

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MICHIGAN SCLC OPPOSES FORCED  
BUSING

## HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, forced busing of school children solely for the purpose of achieving an artificial racial balance, continues to be a deeply divisive issue in Michigan and throughout the country.

It divides blacks as well as other groups in the community. That was underscored recently when the Michigan chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the civil rights organization founded by the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., registered strong opposition to busing for Detroit. As reported in the Detroit News, Dr. Claud R. Young, SCLC's Midwest vice president and a cousin of Detroit's black mayor, Coleman Young, warned that court-ordered busing in Detroit "could destroy the whole city."

This stance contrasts sharply with the position of the NAACP which is pressing hard in Federal courts for a new order to require busing in Detroit only, now that the Supreme Court has refused to require cross-district busing.

Dr. Young stated:

We do not feel that integrating the schools without raising the (educational) standards is going to help us.

According to the News:

Dr. Young said the busing issue is adding to racial polarization and ill feeling because of economic conditions and auto plant layoffs. He said it is causing migration by both white and black families.

He said:

Busing should be put on the back burner.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

NAACP IS UPSET BY CALL TO DROP SCHOOL BUSING

(By Chester Bulgier)

Detroit NAACP officials have expressed dismay at a demand by another influential civil rights organization that the idea of school busing for integration be dropped.

The Michigan chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) has warned that court-ordered busing in Detroit "could destroy the whole city."

Dr. Claud R. Young, SCLC vice-president in charge of the Midwest region, said he was speaking for the Michigan chapter of the organization, which was founded by the late Dr. Martin Luther King and which took a leading role in the battle against racial segregation in the South.

"What would happen here would make the recent violence in Boston over court-ordered school busing look like a warm-up," he said in an interview.

"We have enough first-hand information about racial polarization, resentment over unemployment and the extent of arms in Detroit to know that we simply could not stand

that extent of violent physical confrontation."

Dr. Young, a cousin of Detroit Mayor Young, said any money now set aside to implement a Detroit-only bussing plan should be diverted to improve vocational training in Detroit public schools.

Mayor Young said he agreed with his cousin "100 percent."

The mayor said he believes the fundamental problem for Detroit schools is that they receive only 50 percent of the amount of per-pupil dollar support received by suburban schools.

"That in essence is the problem, and that problem cannot be solved by bussing," Mayor Young said.

Mayor Young said he would seek to prevent disturbances if bussing were implemented. "There will be no Boston here if I can help it," he said.

The NAACP is pushing for implementation of a Detroit-only bussing plan after failing in its fight—carried all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court—to obtain cross-district bussing throughout the tricity area.

The high court last July rejected the NAACP plan to integrate Detroit and 53 predominantly or exclusively white suburban school districts by bussing students across district lines.

The case was referred back to Federal Court in Detroit, which must draft a plan for Detroit-only school integration.

"We are extremely disappointed in the SCLC position," said Joe Madison, Detroit NAACP executive director, "particularly in view of SCLC's long history of fighting segregation on both local and national levels."

Madison said he also expressed the view of Dr. Jesse Goodwin, chairman of the NAACP's education committee.

"We think they are just wrong," Madison said.

He agreed "there may be some truth" to fears that bussing may cause racial violence in Detroit worse than Boston's.

"I have had some threats on my life in connection with this already," he said.

But he said violence is caused by fear based on ignorance.

"What we should be about in Detroit is to eliminate ignorance about school desegregation," Madison said. "If you do that, you eliminate fear, and if you eliminate fear you eliminate violence."

Madison also said the SCLC stand "has very little leverage" because the matter is in the courts.

"The Supreme Court has ruled that Detroit is guilty of segregation in its public schools and that it must desegregate immediately," he said.

"Any discussion of eliminating plans for desegregation is useless, because you can't just ignore a decision by the Supreme Court."

Dr. Young said it is impossible to achieve racial balance in the Detroit school system alone because 71.6 percent of its pupils are black.

"The SCLC is still strongly integrationist, but we're trying to look at this as a practical matter," he said.

"We do not feel that integrating the schools without raising the standards is going to help us.

"The reason we supported bussing in the past was it would force us to upgrade our schools and achieve quality education for our children. But the NAACP has lost the original concept, which was quality education."

Dr. Young said the business issue is adding to racial polarization and ill feeling because of economic conditions and auto plant layoffs. He said it is causing migration by both white and black families.

Achieving racial balance without crossing school district lines is already impossible," he said.

"With this hanging over our heads, we cannot move forward on some of the issues we need to move on to turn this city around. "Bussing should be put on the back burner."

Instead, Dr. Young said, SCLC is calling on state and federal officials to allocate funds to bring all schools up to standard.

"We're calling on the state of Michigan to revamp its vocational program so that people living in inner cities, minorities and the poor will be prepared to make a living for themselves at the age of 18," he said.

Dr. Young said public schools also should offer college preparatory courses for those who want to continue their education.

Madison strongly denied that the NAACP has abandoned the concept of quality education.

"That's still our No. 1 goal," he said. "But as long as segregation exists, equality is impossible. The Supreme Court has said this."

Madison said NAACP lawyers are seeking a multidistrict bussing plan which would be acceptable to the Supreme Court.

"So we regard the Detroit-only plan as just an interim plan anyway. Meanwhile, we have to deal with it where it's at. And what we have to do now is to see that this desegregation plan is implemented as effectively as possible," he said.

"We're not talking about racial balance. What we're talking about is true integration—the sharing of responsibility, power and resources and equally distributing these to all children in the city of Detroit."

WHAT IS THE STATE OF THE  
NAVY?

## HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, most Americans unfortunately are unaware of the real nature of the Nation's current defense posture. They believe, incorrectly, that the United States is still the most powerful nation in the world and, more particularly, that our naval forces are superior to those of any other nation.

In recent years, our defense position has been permitted to deteriorate. Operating on the false assumption of U.S. superiority, the Congress and the executive have together made serious cuts in funds for research and development of new weapons. Today, many urge further cuts in order to improve our economic situation, ignoring the very real danger to our world position.

The most recent issue of "Jane's Fighting Ships" refers to the U.S. Navy as that of "the other superpower," clearly indicates that the Soviet Union has achieved superiority in naval forces, and declares that—

Of those countries to whom a navy is today essential, the United States is one of the foremost, and the U.S. Navy is probably also in the van of navies subjected to misinformed, illogical and irrational attacks on it by some of those who depend on it the most.

The president of the Navy League of the United States, in his message in the

November 1974, issue of *Sea Power*, the league's official publication, ask the question: "What is the State of the Navy?" His answer paints a picture which most Americans will find disturbing.

This report notes that—

We . . . know that the Navy has been almost halved in size since the end of the Vietnam War, in a calculated gamble to rid it of obsolescent ships and to provide funds to rebuild. We also know that Vietnam left the Navy with the largest backlog of required overhauls in its history, and nowhere near enough time and money have been provided since then for those overhauls to have been accomplished. We are aware that few, if any, ships under construction are on schedule, and that some of those now being built will be over two years late when they finally join the fleet. . . . The research and development picture is also discouraging. The "fleet of tomorrow" sought so eagerly, and spoken of so glowingly . . . still is a long, long way off.

Only if we understand the negative picture of today's naval preparedness will we be willing to take the necessary steps to reverse this regressive trend. In order to provide further information about this situation, I wish to share with my colleagues the President's message from the November 1974 issue of *Sea Power* and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

QUESTION: WHAT IS THE STATE OF THE NAVY?

In recent weeks, we have seen so many claims and counterclaims on the subject of the strength of the U.S. Navy that we have become confused over the true status of that force which plays such a unique role in the maintenance of our freedoms. Jane's Fighting Ships, a prestigious publication long respected for its research and its commentary about the world's navies, without actually stating in so many words that the Soviet Navy is foremost in the world, clearly indicates this view in a detailed analysis of what the Soviets have accomplished in building up their fleet. Jane's refers to our Navy as "the other superpower" and also interestingly observes, "Of those countries to whom a navy is today essential, the United States is one of the foremost, and the U.S. Navy is probably also in the van of navies subjected to misinformed, illogical and irrational attacks on it by some of those who depend on it the most.

Not too many days passed before one of the nation's most distinguished legislators, and one who has long been regarded as strongly pro-military, Senator John C. Stennis of Mississippi, in a speech on the floor of the Senate said that speculation about inferiority of U.S. naval strength is "false" and could encourage the Soviet Navy "to react recklessly or belligerently." He added that, on a navy-to-navy basis, the Soviet Navy does not match the capability of the U.S. Navy, and that the U.S. fleet should be able to fulfill its missions except under "the most adverse and extreme circumstances"—such as a massive land-based air attack without adequate air support. His remarks generally were taken as being in vigorous opposition to the views of Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, who completed a four-year term as Chief of Naval Operations on July 1 and who has averred that the Soviet Navy is indeed superior to our own.

Following on the heels of the rather surprising Stennis speech came news releases from the offices of the services' most vociferous critics, Senator William Proxmire and Congressman Les Aspin, both of whom resorted to statistics to "prove" that the U.S. Navy is not only much stronger but also

younger than the Soviet fleet, while also taking advantage of the opportunity to fire a few pot shots at the admirals who have been seeking to modernize and rebuild our fleet. Unfortunately, the data used failed to include, among other items, information on weaponry, ship construction rates in both countries, expenditures for research and development, and funds allocated to hardware, factors that must be considered in evaluating any navy; for that reason, the statistical onslaught did little more than add to the confusion.

