these innocuous words would require such elaborate arrangements.

As I walked about the U.S. Capitol in the late afternoon of January 30, it was obvious that big things were underway. Some of the 450 policemen in crisp, dark blue uniforms guarded every entrance to the Capitol; others cordoned off the area around the Capitol, standing only a few feet apart. Helicopters flew overhead, training powerful searchlights on the buildings and the grounds of the Capitol; walkie-talkies were clacking everywhere; and nearly 100 Secret Service men carefully scrutinized each visitor. Large groups of marchers, some supporting the President, others denouncing him, awaited his arrival. Sleek black Government limousines arrived on Capitol Hill to discharge Cabinet officials, high ranking military officers and members of the diplomatic corps. Several ambulances were parked nearby.

On the second floor of the Capitol, in the House of Representatives Chamber where the speech is traditionally delivered, extra chairs were being set in place; TV technicians scurried back and forth from the mobile van parked next to the Capitol, checking their cables, which looked like long black spaghetti running to the House Chamber. The special color television lights in the House Chamber, which had been permanently installed for such events, were being switched on and off. In the press and radio galleries, journalists were speculating about the contents of the speech and the Congress reaction to it.

Downstairs on the first floor of the Capitol in an almost festive atmosphere, Members of Congress and their families and guests were dining in the Capitol restaurant and attending scores of receptions and parties. A couple of blocks away, the Indiana Society of Washington was meeting at the Capitol Hill Club where hundreds of transplanted Hoosiers listened to the snappy lyrics of the Purdue University Glee Club and reminisced about life in Indiana. All across Capitol Hill, television sets were readied for those persons who did not have tickets to the event.

To capture a large television audience, the President's address was scheduled for 9 p.m.—6 p.m. in California and 3 p.m. in Hawaii. By 8 p.m. the galleries began to fill with people, and within another hour over 1,500 persons filled the room. House pages and employees stood on the edge of the Chamber; brightly dressed wives of the Cabinet members took their seats in the President's gallery; and over 100 journalists packed the news gallery right above the place from which the President was to speak.

At 8:30 p.m. Members of the House of Representatives began to file in, and in another 10 minutes the Speaker of the House called the House to order. At 8:45 p.m. the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the ranking officers of each of the military services, took their seats, followed by the Members of the U.S. Senate. At 8:50 p.m. several hundred ambassadors and ministers of foreign governments filed in, and the Justices of the Supreme Court entered at 8:55 p.m. Just before 9 p.m. the President's family was seated to the standing applause of the Members of the Congress, and then the members of the President's Cabinet entered. At 9 p.m. the bright lights were turned up and the Doorkeeper of the House announced in stentorian voice: "Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States."

The President entered the Chamber to standing applause as Senate and House leaders escorted him to the rostrum. After delivering printed copies of his address to Vice President FORD, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, and to House Speaker CARL ALBERT, the President began the 186th state of the Union address, following a custom that is derived from the British practice of opening Parliament with a speech from the throne.

As the President spoke, he stood before an American flag with the Speaker and the Vice President seated immediately behind him. On each side were full-length portraits of President Washington and General Lafayette, and overhead, carved in marble, was the national motto, "In God We Trust."

Throughout his 45-minute address, four television cameras, operating in a network pool, scanned the Chamber, which hummed with the constant clicking of cameras.

During the speech, and for the only time during the course of a year, all high-ranking governmental officials—civilian and military, executive, judicial, and legislative—are gathered in a single room.

Each state of the Union speech is an historic event, and each speech is analyzed, word by word, throughout the world for indications of American policy. The speech has become a potent instrument of national leadership and a solemn annual ritual of the National Government.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OYSTER BAY GUARDIAN

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 10, the Oyster Bay Guardian celebrates its diamond jubilee. In tribute to this fine newspaper I would like to share the history of the Guardian with my colleagues:

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OYSTER BAY GUARDIAN

The Oyster Bay Guardian was founded by Nelson H. Disbrow, with his 17-year-old son as junior partner, just 75 years ago, and this well-known weekly newspaper has been in continuous existence ever since. The first issue of the Guardian appeared on Friday, February 10, 1899, published at the Disbrow Printery, first established several weeks previously on the second floor of the Van Sise Meat Market on South Street, Oyster Bay, and then located in Mrs. Vail's building on the same street.