Then the Wall Street Journal chimed in with a report that "Navy officials get word from top Pentagon civilians to stop talking openly about U.S. seapower weaknesses. Secretary Schlesinger and colleagues feel the comparison with Russia is nowhere near as dire as some admirals make out."

While we were pondering the impact of this statement, there came a spate of news stories from the Pentagon that inflation is eating away at the Navy's shipbuilding program and that the Navy is now going to get much less than it hoped for with the funds allocated for the program. Then came a chilling charge by the outspoken and acerbic Admiral Hyman Rickover that the existing ships of the Navy are in the worst condition they have been in in the last 50 years.

On the basis of these conflicting and disturbing remarks, we begin to wonder just what kind of shape the Navy really is in. We do know that the Navy has been almost halved in size since the end of the Vietnam War, in a calculated gamble to rid it of obsolescent ships and to provide funds to rebuild. We know also that Vietnam left the Navy with the largest backlog of required overhauls in its history, and nowhere near enough time and money have been provided since then for those overhauls to have been accomplished. We are aware that few, if any, ships under construction are on schedule, and that some of those now being built will be over two years late when they finally join the fleet. We know that some ships authorized by Congress two years ago still are not under contract to be built, and that the Navy has encountered heavy going in its search for shipbuilders to build them. And we have heard much of late of the running battle between the Navy and almost all private shipyards, almost all of whom contend vigorously that the Navy's approach to shipbuilding is antiquated, cumbersome, bureaucratic, too prone to changes and designed to keep builders' profits so low as to make it undesirable for them to build Navy ships.

The research-and-development picture also is discouraging. The "fleet of tomorrow" sought so eagerly, and spoken of so glowingly, by Admiral Zumwalt still is a long, long way off. The sea control ship for which he pushed so hard still is on the drawing board, with Congress blocking the expenditure of funds for its construction. It now appears unlikely it will ever sail the seas in the form originally envisioned. The surface effects ship, one which would appear to offer great promise, still has not gotten a green light for production. Hydrofoil development and production still are agonizingly slow, and Congress cut more than half of the new patrol frigate program.

Operationally, a number of experts agree that a major deficiency exists in surface-missile capability, and that we are far behind the Soviets in this most important sector of naval warfare. The authoritative Jane's also tells us that one of our newest additions to the fleet, the SPRUANCE-class destroyers, ships as large as WWII cruisers, will be out-classed by Soviet ships of the same tonnage in all aspects except ASW operations and the possession of gas turbine engines. This is a depressing view of brand new ships.

LET'S NOT FORGET GENERAL BROWN

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, in the recent past I wrote to the Secretary of Defense requesting some explanation of the incredible remarks of Gen. George S. Brown, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I reproduce here the letter which I have received from John M. Maury of the office of Assistant Secretary of Defense. I attach also the five last paragraphs referred to by Mr. Maury of the address given by General Brown.

I reproduce these two items, not to suggest that General Brown's explanation is very satisfactory, but simply to put on the record the reaction of the Pentagon and General Brown to an incident which should not be forgotten. The material follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, D.C., December 2, 1974.

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRINAN: The Secretary of Defense has asked that I respond to your letter of November 22 in which you requested comment upon your recommendation, as published in the November 19 Congressional Record, of the resignation or removal of General Brown.

As you are already aware of the statement issued by General Brown on the matter, I will not repeat it. Subsequently, however, General Brown did address the subject on November 25 before the Comstock Club of Sacramento. A copy of his speech is enclosed for your information and I call your attention to the last five paragraphs. Be assured that no one regrets the self-admittedly unfounded remarks more than General Brown.

Both the President and the Secretary have discussed this matter with General Brown. He continues to have their confidence. The President, as you will recall, stated:

"General Brown has been an excellent Air Force officer; he has been an excellent Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He has made a mistake; he has recognized it. He is going to continue as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff."

The Secretary of Defense fully endorses the President's remarks regarding General Brown. Secretary Schlesinger appreciates your concern and your taking the time to advise him of it.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. MAURY.

In response to a question from a student on a very complex and difficult subject, I provided an unthinking shorthand answer. In an all too casual fashion, I used inaccurate words, poorly chosen at random, without knowledge of their emotional impact. I meant no affront. In fact, those present felt none. On every possible occasion, I have expressed my concern at having unintentionally offended my fellow Americans, not merely Americans of Jewish faith.

More than anything else, I am both awed and appalled by the divisiveness this incident has caused. I understand the upset and dismay that have been expressed. I have received some letters of support of a type I

totally reject as alien to America and alien to me. Polarization of our society is contrary to our traditions and clearly not in the best interests of the Nation.

There are two lessons that I have learned. First, I have learned a good deal about the corporate structure of banks and newspapers, and, in addition, I have learned that the strategic direction of the Armed Forces in the defense of America is my forte and is a full-time job. With this in mind, I intend to avoid even the appearance of dealing with anything else.

One final word—in light of those offending remarks. In three wars, I have been shot at in an effort to serve and protect freedom of religion and freedom of speech. I feel we must now get on with the serious business of maintaining the strength of America—not for strength's sake, but in order to preserve these fundamental American freedoms. I assure you that I intend to continue in that effort.

Thank you.

H. R. GROSS: PERSISTENT, INFORMED, AND ON THE JOB

### HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. THONE, Mr. Speaker, American author Edward Eggleston wrote, "Persistent people begin their success where others end in failure."

Thus, it is not derogatory but laudatory to report that the gentleman from Iowa has been defeated more often than any other Member in efforts to reduce Federal spending. HAROLD ROYCE GROSS has been undaunted by his defeats. He has persisted. As a result, on many other occasions he has succeeded in reducing the rate at which this body is adding to our national debt. Americans have been spared billions and billions of dollars in taxes because of the persistent efforts of H. R. Gross.

I share the view of the gentleman from Iowa that America is being endangered because of the ever-faster growing national debt. Not every Member shares that opinion. One conviction that I am certain we all hold in common, however, is the importance of passing legislation that is technically sound, free from error and worded so that it will accomplish its objectives. This body has been greatly aided toward that objective through the efforts of the gentleman from Iowa. No other Member of the House of Representatives, in my opinion, does a more conscientious job of studying every bill that comes to the floor than H. R. GROSS. He has saved this body from embarrassment on many occasions because he was thoroughly informed of the content of proposed legislation.

No Member is more faithful than the gentleman from Iowa in being present on the floor when legislation is being considered. Because he is always on hand, he can point out to the House both its technical errors and its errors in judgment.

The House needs an H. R. GROSS. He will be sorely missed in this body. No one

CXX—2518—Part 30

person can fill the shoes of the gentleman from Iowa. Hopefully, three or four Members will take over the valuable functions now being performed by H. R. GROSS, who has been persistent, informed and on the job.

### OIL AND WATER WILL NOT MIX

#### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Journalist Gil Bailey of the San Jose Mercury observes that "Oil and Water Will Not Mix" in the winter 1974-75 issue of *Cry California*. The conclusions of this fine article are that Project Independence may have sobering effects on our environment, our food production, our transportation systems, and our water supply.

The article is as follows:

OIL AND WATER WILL NOT MIX: PROJECT INDEPENDENCE  
(By Gil Bailey)

If it is true that coming events cast their shadows before, the American people should recognize that the Ford Administration's "Project Independence" for national energy self-sufficiency carries the threat of national and international disaster.

The warnings are clear. Of dubious validity on several counts, Project Independence is also in direct conflict with the need to increase the nation's production of food. Further, it can only add momentum to the inflationary trend of the economy. The impact of Project Independence on future food supply is probably its least realized danger. Unless the program is based on conservation of energy and closely related to plans for increased food production, neither aim can be accomplished and the physical environment may be irreversibly impaired in the process.

Late last month, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture warned that without intensified food production and a change in population patterns, starvation may be the consequence in many areas of the world. The impending food crisis, the report added, "will have the potential to affect everyone from every walk of life and hit with more impact than the energy crisis of 1973-74."

The report further pointed out that "shortages of land, water, fertilizer, and energy could aggravate the crises, with the United States in the midst of the situation . . . Americans cannot afford to sit idly by thinking that this problem does not affect us."

The National Academy of Sciences, in a bulletin entitled *The Rehabilitation Potential of Western Coal Mines*, has noted: "Until recently, it has been tacitly assumed that the unappropriated water in the coal region would be used for some combination of irrigation, wildlife management, and municipal and industrial purposes. In 1973, the use of this water became, as far as government reports are concerned, more importantly directed towards energy conversion . . . Such a sharp reversal in government policy came about with little or no public awareness."

Here are other harbingers:

From *Energy Use and Outlook*, prepared by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture: "In the Rocky Mountains and Northern Great Plains, energy development—coal and oil shale—can have

high water requirements. Depending on the type of energy development—coal gasification or thermal electric generation—water needs in energy development would equal the amount [needed] to irrigate 150,000 to 300,000 acres for intensive crop production annually. The value of the water for energy development may be so high that farmers cannot bid for it for agricultural uses. If so, irrigated agriculture in the area will decline, as will food production."

Duncan Warren, director of the Lewis and Clark Resource Conservation and Development Project in North Dakota, where thousands of acres are being leased for strip mining, was quoted in the *New York Times* magazine: "But how about a food crisis? That's going to hit us hard in a few years. Maybe a few hundred thousand acres right here isn't going to make much difference. But if this happens everywhere in the West, what happens to food production? We don't have the population out here in the West to get a real good impact politically on the Legislature or on Congress. And where the population is, they want energy, at least for right now."

And from *A Time To Choose: America's Energy Future*, a Ford Foundation study: "By cutting the growth rate in energy consumption, the United States can balance its energy budget, safeguard the environment and protect the independence of its foreign policy."

With the forced resignation of John Sawhill as Federal Energy Administrator in late October, however, it became clear that the Administration will have no real conservation program. Sawhill had emphasized the necessity for conservation as an essential element in the effort to reduce the nation's dependence on foreign oil. Instead, when Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton won the bureaucratic struggle for control, he immediately proclaimed his own stand in a speech entitled, "Coal is the Answer."

Although the secretary later denied that the Administration has no interest in conservation, the nation is nevertheless proceeding with a single-purpose program for energy production, despite numerous warnings coming also from informed members of Congress, the Central Intelligence Agency, the President's Council on Environmental Quality, and the Environmental Protection Agency. If Project Independence were to proceed as presently designed, let's see what the future might hold . . .

WASHINGTON.—The year is 1990 and Project Independence is a reality.

A commercial airliner takes off from Dulles International Airport and climbs swiftly. Although it is still daylight, the sky is eerily dark. Little can be seen of the ground below, the capitol dome, or the Potomac River a few miles away. Smoke, heavy and black from the coal-fired power plants, and heavy auto emissions have combined to cast a pall over the area. The pall is not confined to the capital city. It covers most of the metropolitan East Coast, the great megalopolis that stretches down the Atlantic seaboard.

The smog, of course, has destroyed more than esthetic values. The rate of lung cancer has risen in urban regions, as has the death rate from heart disease. Respiratory problems are much more serious, and doctors advise those with heart or lung problems to leave the vicinity, as in the 1960s and 1970s they advised patients with similar ailments to move from the Los Angeles region. There are other side effects. Paint peels off homes located downwind from the power plants. Soot collects on everything and there is no longer such a thing, fashion or no fashion, as a white shirt.

Finally above the dark layer, the plane swings west on its flight across what has often been called "America's Heartland," where the "amber waves of grain" provided not only

sustenance for the nation, but a surplus for export. Here, also, there are huge clouds of smoke formed, as in the East, by the mixture of auto exhausts and emissions from coal-fired plants. Chicago and Gary are invisible, as later are the twin cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and St. Louis.

Over St. Louis, another phenomenon is glimpsed only dimly. The Missouri River is no longer "wide." It is reduced to a thin stream, most of its waters having been preempted for the oil-shale and coal-gas plants upstream. Barges can no longer navigate the river, which puts an additional burden on the rail and highway transport systems. But then, there is less to be carried from the Dakotas and the mountain states, for the same demands that dried up the Missouri—water for coal, lignite and oil shale—have also reduced the water available for cropland irrigation.

Farther west, the plane crosses the Colorado River, now also a small and black stream. Its waters too have been turned over to the ever-increasing demand for energy. Already over-extended in 1974, the Colorado now is truly a dead river. The salt and acid content of its lower basin is so great that no farmer wishes its waters to wash his fields, and the cost of desalting the river is prohibitive.

The pilot is more than usually careful on this leg of the trip because weather-modification projects in the Upper Colorado River Basin have had unpredicted climatic effects in the Rocky Mountain and Plains states.

The jet lands at San Francisco after flying over Yosemite Valley. The valley is now filling with water, the culmination of a project similar to San Francisco's Hetch Hetchy which many years ago inundated another scenic valley to supply water for the city of San Francisco. Farther north, huge machines bore giant tunnels to divert Columbia River waters to the Colorado basin, against the outraged protests of Oregon and Washington.

Had the plane been scheduled to land in Los Angeles, its passengers would have observed a skeletal, thinly populated city. The decline was caused by many factors. Introduction of oil and high-sulfur coal to fuel its power plants contributed heavily to the severe smog of 1979. Massive spills from offshore oil fields ruined the beaches and destroyed marine life. The final blow was the shrunken supply of water, which gradually strangled this once basically desert area converted to a metropolis only through the importation of water. The disappearance of their water came as a great shock to the millions who lived here but were unaware of the precarious balance of the natural resources on which the richness of the area depended. The lush fields of the Imperial, Coachella and Gila valleys have meanwhile been destroyed by salt-laden irrigation water, and the diversion of water from the San Joaquin and Sacramento valleys in a desperate effort to save Los Angeles has sharply reduced agricultural production there.

The plane's passengers disembark at San Francisco and buy newspapers at \$1.50 for 12 pages. They read of the continuing border wars with Mexico, sparked partly by United States efforts to control Mexico's off-shore oil fields, and also by the accumulated impurities in the Colorado River which destroy Mexican cropland.

San Francisco, too, is smog-bound, and respiratory disease has increased sharply because of the use of coal in power plants. A trip to Monterey and Carmel is no longer a pleasure. The sea otter, once a friendly and diverting sight in Monterey Bay, is extinct, victim of oil spills and other man-caused disruptions of the marine environment. There are serious problems caused by radiation leaks from nuclear plants along the coast and inland.

California markets, once filled with fresh produce, are nearly empty because of the curtailment of agriculture brought on by

the need for energy. International demands for food aggravate the domestic situation. Several hungry but nuclear-equipped nations back demands for American produce with clear threat of holocaust.

If the present formulation of Project Independence becomes a reality, the consequences may not be far wide of the scenario just outlined, although the exact year may not be 1990.

The President appears to be guided by a single yardstick—the continuation of an unlimited growth economy. The problems facing the nation, however, cannot be solved simply by conventional projections of future energy demands in the United States based on past rates of consumption. Future needs must be tailored to the unavoidable limitations of finite resources.

Unfortunately, there is no national planning body such as suggested by Russell Train, administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to evaluate conflicting demands on resources and seek equitable allocation. Train pointed out in the previous issue of *Cry California*:

"There is probably no more compelling evidence of the need for a permanent mechanism for long-range analysis and evaluation than the multitude of interdepartmental task forces, committees and commissions that in recent years have appeared and disappeared, flourished and faded, as the crises that led to their creation have come and gone . . . What we need, in fact, is a mechanism that will produce the kinds of information, analysis and evaluation of issues that will enable us to understand the long-term impact and implications of the decisions we must take."

In light of these comments, it seems worthwhile to review the origins of Project Independence. It was conceived as a public-relations gesture, in what turned out to be the final months of the Nixon Administration, to appease a public bewildered over the sudden fuel crisis and angry at waiting in line for hours for gasoline. A simple example will illustrate the lack of forethought with which the plan was conceived. When former Colorado Governor John Love held the position of "energy czar," reporters met with him in the old Executive Office Building. Love trotted out the usual figures showing that oil shale and coal could save the nation. A reporter asked about water requirements and he replied, "We haven't thought about that." Yet it takes three barrels of water to produce one barrel of oil from shale, and many of the oil-shale deposits are in water-short areas of Colorado.

Other adverse factors being ignored include:

Loss of agricultural production as water and land are preempted for energy.

Lowering standards of air and water quality, with the accompanying danger to public health.

Increasingly inflated costs of developing net energy. (It takes energy to produce energy.)

Among a series of studies on the water needed for energy production, a report covering the Upper Colorado River Basin has been completed. The conflict over water allocation and use, arising from the need to produce food and energy in ever-increasing amounts, is highlighted in a section of the report which opens a discussion of the "crunch" in water supplies:

"It is apparent that the legal right to utilize water will be, perhaps, the most important factor in the consideration of the question of water for energy development in the Upper Colorado Basin."

The Colorado is a classic case. Hardly a drop of the river now flows freely to the sea. Almost all is used and reused for irrigation, power production and municipal and industrial purposes. Water rights—the legal rights to use the water of the river—are distributed among seven states, including California, and Mexico. These commitments far

exceed the actual flow of the river. As a result, there is a great deal of "paper water," of no use for drinking but a great use in court. Approximately 17 million acre-feet of water rights are allocated (an acre foot of water is the amount that would be required to cover one acre a foot deep) for a river which produces only 13.5 million acre-feet of water annually. Even though there is normally a real surplus of water in the upper basin, that surplus is eventually used up in the lower basin for agriculture in the Gila, Imperial and Coachella valleys and for the multiple needs of the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area along with those of Mexico.

Thus, if we can rely on estimates by the Department of the Interior that additional water needed for energy by the year 2000 will total 874,000 acre-feet per year for little more than prototype programs in the states of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico and Arizona, or on the Western States Water Council's calculation that the same need will be 821,000 acre-feet in 1990, we can be sure the extra water will be taken from the mouths of many.