The Guardian's publisher, Nelson H. Disbrow, was a veteran printer and journalist of Prattsville, New York who moved his family to Northport on Long Island, where he had a job on the Northport Journal. About two years later, the Disbrows moved to Oyster Bay, as Nelson had accepted a place on the Oyster Bay Pilot. Then, over half a year later, Nelson Disbrow started his own paper, the Oyster Bay Guardian.

"It was rough in those days," for the struggling new newspaper, however, as the former junior partner, Leslie C. Disbrow, recalled fifty years afterward, writing in the Golden Jubilee Guardian Issue of February 11, 1949.

The hardest battle Nelson Disbrow was called upon to fight, as told in his obituary, "was caused by the dispossession of his business and equipment, through the then owner of the Pilot renting the building over his head." According to Leslie Disbrow's article, owners of available store space were allegedly warned not to rent or sell to the Disbrows.

The Guardian publisher did succeed, at last, in buying a lot on West Main Street, but did not dare to announce the purchase, his son wrote, until the deed of sale was recorded as feeling against the newspaper was running so high due to the competitor.

The building constructed for the Guardian on the West Main Street lot in 1901 proved a haven for the printing and publishing business, and the Guardian was safely launched on its future—now measuring 75 years of publication, reporting the "vital statistics, social, political and athletic news of our fellow citizens," and participating in the progress of our community, and the surrounding areas.

Sorrow came to the Guardian enterprise on the death of the founder, senior partner and editor, Nelson H. Disbrow, on Thanksgiving Eve, 1928. The junior partner, Leslie C. Disbrow, in charge of the mechanical part of the job, carried on with his nephew N. Edward Disbrow, who had come on as an apprentice in the 20s.

In 1943, Leslie Disbrow was elected Town Clerk of Oyster Bay, and Edward Disbrow carried on with the aid of his wife, Mary Allison Disbrow whom he had married in 1931. Leslie Disbrow served five terms as Town Clerk.

Celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Guardian in 1949, Edward Disbrow printed the Golden Jubilee issue.

Edward Disbrow died Dec. 30, 1966, at his Syosset home, just a few hours after the last issue of the year had been printed.

The following Sept. 29, Mary Disbrow, with "heartfelt emotion," sold the family weekly to Edwina Snow and the Oyster Bay Publishing Co. Inc.

Mrs. Snow, the former Edwina C. Feigenspan, was born in New York City, grew up in New Jersey, and has been a resident of Long Island's North Shore for most of the past 30 years. The wife of MacVicker Snow and the mother of four children, she attended the Madeira, Oldfields and Hewitt Schools, Juilliard School of Music, Barnard College and Columbia University. Her business experiences include work in publicity, fashions, the stock exchange, the music world. In the newspaper field, she is co-owner of the Locust Valley Leader in addition to the Guardian. The Syosset Guardian joined the family in July of 1968, and The Scene, monthly rotogravure supplementary magazine to the Guardian, will celebrate its 5th birthday next month. She is listed in the 1974 Who's Who of American Women, and World Who's Who of Women.

Through 75 years, the Guardian has viewed many changes, from the "derby-stiff-collar" fashions to the mod garb of today; transportation from "Old Dobbin" to the jumbo jets overhead; from quill pen to computer; an agricultural economy to industrial to the space age; the effects of two World Wars, Korea and Viet Nam; the growth of its mother Nassau County and the Town of Oyster Bay, with the concurrent step-up in housing; the recent reorganization of Town government under the Honorable John W. Burke, TOB Supervisor, in the areas of master planning, recreation, parks, youth and senior citizen programs, historic preservation and environmental concerns . . .

For the Guardian, it has been "like being a partner in the making of history," as stated in the Golden Jubilee issue.

Among causes and projects which the Guardian has strongly supported in recent years are the defeat of the proposed Oyster Bay-Rye bridge and access roads, with the accompanying historic and ecological preservation of homes, trees, as well as wetlands; the reestablishment of Planning Fields Arboretum; enactment of federal legislation for the protection of America's wild mustangs; and of state law for the protection of abused horses; also the paving of the way toward the first shelter and regulations concerning domestic cats. The Guardian has been vocal over the paper shortage; over crime, running one of the few Police Blotters in the country's presses; over the related battle against narcotics addiction, on which it began editorializing for action as early as May, 1968. Also as early as 1969, the Guardian began taking a stand on the removal of hazardous and unsightly power and telephone poles in favor of underground wiring, an issue which finally just this week is being pursued on a county level. The local historical scene, including the Wightman House, owned and restored by the Town of Oyster Bay as a museum and home of the Oyster Bay Historical Society, and preservation of a growing number of historical homes have been well chronicled by the Guardian, along with acceptance of Oyster Bay as an official site for the American Revolution Bicentennial.

Next week, on Feb. 15, the Guardian moves into a new home in which to enjoy its 75th year of publication and hopefully many more. That building, 33 W. Main St., is a former Wright homestead, one of the historic Oyster Bay homes salvaged through the Guardian's own efforts.

TAXPAYERS SUBSIDIZE NORTH VIETNAM LOBBY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 7, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers are subsidizing a lobby for North Vietnam on Capitol Hill. The "authorized" use of Federal office space and equipment in the Rayburn House Office Building to "teach" totalitarian benefits to impressionable salaried staff members and to lobby Members of Congress for a more passionate understanding of North Vietnam is an insult to every veteran who fought in Vietnam.

I agree that the North Vietnam lobby is only furthering the announced goals of President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger to give $5 billion in foreign aid reparations to North Vietnam. At least for the present time this goal has been sidetracked. The conditioning program to accept the giveaway of the Panama Canal and normalization of relations with the Castro government has taken the administration's priority.

As the successful offerer of numerous amendments to prohibit any taxpayers aid to North Vietnam, I strenuously object to the latest affront to the American people and demand that any authorization of the use of Government property and taxpayers subsidy to the North Vietnam lobby be immediately wtihdrawn.

A related newsclipping follows:

[From the Washington Star-News, Feb. 5, 1974]

JANE FONDA, LOBBYIST

(By Mary McGrory)

Her famous face, so like her famous father's, causes heads to swivel in cafeteria lines, and congressmen stop in their tracks at the sight of her in Capitol Hill corridors.

She is Jane Fonda, film star, self-styled "revolutionary woman," and one-half of the newest, most unexpected and most unnerving lobbying team on Capitol Hill. The other half is her husband, Tom Hayden, the Tom Paine of the New Left, a founder of the SDS and a member of the Chicago Seven. Together they are trudging the halls of Congress importuning congressmen to end U.S. military involvement in Indochina, the cause that has claimed him since 1961 and her since 1968, when she came back home from a tour in France as a "sex kitten."

"People expected bandoliers and funny hats," said one bemused aide, "but they're not like that at all. She's very refined, and he's restrained and they're both practical and serious about what they're doing."

It's hard to say which of them would have raised more hackles under the Capitol dome not so long ago.

"Maybe if their memories are good," said one fan, "and they remember the Chicago Seven, he would. But she's projected because of the cinema and they were calling her 'Hanoi Hannah' fairly recently up here."

Hayden, who's slight, dark, grubby and cheerful, says, "Watergate has given us legitimacy. The people who wanted to put the Chicago Seven in jail are going to jail themselves."

Miss Fonda, with the self-effacement not associated with the Silver Screen, says, "They come to see me and to hear Tom."

They met three years ago at a Winter Soldiers' investigation—a war crimes panel organized by the Vietnam Veterans Against the War. She was then ardent and unlettered in peace politics, and Hayden impressed her with his learning.

They were married a year ago. Their seven-month-old son, Troy O'Donovan Geraty, is with them. His three names derive from a South Vietnamese patriot, an Irish revolutionary and Hayden's Irish mother's maiden name. Troy goes along to the peace meetings they address several times a week, but stays home in a borrowed Georgetown apartment while they make the rounds of Congress.

For their calls, they usually wear their funky attire, she in slacks and sweater, he in a navy-blue British busdriver's overcoat with gold braid. Each wears a plastic bracelet with the name of a South Vietnamese political prisoner on it. Working from a list provided by Rep. ——————, they do four offices a day.

"We want to see everyone," says Miss Fonda in her low finishing school voice, "friendlies, marginals, hostiles. We want to see everyone but Henry Kissinger."

"Everyone's very polite around here," says Hayden. "Nobody's turned us down. They're willing to listen to us. No matter how outlandish it sounds, they realize it may be true. We talked for years about murder in the villages, but nobody paid any attention until Mylai. We tell them that Vietnam is going to escalate and become an issue again and they better meet it now. They tell us that military aid is the price they have to pay for not bombing. We tell them that the problem is the same, the Thieu government is unrepresentative and repressive and they can't prop it up forever."