There are two problems with the Colorado River: Besides the absolute supply of water, there is its salt content. As the Colorado winds south, it picks up salts, and the salinity increases with each water use and discharge. At present, Mexico, which is entitled to 1.5 million acre-feet per year from the river, complains strongly about the salt content of the water because it severely damages their crops. As a result, the United States has agreed to build a huge desalination plant to cleanse the river before it goes across the border.

According to the report, "Although salinity is considered the most serious water-quality problem, energy development poses potential problems of added municipal wastes, industrial wastes, dissolved oxygen content, temperature, heavy metals, toxic materials and bacteria."

Like politics and misery, competition for water can make strange bedfellows. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, locally known as "Met," which serves the megalopolis of greater Los Angeles, has not often found itself on the side of environmentalists. Yet in Washington, D.C., a Met spokesman recently sent a reporter an article from *Environment* magazine, entitled "Wringing Out the West: Remember the Missouri and the Colorado?" With the article was a note saying, "Don't know whether you have seen this—thought it might be helpful." The article affirmed the deep concern of Met over energy development based on Colorado River waters.

Spokesmen for Met stress the salinity problem, rather than absolute shortages, because the district believes it can replace quantity deficiencies with water from Northern California. If this were done, the further drain on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, San Francisco Bay, and the irrigation system for farmlands of the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys would intensify pressures for development of all possible sites, not excluding Yosemite Valley.

If unchecked, such energy demand could spark a new drive to tap the waters of the Columbia.

Disturbing as the long-term projections are—long term meaning ten or more years—the implications of the current prototype projects are equally unsettling. Already the energy companies are taking over agricultural water rights in the Upper Colorado, and new reservoirs, and pipelines, at half a billion dollars a crack, are being planned. In addition, the federal Bureau of Reclamation is talking quietly of adding at least 500,000—and perhaps 1.5 million—acre-feet of water to the basin through cloud seeding. Experimental projects are under way.

The Colorado is not the only river under

pressure. Consider the case of the Missouri. That river and its basin provide the only significant sources of water for Montana and portions of North Dakota and Wyoming, now used primarily for irrigation and navigation. The Bureau of Reclamation has estimated that the Yellowstone, one of the tributaries of the Missouri, which now flows all but unchecked the length of Montana, could annually provide 2.6 million acre-feet of water for energy development. Energy developers have already requested 3.3 million acre-feet. The average flow of the Yellowstone is 9.4 million acre-feet each year, just 3.7 million more than would be required for current uses and projected energy uses combined.

The Northern Plains Resources Council has said that "diversions of this scale [by energy companies] would critically threaten the efficiencies of present pumping and diversion facilities and would eliminate any further development of irrigable lands."

The *Environment* article made a further point: "Officials of the Missouri River transport lines operating east of the 98th meridian are understandably nervous about water uses further west that might leave their boats high and dry. As Gibbs [Phil Gibbs of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation] points out, there is the potential for nearly choking off the lower Missouri by legally diverting water for human activities between the headwaters in Montana and the Iowa border."

The situation could result in reopening long-standing controversies over water rights. At present there is a fragile truce, but the proposed federal government policy threatens to upset that delicate balance. In particular, the government is considering making official claim to its own rights for water originating on or traveling through federal lands. Such rights might supersede those granted by states. In addition, several Indian nations are preparing claims of their own, striking terror in the hearts of current users.

Water is, of course, but one of the resources which will be exploited and perhaps even exhausted by demands for unlimited energy.

Land is also the object of strenuous competition, particularly in areas where huge coal and oil-shale deposits lie. The strip-mining bill is once more mired in House-Senate conference committee, and while there may still be legislation to protect the land from unrestricted strip-mining, no such safe-guards exist at this writing.

While a good portion of the coal and oil-shale deposits are under relatively unproductive land, this is by no means true of all. In agriculturally rich North Dakota, for example, there are huge deposits of lignite quite readily available for stripping. An estimated 600,000 acres of farmland have already been leased by energy companies. Lignite is low-grade coal which is commonly burned to produce natural gas, a process requiring great quantities of water.

Although the companies contend they will reclaim all the land mined, that land would be out of production during stripping and for the period of replacement and revegetation. Also, there is no guarantee that it is possible to restore the soil to its former quality. There may well be more public relations than science in the energy companies' largely untested claims of complete reclamation.

So far North Dakota, along with most of the Western states, has taken a "show me" attitude towards energy development. Not so strangely, the enthusiasm for such activity increases in direct proportion to the distance from a development. Most will benefit distant areas—Los Angeles, for example—while bringing hitherto unknown pollution and social problems to the relatively stable and clean Western farm states.

However, the economics of the situation dictate that in the end, many farmers can-

not afford to refuse the persistent offers of the energy companies. Typically, a square mile of this farmland will gross an estimated \$50,000 per year, according to the *New York Times*. The same property could yield an estimated \$1.12 million in energy royalties.

In the Dakotas, as well as elsewhere, the search for energy is in direct competition with the need for increasing food supplies, and the United States no longer produces a real surplus of food to the degree that it can meet rising export demands and help balance the trade deficit, or even keep down American food prices. Experts on the Senate Agriculture Committee point out that almost all the nation's Class I agricultural land is now in production. There is no land left in the land bank, and every acre of land or allocation of water removed from agricultural uses decreases the nation's ability to grow food.

The CIA briefed Congressmen recently on the world food situation, noting the dangers of famine overseas and the possibilities of acute problems in China and the Soviet Union if the predicted colder weather cycle develops. The CIA bluntly said the United States can regain world leadership if it has the crops for export, but will face "potential risks" from the powerful nations of the world if the food isn't available. Such risks might of course include nuclear confrontation.

Another question raised by Project Independence—at least as it is now contemplated—is its effect on the economy. The current inflation derives in part from pressures built up by the Vietnam War. The Russian wheat deal, increasing many basic costs, and the huge and abrupt boost in oil prices created the current peaks. The increasing cost of "net" energy production, as envisioned in Project Independence, will further aggravate inflation. There is no cheap energy left. For example, Detroit Edison has contracted for 180 million tons of Montana coal at a cost of \$1 billion, and the cost of transportation will add an additional \$2 billion. Oil from oil shale will be more costly than oil from the ground. Natural gas from lignite will be more costly than natural gas from the ground. Oil from Alaska will be more costly than oil from Texas, oil from off-shore rigs will be more costly than oil from on-shore rigs.

The energy developed by Project Independence will be more costly in another way. It is possible to expend more energy in development and transport than is ultimately realized. It should be determined whether the net energy gained is worth the price paid to produce it. No one has figured the BTU (British Thermal Unit) cost-benefit ratio of many of the proposed energy developments.

Finally, coal, the so-called basic fuel in Project Independence, is the dirtiest of all fuels. The lethal smogs of Damora, Pennsylvania, and London were caused by the burning of coal. It is questionable whether coal can be burned cleanly, and it is certain that additional coal plants will create more pollution. Indeed, the coal industry is pressing for an easing of air-pollution standards because of the energy crisis and may well win its case.

To summarize Project Independence, it simply won't work. There are logical alternatives, including the simplest and most workable of all—conservation of energy by reducing the rate of consumption and concentrating on development of less destructive sources of supply.

In Washington, energy conservation is strongly supported by Train of EPA, Russell Peterson of the President's Council on Environmental Quality and a number of Congressmen. Peterson advocates a "half and half" program—half development and half conservation. (Of course, no one speaks against conservation any more. Energy policy, however, is a different matter.)

Senator Alan Cranston (Democrat, California) and Representative Morris Udall (Democrat, Arizona), together with Senator

Henry Jackson (Democrat, Washington) and others have consistently advocated a balanced program of conservation and development.

Cranston proposed that the President exert the "full power and persuasion of the federal government to cut the annual rise in the rate of fuel consumption in the U.S. by 50 percent." He said Americans can save at least 340,000 barrels of oil a day, noting that "at current inflated prices, that comes to nearly \$4 million a day." Cranston has also suggested specifics to make such a program effective, including a graduated tax on autos, based on weight, thus related to consumption of gas.

Udall stresses prudent resource management, commenting: "There is only one new real source of energy and that is to conserve energy." As the man who has worked hardest to pass a strong strip mining control bill, Udall has faced the problem head on.

As noted earlier, the Ford Foundation report warns that a number of things must be done to achieve a reduction in the national consumption of energy. These include:

Adopt minimum fuel-economy performance standards for new cars, to achieve an average of at least 20 miles per gallon by 1985.

Encourage more efficient space heating and cooling. This includes making credit easily available for energy-saving investments in existing buildings; setting higher Federal Housing Administration standards for insulation and heating and cooling systems; upgrading building codes and providing technical assistance to builders.

Design government programs to encourage technological innovation for saving energy. This includes shifting federal research-and-development funding toward energy conservation technology.

Set prices to reflect the full costs of producing energy—this is especially important for the promotion of energy-saving in industry. This means eliminating energy industry subsidies; abolishing promotional discounts for big electricity users; levying pollution taxes to supplement pollution-control regulation; and building oil stockpiles financed by tariffs on imported oil.

Even at a two-percent annual growth rate, energy supplies will need to be 28 percent larger in 1985 than in 1973. Yet the slowdown from present growth rates would mean that from now until 1985, the nation could meet demand without resorting to developments that risk grave environmental damage or serious foreign-policy confrontations.

Until 1985, new supplies could come from discoveries of oil and gas onshore, plus offshore production in the Gulf of Mexico; secondary and tertiary recovery from existing oil and gas wells; coal from deep mines and surface mines where the land can be reclaimed; and electric power plants already in some stage of construction. For this period, at least, it would not be necessary to embark on large-scale development of Western coal and shale where reclamation is chancy or impossible. Nor would massive new commitments to nuclear power, increased oil imports, or offshore oil development in so far undisturbed areas (Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf of Alaska) be required.

The study concludes that if historical growth patterns are followed it would mean "very aggressive development of all energy sources." There would be "little scope to pick and choose among sources of supply, no matter what economic, foreign policy or environmental problems might arise."

Yet this is the course taken thus far because of failure to realize the consequences of Project Independence or, in fact, of any single-purpose approach to the complex problems we face in company with the rest of the world.

To plan by slogan is a dangerous exercise in self-deception. In an interdependent

world which must find a way to live in harmony, Project Independence invites chaos. It is not too late to consider all of the factors involved—food supply, inflation, foreign policy and pollution—and plan comprehensively from a base of resource conservation.

**SIMAS KUDIRKA—THE SAILOR IS NOW HOME BUT THIS TIME IT IS FOR REAL**

**HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, after 4 long years of hard labor in a Siberian concentration camp, Simas Kudirka, the Lithuanian sailor who attempted to jump ship and defect to the U.S.S. Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant* off Martha's Vineyard, on November 23, 1970, is now home and safe in the United States of America.

My staff—Betty Burger, caseworker and my executive assistant, Sandy Burke—and I along with hundreds of Lithuanian-American groups, especially, Dr. and Mrs. Roland Paegle, Mr. and Mrs. Romus Kezys, and Dr. and Mrs. Kezys Bobelis, began our exhaustive 2-year crusade to free Simas Kudirka from a 10-year hard labor sentence in a Siberian concentration camp.

Through the great assistance of the U.S. State Department and the personal intervention by President Gerald R. Ford with Soviet Communist Party Chief Leonid Brezhnev, Simas Kudirka, the sailor, is now home, but this time it is for real.

I wish to insert an article which appeared in the Washington Post for the interest of my colleagues.

HOME IS THE SAILOR, THIS TIME FOR REAL

(By Jean M. White)

Simas Kudirka, who survived one of this country's less glorious moments with untarnished belief in America, was put to another stern test yesterday.

In a crowded, noisy Capitol reception room, the Lithuanian sailor, who tried to jump ship to freedom, went through the ordeal of a hero's welcome, shaking hands, smiling, understanding little of what was said, sweating in a stifling room, often more than a little confused. And yet he still could say that he was happy to be in America.

There have been worse moments for Kudirka.

Four years ago he jumped aboard an American Coast Guard vessel tied to a Russian fishing trawler off the New England coast during a talk about fishing rights. Kudirka asked refuge in the United States, but Coast Guard officers allowed Russian sailors to beat him and drag him back to the Soviet ship.

The 44-year-old Lithuanian then served four years of a 10-year sentence in a Siberian concentration camp. He was freed in September after his mother's baptismal certificate was found in a Brooklyn, N.Y., Roman Catholic Church to give her son claim to American citizenship.

Looking across the crowded reception room yesterday, a trifle ill at ease in his new blue suit, Kudirka said forcefully.

"I do this if it will help the people left behind. I am no hero. I know people back there who have been in labor camps for 25

years for nothing . . . I only wish those beautiful people in that beautiful country wouldn't have to live in a land of concentration camps."

An interpreter was needed to translate the words. But no interpreter is needed to translate Kudirka's emotions, hand clasp, and piercing blue eyes when he challenges:

"I'd like to send at least one American over there to ask for a document of human rights. They took away four of my human rights."

"We're very emotional people," he concluded, grasping a hand and not letting go until he was through.

Kudirka's aborted jump to freedom resulted in a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee report and the early retirement of two Coast Guard officers, who were faced with courts-martial.

When Kudirka jumped aboard the Coast Guard cutter off Martha's Vineyard in 1970 and asked for political asylum, he had no idea that he could claim American citizenship, he recalled yesterday.

It was only when word came out of Lithuania that Kudirka's mother, Maria Sulskis, had been born and baptized in America that the break came for Kudirka, serving the 10-year term of forced labor for treason.

What turned into a detective hunt for the proof of American birth—with the State Department carefully checking the ink to rule out forgery—started with a letter from Lithuania to an old friend of Mrs. Sulskis.

"The letter to Maria Achenbach, who had known Mrs. Sulskis in Lithuania, said that Simas' mother 'was born in the United States like yourself.' We didn't know the name of the church where she was baptized, but we got hold of a Catholic priests' association and checked where the priest, whose name we knew, had been assigned. It was St. Mary the Angels in Brooklyn," related Glazina Paegle.

Kudirka, his wife, his mother, son, and daughter, have been living with the Paegles in Locust, N.J., where the Lithuanian sailor is close to the water of a nearby bay.

"The morning after he arrived," Mrs. Paegle said, "he went out in a motor boat with my husband. He was amazed there were no guards along the seacoast, no checkpoints."

Once the baptism certificate of Kudirka's mother was found, the State Department declared her an American citizen earlier this year, opening the way for her son to claim citizenship by choice. Mrs. Sulskis was born in Brooklyn in 1906 and, at the age of 6, taken back to Lithuania, where she lived until she joined her son's family to return to her homeland.

Rep. Robert Hanrahan (R-Ill.), who was co-host with New York Sen. James Buckley and Illinois Sen. Charles Percy in the Capitol reception yesterday, said President Ford had intervened personally with Soviet Communist Party Chief Leonid Brezhnev to free Kudirka on his claim of American citizenship.

"The State Department checked carefully," Hanrahan said. "They even checked the ink on the mother's baptismal certificate. You remember that forged map that fooled Yale University a while back."

Kudirka arrived in the United States on Nov. 5—Election Day.

"Unfortunately, I was in Chicago so it didn't help me in the election," Rep. Hanrahan noted wryly. His Third Illinois District includes suburban and city wards in Chicago with a sizable number of constituents with Baltic blood.

Kudirka, who had picked up some English as radio operator on his ship, is adding to his vocabulary. Yesterday, holding a silver plate given him by the House of Representatives, he pointed to the insignia of the eagle when asked about his two lapel pins: the American flag and the Lithuanian national symbol of a knight.

"Like the eagle—American eagle," he said, pointing to his Lithuanian symbol.

Mrs. Sulskis, a stolid woman with a big smile, told—through an interpreter—of being harried in her small village after her son's arrest.

She said that a woman's organization to which she had belonged for 20 years dropped her suddenly, the interpreter explained, adding: "She wishes she had brought some smoked bacon with her, although she isn't supposed to eat it."

For Kudirka, the long wait for freedom is over. But at the reception yesterday beginning his fight to get his wife and 11-year-old daughter to this country, Aloyzas Jurgutis escaped to Italy while on an excursion to Yugoslavia and arrived here in September. After his defection, his wife lost her job and none of his letters has been answered.

"Please help me if you can," Jurgutis said in halting English.

HON. H. R. GROSS

**HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, although not tall in stature, one of the real giants of the Congress is leaving for a well-earned retirement. These Halls will not be the same next year without H. R. GROSS. In the last 26 years he has become one of the legendary personalities of Capitol Hill. Visitors from all parts of the country looking down on this Chamber from the gallery invariably ask, "Which one is H. R. Gross?"

Yes, H. R. GROSS has been more than a Representative from the State of Iowa. In his self-styled role as "watchdog of the Treasury" he has built up a devoted national constituency. Citizens from all 50 States who believe in sound government and fiscal integrity have come to admire the tenacious resolve of this man in his pursuit of responsible legislation.

The other day someone facetiously remarked that when those two great liberals—GROSS and ARENDS—retire, perhaps something can be done about Federal spending. The incongruity of casting H. R. in the role of liberal naturally brought forth a good laugh in the cloakroom. But in many ways that really count, he is just that.

Certainly no Member of Congress, past or present, has been more liberal and generous in giving of his time and talent to serve his constituents and his country.

Certainly no Member of Congress, past or present, has been more liberal and conscientious in his efforts to preserve and promote the principles upon which this Republic was founded.

Certainly no Member of Congress, past or present, has been more liberal in sharing his vast knowledge of the legislative and parliamentary process.

Yes, H. R. GROSS throughout his 13 terms in the Congress has been liberal in ways that count—just as he has been conservative in way that count. Labels have never been important to him. What mattered most was the welfare of the country and how it is affected by what we do here. He has been one of our most

effective legislators. Countless measures bear his unique imprint.

I feel privileged, indeed, to have had the opportunity to serve with H. R. these past 26 years and to have been included in his circle of friends. I join with all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in saluting his outstanding record as he retires to private life, and I extend my best wishes to him and his charming wife Hazel, for good health and abundant happiness in the years ahead.