Times have changed so much that Hayden will conduct a school on Capitol Hill for the next three weeks. He will hold seminars in a Judiciary subcommittee room arranged by ——— ——— on the history of Vietnam and U.S. intervention there. At least 60 staff members have signed up. There have been no squawks.

Miss Fonda will attend but will not speak. She is far more sensitive about her notices as a political activist than as a star, and is fearful of being considered a dilettante. She was gratified to be told that a congressman who met her in the hall said later he thought she knew what she was talking about.

"It's kind of ironic to see those two trying the system," said one staffer. "They go around telling people to write to their congressmen. What could be more American than that?"

Hayden grins when asked about his switch to convention. "The situation has changed," he says. "It calls for new tactics. Now a majority of the people are on our side about Vietnam."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, February 13, 1974*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want.—Psalms 23: 1.

O thou seeking Shepherd of our striving souls through all the length of days Thy goodness faileth never. We nothing lack if we are Thine and Thou art ours forever.

In a time filled with fear and frustration save us from hasty decisions and hurried actions. Grant unto us a steadiness of spirit and an inner strength of being which will enable us to be faithful stewards of the trust given to us to lead our Nation in wise ways toward good goals for the benefit of all people.

To this end keep our honor bright, our hearts pure, our hands clean, and our devotion to our country deep and true.

In the spirit of Christ 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 37. An act to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to require the advice and consent of the Senate for future appointments to the office of Director and Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 184. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Alaska to the Gospel Missionary Union;

S. 194. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Anchorage, Alaska, interests of the United States in certain lands; and

S. 1863. An act to designate the Weminuche Wilderness, Rio Grande and San Juan National Forests, in the State of Colorado.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE RICHARD T. HANNA ON HIS ANNOUNCED RETIREMENT

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to make some remarks about the announcement in the newspaper this morning that I will not be seeking reelection.

I would like to make three points, if I may, under this 1-minute speech; the first one is directed to the Members. I hope to see each of the Members individually to tell them how badly my decision weighs upon me because I will be leaving so many good friends.

Mr. Speaker, I shall also admonish the Members that in the future what I think they will need more than my presence is their sense of humor. With all the losses we have had in the country, the least we can afford is the loss of our sense of humor which is so finely nurtured and sustained.

Second, I would like to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate the efforts of the wonderful people in and about this Capitol who have the responsibility for the care and feeding of Congressmen. I direct this to my own staff, which is a wonderful group of dedicated people, to those in the offices of other Members, and to the many others around here, both in this great room and in the many other places where Congressmen perform their duties. They are a sustaining, helpful group of people who have made being a Congressman worthwhile. They are going to be missed by me, I am sure, even more than some of the individual friends I have made.

The third point, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the new Members who are going to be coming into this House. My announcement is hallmarked by a complete lack of uniqueness, since I anticipate there are going to be a lot of new Members.

I would like to say that when I first came to Congress, I made a prediction in my district that no one would come to me and say, "Thank God, young man, you are here." And that was very true. It is equally predictable now that there are not going to be a lot of people saying, "Please do not leave." So there is a humility about being in service here.

When I came to Washington, I put a lot of time and energy into finding out what was going on and some additional effort into trying to fit in.

To those who will be in the new group next January, they should put all their time and attention into finding out what is going on. If they find out, they will not have to worry about fitting in, because they will have already reached the elite group in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that during the remaining period of my service I can be of some assistance to my fellow Congressmen and to this House and to my district, and it is with great sorrow that I have made the decision not to be one of those who will be sitting here in the next Congress.

SPECIAL ENERGY APPROPRIATION BILL

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the House today will consider an energy bill; namely, the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act. Today's bill authorizes the appropriation of $50 million to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration over a 5-year period.

The energy crisis is the most urgent and immediate economic problem confronting the Nation and world today, and it is mandatory that Congress act aggressively and promptly in providing the necessary legislation to move forward with energy research and development programs.

The Committee on Appropriations proposes to bring to the House, immediately after Easter, a special comprehensive appropriation bill for energy research and development programs for the fiscal year beginning July 1. This would allow funding to be in place for energy activities in advance of the new fiscal year and would do much to promote orderly planning and efficient execution of the energy programs of the various Federal agencies.

The Appropriations Committee proposes to move as rapidly as possible to-