#### THE ARGONNE

### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago E. Sheldon Graeff, of Stratford, N.J., presented me with a beautiful poem entitled "The Argonne." It is an emotional piece and, at this time of year, as we approach the Christmas season, it would be well for each of us to remember and read this stirring reminder of things gone by. It was my intent to publish this poem on Veterans Day, but due to the pressure of business I withheld it and on the advice of my good wife decided to publish it just prior to Christmas Day.

Mr. Graeff is a gentleman of considerable note and is an outstanding member of the community of Stratford, N.J. His contributions to mankind will long be remembered. Mr. Graeff's poem follows:

#### THE ARGONNE

God created a forest sublime,  
Of stately trees twixt spruce and pine;  
Their needles fill a quiet glen,  
On a rock-strewn slope hid the "Black Bear" den.

Soft streaks of sunlight beam,  
And sparkle on a mountain stream;  
The top most limbs to the blue skies tower,  
And gently shade the woodland flower.

When his wondrous work was done,  
Man called it "The Argonne";  
This place on Earth so picturesque,  
Now a blackened skeleton so grotesque.

Where once was heard the whip-poor-will,  
Now rings with cries of man's urge to kill;  
From the "Lost Battalion" a pigeon flew,  
A sniper's shot it's feathers askew.

The crystal stream where one's thirst could quench,  
Runs red with blood stink and stench;  
The fragrant smell of wooded air,  
Now polluted with burning flesh and hair.

Charred boughs smouldering in the moss beneath,  
Lies a Captain's sword still in its sheath;  
From a thicket bolts a frightened stag,  
And bounds o'er a blazing flag.

In the shattering crash of shot and shell,  
Brave men endured the fires of "Hell";  
Mid the thunderous roar of "Big Bertha's" din,  
A soldier prays from his soul within.

Both friend and foe lie side by side,  
To be free men in battle died;  
And far up in the darkened sky,  
One could hear the Buzzards' cry.

Were their deaths to be in vain?  
Or were men to march to war again?  
There are some still here but most are gone,  
Who still remember "The Argonne."

#### A WALK ON THE SOUTH SIDE

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, for those of my colleagues who would relish a taste of "old world" atmosphere in the course of modern-day living. I call their attention to the following article which describes the South Side of the city of Pittsburgh.

Written by Margie Carlin and published by the South Side Chamber of Commerce, the article accurately describes the mixture of old and new in the community today. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to enjoy "A Walk on the South Side":

#### A WALK ON THE SOUTH SIDE

(By Margie Carlin)

It isn't true that you need a passport to cross the 10th Street Bridge into the South Side, but sometimes visitors get that impression.

South Side is one of Pittsburgh's oldest neighborhoods and perhaps the one most insulated against change.

The Old World atmosphere persists, and you still can hear greetings in Czech, Hungarian, Ukrainian, Serb, Polish or some other Middle European tongue.

Kiszki, kielbasa, holubki and pieroghis (sausages, stuffed cabbages and stuffed dumplings) are standard fare, and the old style bakeries offer special Slavic breads and cakes at holiday times.

Much of the social life still revolves around the area's nationality churches—among them, St. Mary's Russian Orthodox, St. Joseph's and St. Adalbert's (Polish), St. Peter's (German), St. Matthew's (Slovak), St. John the Baptist Ukrainian Church and the oldest church in the area, St. Michael's, founded in 1848 by German immigrants.

South Siders also group in clubs for drinking and socializing, among them Serbian, Slovak and Ukrainian. The Polish Falcons even offer a small museum about Polish history in their building at 97 S. 18th St.

South Siders call the level two-mile stretch along the Monongahela River the "flats" and its narrow streets are lined with Pittsburgh's greatest concentration of preserved 19th-century houses and churches.

The area was settled by workers from the British Isles and Germany, who came during the last century to work in the mills and factories along the river.

They built the sturdy brick row houses along Sarah, Jane and the other streets and ways on the South Side, and in the style of the period, trimmed the structures with carved window frames, door lintels, brackets and other fanciful details.

The area was fortunate when the second wave of immigrants took over. After the original settlers became a little more affluent and moved to the suburbs, the houses were bought by Slavs. These people brought with them habits of thrift and cleanliness, and thanks to these virtues, the South Side has remained safe from the wrecking ball.

The village was founded in 1811 by Dr. and Mrs. Nathaniel Bedford, and called Birmingham after Bedford's English home town. It became South Side after annexation to the city in 1873.

The land originally had been deeded to Jane Bedford's father, John Ormsby, for Revolutionary War service.

The original plan included Carson Street—named for a Philadelphia sea captain friend of the Bedfords—and at one time, the street was the major road linking Pittsburgh with

Washington, Pa., and the great National Road.

Today, it still is a major artery, and every day, an endless stream of traffic pounds its way along the narrow street. City planners, restoration specialists and just plain South Siders would like the heavy traffic rerouted, but so far, any bypass is tangled in bureaucracy.

Carson Street, of course, is the key to any significant restoration of the area. For years, members of the South Side Chamber of Commerce, Citizens Council and the Pittsburgh History and Landmarks Foundation (PHLF) have been dreaming great dreams about old Birmingham—as they like to refer to the area.

They see South Side as a potential Georgetown, Society Hill or Beacon Hill, once the dilapidated boarded-up buildings, tawdry plastic store fronts, sidewalk litter and other evidences of inner-city decay are removed from the 20-block-long business section.

"We almost had a couple high-rises a few years ago, but it fell through," she said. "This was made for the future of the South Side. If the older people could move into apartments, it would open up housing for young couples, and we'd have new blood here."

She said that the older South Siders had been eager to move into modern apartments near their familiar shopping and churches.

#### HOUSES HARD TO FIND

"Houses for rent or sale on the South Side are practically nonexistent. You just try to find one. If a house does open up, it's sold almost right away to a friend or relative."

One of the lucky "outlanders" who has found a nest right on East Carson Street is Mrs. Laura Pence. She moved into the area three years ago from a pleasant suburban home in Carnegie.

"My friends all thought I'd lost my mind," she says, "because this place was in such awful shape."

Mrs. Pence bought a three-story building and apartment house at 1813 E. Carson as an investment, and a smaller house in the rear for herself.

"I liked the old, undeveloped feeling of the South Side, and I toured all kinds of city neighborhoods before I made up my mind. This place was so rundown, that a friend told me he'd do me a big favor and burn it down—but I'm lucky he didn't. I just love the convenience of living here. Besides, it's a well-built place. You should see the cellar and joists in this place—just fantastic."

Mrs. Pence sold her car, and now enjoys shopping at nearby markets on foot. She thinks city living will be on the upswing again, and feels South Side might become even a fashionable place to live.

Making the South Side "fashionable"—keeping its architectural beauty intact while moving the business district and housing into swinging contemporary times—is a major concern to South Side leaders.

#### GERALD M. "JAY" CHERRY

### HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of Jay Cherry at the end of October this year comes as a great loss to the many people here on the Hill and in the executive branch who had the opportunity and good fortune to work with him and make his acquaintance.

Jay Cherry had served with the Federal Education Impact Aid program

from 1952, when he came to Washington from Nebraska, and had been its Director since 1968. His program helps school districts compensate for the presence of tax-exempt Federal lands and the burden of providing free public education to 2.5 million children of military and civilian Federal employees. It also, among many other things, restores or replaces school facilities destroyed or damaged in natural disasters. As anyone who knows the legislation can testify, there are few aid-to-education programs of greater administrative complexity than this one Jay administered.

His mastery of the program and his energies in carrying it out were extraordinary. But what was perhaps even more memorable to those of us who knew him were his absolutely unflagging good nature, balance, and good sense under pressure. He was the kind of administrator for whom the taxpayers could well be thankful, and a first-rate human being as well, self-effacing. Highly effective. A gentleman whose passing brings sorrow to us all. We join together in extending our heartfelt sympathy to his wife, Fern; their son, Gerald L.; and two granddaughters, Diana Elizabeth and Alexandra Caroline.

KIWANIS CLUB OF TAUNTON  
CELEBRATES 50 YEARS

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Kiwanis Club of Taunton, Mass., gathered together in Swansea to celebrate their 50th anniversary on December 8.

For 50 years the outstanding members of the Kiwanis Club of Taunton have dedicated themselves to service projects for the entire community. Their continuous endeavors to improve community life through the spirit of good fellowship deserves national recognition.

I am submitting to the RECORD some segments of the history of the Taunton Kiwanis and a list of the 1974 membership roster:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF TAUNTON KIWANIS CLUB,  
1925-74

Early in February, 1925, the readers of the Taunton Daily Gazette were interested in the headlines that cried for their attention. The tragedy of Floyd Collins who was entombed in a sand cave in the bleak hills of Kentucky was a gripping story. Night after night the newspaper described the heroic efforts to reach the young man trapped some sixty feet below the surface until finally, after nearly three weeks of struggling to reach his body, the same men who had toiled for days shoveled back dirt and rocks into the shaft they had dug and made it the grave of Floyd Collins.

During that first week in February another front-page story told of a band of independent Seventh Day Adventists called Rowenites who assembled in Patchogue, Long Island, and prayed together in preparation for the millennium that was expected to take place at midnight on February 6. To make ready for the hour when they would

be transported to heaven, this little group of believers got rid of all their worldly goods and dressed in their Sunday best to await the crack of doom. The prediction of the Rowenites never came to be, and, in a day or so, it was no longer news for the press.

There was, however, an event that took place in Taunton in February that, while it may not have been of national import, it was the beginning of an organization that would exert a lasting influence on the community. The story of this event appeared on the last page of the Taunton Daily Gazette on February 5, 1925. It stated that "the Taunton Kiwanis Club started with a bang! when in the presence of two hundred visiting Kiwanians, Rotarians, and Lions and other invited guests it received its charter and became a part of an international organization."

Plans for the new club started during the year 1925, when a group of civic-minded men met in the office of John W. Robertson on School Street to start a service club. About a dozen men worked hard to organize what was to become the Kiwanis Club of Taunton. The first luncheon meetings were in the old Taunton Inn on the northerly side of the Green. A nominating committee prepared a slate of officers, and the necessary steps were taken to form a permanent organization. Then, on February 4, 1925, Charter night was observed in Odd Fellows Hall on Court Street, and the Taunton Kiwanis Club became a part of Kiwanis International. Taunton was the 50th club to be formed in the United States.

Let us look at the record to find out what the Kiwanis Club had done during their first quarter of a century to live up to its motto, "We Build."

The Milk Fund was started in 1927.

Concerts by the High School Band and Girls Glee Club and Grammar School Chorus brought attention to what the young people were accomplishing in the field of music.

An annual award to the winner of the Grammar School Baseball League stimulated sports competition.

Bus loads of children were sent to summer camp.

Scholarships were awarded high school graduates to help them further their education.

Money was furnished to support 4-H Club projects.

Kiddies Day honored the young children of the city.

Funds were raised for underprivileged children.

A Tag Day for the Infantile Paralysis Fund. Joint activities with the community in civic projects.

This included an aviation sign on top of the freight depot.

This list is not complete, but it does indicate some of the good work done by the men of Kiwanis.

As stated above, the club motto is "We Build", and with that in mind the directors over the years have spent many hours devising ways and means of raising money to support the many activities of the club. The fund-raising methods include Tag Days, entertainments, sporting events, gumball dispensers, fair booths, Christmas trees and sportsman shows.

The first Tag Day was on February 19, 1934, when Tauntonians were given the opportunity of contributing to the Kiwanis Milk Fund. A group of fifty school students, under the direction of Miss Margaret Tufts, Dean of Girls at Taunton High School, distributed the tags and collected \$133.52—not a great sum by today's standards, but it was an auspicious start. In the years that followed the amounts increased markedly.

The Milk Fund was the first Kiwanis activity to serve the underprivileged child, and it dates back to a meeting of the Directors on April 4, 1927, when Dr. Frank Murphy, School

Physican, and Mrs. Thomas E. Dunn, School Nurse, described health conditions among school children and the special need for milk in the diet of children. The Directors immediately voted to donate free milk to the needy children in any two schools selected by Dr. Murphy. It was not long after this meeting that Kiwanis was distributing more than 50,000 bottles of milk annually. The milk project is perhaps the best-known service of Kiwanis to the underprivileged child, and it certainly was a great help during the depression years. For example, in 1932 the treasurer of Kiwanis paid out \$1,313.76 for milk given free to the needy children.

A great deal of the work done by Kiwanis is a result of the activities of committees. From time to time membership on these committees change, and sometimes the name and function of the committee itself changed; but one Kiwanian ideal that does not change is the interest it has in our youth. From the very beginning of Kiwanis in Taunton the needs of youth have been recognized, and something has been done about it by the Taunton club.

The first object of Kiwanis as stated in the constitution that was adopted here in Taunton fifty years ago gave primacy to the human and spiritual values of life. It still is the first objective, and Taunton Kiwanis will continue to build on that sound foundation.

Taunton Kiwanians have accomplished much during the past fifty years. The club has been the source of many good works that have benefited the entire community. There remains, however, much more to be done and many challenges to be met. Be assured that Kiwanis will do what is needed in the spirit of good fellowship. We are confident that the next fifty years will see the building of a bigger and better community as a result of the efforts of this dedicated service club—Taunton Kiwanis.

ROSTER OF 1974 MEMBERSHIP

William L. Williams, Jr., President.  
Frank W. Carroll, First Vice-President.  
David E. Latham, Second Vice-President.  
Lincoln Davison, Treasurer.  
Lawrence E. Ross, Secretary.  
David E. Latham, Assistant Secretary.  
Robert L. Cammarata, Immediate Past President.  
Rev. Samuel J. Riggs, Chaplain.

Directors

Paul M. Berry, William J. Brelsford, Robert E. Costello, Edwin F. Devine, Jr., William R. Drummond, Donald T. Lachapelle, Edward T. McCaffery, Fred M. Whitehouse, and Charles J. Williams.

Members

Theodore Aleixo, Bertram J. Antine, Edward J. Almeida, Jr., Normand L. Belanger, Dr. William H. Bennett, Paul M. Berry, Dr. Fred R. Blumenthal, William J. Brelsford, Michael J. Brennan, Robert L. Cammarata, Frank W. Carroll, L. Robert Clift, Manuel Costa, Robert E. Costello, Henry G. Crapo, David Dahroos, Richard W. Davidson, Lincoln Davison, John H. DeSilvia, Edwin F. Devine, Jr., T. Howard Donahue, William L. Donle, Joseph W. Dooley, Manuel J. Drummond, William R. Drummond, Manuel J. Gallego, Harold H. Galligan, John Glazebrook, Ralph M. Handren, David E. Hoxie, and David R. Hutchinson.

Joseph W. Kirker, Donald T. Lachapelle, David E. Latham, P. Frank Leddy, Edward T. McCaffery, John G. Nelson, Dr. William H. Niedner, John F. Parker, Philip R. Perra, George M. Powers, Jr., Joseph G. Quill, Albert F. Richmond, Charles J. Rocheleau, Lawrence E. Ross, Charles E. Rouleau, Wilfred V. Saint, Arthur J. Shaw, Alfred P. Silva, Stephen J. Stepanaitis, Richard J. Tobin, Leslie A. Wheeler, Fred M. Whitehouse, Charles J. Williams, and William L. Williams.

Honorary members

Rev. Samuel J. Riggs, Warren L. Ide, Michael F. Strojny, and R. Darrell Lambert.



**RULES COMMITTEE VOTES TO DEFER ACTION ON STUDY OF RIVER**

**HON. WILMER MIZELL**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, the House Rules Committee voted to kill legislation I have proposed to study the ancient and beautiful New River on the North Carolina-Virginia border, to see if it qualifies for the permanent protection of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

By a vote of 13 to 2, the Rules Committee voted to defer action on the bill, despite the fact that the committee knew full well their deliberate inaction spelled doom for the river and for the people who live on its banks.

Failure to pass this bill will allow the Appalachian Power Co. to construct a massive power project that will destroy the river, which has flowed free and clear for 100 million years, and flood 38,000 acres of scenic and fertile farmland.

Harry Reasoner, the very distinguished and thoughtful co-anchorman of the ABC Evening News, had an editorial comment last night on the Rules Committee's decision, and I believe it is important that every Member of this House pay attention to what Mr. Reasoner had to say.

Following is the text of his commentary:

As we reported earlier, the House Rules Committee today voted to block action this session on a major tax bill.

That committee has been busy indeed, tidying things up so that Congress can take its first really long vacation in almost two months, and an action it took yesterday may tell even more about its dedication to the public weal.

Yesterday, it voted 13-2 to prevent the full House from considering a bill to save a river on the Virginia-North Carolina border. The bill that the House won't see would prevent the damming, for a private power plant, of one of the few remaining wild and clean rivers in the east.

I don't pretend to be an expert on the case, and I am sure that as in most stories, there are two sides. But both North Carolina's Senators—one Democratic, one conservative Republican—were against the dam. The State of North Carolina is formally against the dam. Secretary of the Interior Morton is against the dam. So the evidence in favor of at least giving the House a look at it would seem to be overwhelming.

And the evidence that we still have the same old Congress, responsive to the citizens in public statements but to special interests in the quiet of committee rooms, that evidence would seem to be overwhelming, too.

Only two of the thirteen members who voted to bury the bill won't be back for the next session. This is one of those stories where the men who make the decision usually do so pretty anonymously. Even the New York Times, which has strongly supported the bill editorially, did not list the thirteen men who voted so arrogantly and so mysteriously.

I think this may be a case where a lot of people would like to know their names, so that credit may be given where and if it is due.

The two representatives who voted to let the House look at the measure are Chairman

Ray Madden of Indiana and Democrat Richard Bolling of Missouri.

The eight Democrats who voted to kill the bill are James Delaney of New York, B. F. Sisk of California, John Young of Texas, Claude Pepper of Florida, Spark Matsunaga of Hawaii, Morgan Murphy of Illinois, Gillis Long of Louisiana, and Clem McSpadden of Oklahoma. All five Republicans voted to kill. They are Dave Martin of Nebraska, John Anderson of Illinois, James Quillen of Tennessee, Delbert Latta of Ohio, and Del Clawson of California.

Nice work, gentlemen.

To Mr. Reasoner's very telling comments, I would add only the following: About 3,000 God-fearing, hard-working people petitioned the Congress to hear their case and consider their plight before the swift hand of destruction could come down on their river and their homes. Their plea fell on deaf ears.

Is this really the people's House? If so, which people?

**FIRST SAVINGS CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY**

**HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have some good news. I attended the 50th anniversary of the First Savings and Loan Association located in New Brunswick, N.J. Their deposits are 10 times what they were 10 years ago. I was with life-long friends, and I heard Louis Friedberg who was the dean of the 50 years tell how happy the group was.

I am delighted to share this speech with my colleagues because this organization bought millions of dollars worth of mortgages from our New Jersey Community Affairs Department which has made a good showing for new housing:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN AND HONORED GUESTS: Thinking back over the last 50 years of my life, I have come to appreciate what the building and loan business and the savings and loan business has meant to the United States, and in particular, I think of the impact upon New Brunswick, New Jersey certainly in 1924, we, the Property Owners Building and Loan, were not a major or even significant influence upon the economy of this little community on the banks of the Raritan.

Phil Brenner, Arnold Rosenthal, Sam Hodgeson, Harold Bruskin, Emil Klein and myself, were aware that homeownership on the part of our citizens was important. We believed that this could only be accomplished through the combined efforts of the citizens of New Brunswick.

Through serial plans we were able to achieve a measure of success not readily appreciated by the multitudes of today. Through the years of trials and tribulations, the depression, the post-war period, the days of our early insurance of accounts, our little association survived and worked for the benefits of New Brunswick, Middlesex County and its environs.

The efforts of men like Arnold Rosenthal, Philip Brenner, Terry Brenner, Harold Bruskin, Emil Klein, myself and the balance of the charter members, were not always appreciated, but these men spoke their minds regardless of the consequences. These men strongly quarreled over the virtues of

merger, federal insurance of accounts and even such a mundane question as to a ground floor location for our savings and loan association. Finally, a meeting of minds was accomplished. At this point, the association qualified for insurance and the property owners building and loan and the Middlesex County building and loan merged under the leadership of George H. Gordon. From this humble beginning of \$1,200,000, the association obtained the services of George H. Towers as executive vice president and over the next 14 years, the association prospered, and opened a branch in North Brunswick, and a branch office in Edison Township. The performance of both offices supported the directors' belief in the development of the Middlesex County area. At this point with the acquisition of the Edison office, the association acquired the valued services of Wallace Steinberg, Bill Foley and the men of the uniform savings and loan.

After opening this office in Edison, Mr. Towers retired to Florida and the association engaged LeRoy R. Terry as president. Shortly thereafter, the Security Building and Loan was acquired by First Savings and Loan. This advent produced a new office in Somerset. The Somerset office further re-deemed the board's thinking in the expansion within their own immediate region. The board has subsequently looked to new and greater fields as New Jersey has moved New Brunswick from the Hub city to the Hub state.

With the advent of increased commercial activity in the Middlesex area, the board intensified its efforts in this region and has sought new markets to deliver the know-how of First Savings to a larger and more sophisticated market.

Because of the dedication of the men who had belief in First Savings, I would ask that you all rise for a moment of silent prayer for those men who have given to our association and who are no longer with us. (pause)

Thank you ladies and gentlemen for your moment of remembrance and to you who will be here when we celebrate our 100th anniversary, please remember the humble beginning of our association.

I want to thank all of the board of directors for their wonderful cooperation while I was president. I also want to thank the president, officers and all personnel for their faithful service in helping to make this celebration possible.

May God bless you, one and all.—LOUIS FRIEDBERG.

**THE RETIREMENT FROM CONGRESS OF H. R. GROSS**

**HON. JOHN J. McFALL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation for the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross). For 26 years, H. R. has served as a watchdog of the U.S. Treasury. During this time, with the constant help of his wife, Hazel, H. R. has tirelessly studied all legislation. He has combined the "who, what, when, where, why" of his journalistic experience with a "how much" perspective as a citizen, enforcing that sense of proportion during House deliberations and particularly during the consideration of spending measures. As a Member of Congress, he pursued even more vigorously and effectively that scrutiny of public

affairs and the exercise of fiscal responsibility that he had championed during his long service as a radio news broadcaster at home in Iowa.

The gentleman has been a lifelong advocate of financial responsibility by the Federal Government and a consistent opponent and seeker out of wasteful Federal spending and practices. Not the least of his criticism has been extended to unwarranted trips abroad by Members of Congress. H. R. himself has not been out of the country since World War I when he served with the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe. The gentleman also served with General Pershing during the Mexican border dispute just before U.S. entry into the war. That qualifies him for one of the Nation's most exclusive veterans' groups with only 445 members.

It is therefore fitting—and perhaps with just a touch of retribution—that some friends in the House are giving the Grosses a trip to Paris—a “junket” that I hope Hazel and H. R. will thoroughly enjoy.

It is a profound tribute to H. R.—a measure of his stature—that even those whom he has opposed on legislation admire him and like him. Personally, I have enjoyed my floor exchanges with H. R.

I remember how impressed I was, when I first came to Congress, with the stern-visaged man who fired off one disconcerting question after another at floor managers who became increasingly uncomfortable under the barrage. It was a formidable and—to a new Member—even intimidating performance.

But I kept looking at him and studying him, and finally I figured it out. So one day, I said to the gentleman—as he fixed me with a penetrating stare worthy of a representative of the Hawkeye State:

“I know what it is. You always appear very stern and hold your face so stiff. But your eyes give you away. You can't stop them from sparkling. You hold your features so stiff to keep from smiling and showing what a good time you're having. But you can't control your eyes.”

When I confronted him with that, his face opened into a huge sunflower of a smile and he burst into a huge laugh. I had found out his secret. And over the years, I have discovered what a wonderful sense of humor H. R. really has. He loves to hear good stories, and he loves to tell them. Despite that stiff exterior, he is one of the most congenial Members of the House. His wit makes debates not only challenging and informative but often humorous. He has made interesting even announcements of the schedule and recesses.

As H.R. leaves the House, the floor will be less challenging and bills less well examined. Few House colleagues would neglect their homework, knowing they would have to face the gentleman's sharp inquiry on the floor the next day.

The taxpayers most of all will miss him. Certainly, Congress as an institution and the Nation are the poorer for his departure. All these years, H. R. has been the conscience of the Congress. He has earned his place in the history of this post-World War II era as a voice for constancy and responsibility in a period of unprecipitated and sometimes unsettling change.

Throughout it all, he has been a force for stability and prudence and uncommon good sense.

Perhaps one of the highest compliments I can pay my friend from Iowa is to say that his sense of purpose, his integrity, his high moral principles, and his wry, good humor have never changed. Few of us have escaped the sting of his pointed inquiry; fewer still would not agree that their legislation has been the better for it.

The gentleman from Iowa never forgot the mandate of the people who 13 times elected him to the Congress. He exemplified the highest concepts of the public trust with which the people have invested him. He is all that the people can expect of their Congressmen.

Now he has chosen to leave the office. I cannot imagine that his retirement could be anything but active and productive, and as acute as ever. I extend my friend my congratulations on his long and exemplary career in public service and wish him and his wife, Hazel, the very best in whatever they may choose to do.

#### SENATOR STENNIS' WASHINGTON REPORT

### HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Mississippi have learned over the years that my colleague and friend, Senator JOHN STENNIS, speaks with authority. His recent “Washington Report” to the people of our great State of Mississippi is typical of his insight.

I call this report to our attention, because I think it is a sensible and clear-thinking analysis of our Nation's problems. I highly recommend its contents to my colleagues in the House and hope that we heed its message:

SENATOR STENNIS' WASHINGTON REPORT  
NOVEMBER 27, 1974.

DEAR FRIEND: During the latter part of October and early November, I literally traveled to the four corners of Mississippi, visited in 21 counties and talked with hundreds of Mississippians. It is always both enjoyable and stimulating to return home, and this visit was especially so.

I return to Mississippi as often as possible to keep in touch with the people at home and determine first-hand face-to-face what the problems are and what the people consider as the possible solutions.

No matter what particular set of circumstances anyone mentioned to me during my trip they all went back to one basic topic. The people are deeply concerned about this economic upheaval that is absolutely destroying the ability to plan ahead and the high cost of living which is beyond all reason.

The economy is slowing down. Jobs are being lost. Prices are out of proportion and the people are expecting the Congress and the President to do something about it. I was greatly encouraged to learn that the people understand that there is no magic wand that can be waved to cure all these evils. However, this understanding is certainly no excuse for further delay.

I have warned about inflation and tried to do something about it for years but I came

back to Washington more determined to make an all-out effort to get the Congress—both the House and the Senate, both Republicans and Democrats—lined up to work together to do something about this raging high cost of living.

This is not a political question. This is a matter of survival for our people and our economy. I found that the people are willing to do their part. It is now up to the Congress and the President to take immediate steps to solve these problems.

#### COOPERATIVE EFFORT SOUGHT

During my tour of Mississippi, I realized more clearly that we simply must dig deeper to get all the facts about the real reasons for these galloping high prices.

People would ask me: “What are the facts?” When I could not tell them all the facts they would look at me in disbelief. Unless we in Congress develop these facts and let the people know, the Congress will fall even further in the esteem of those who elect the members.

I am convinced that neither the Congress nor the President can solve these problems alone. For this reason, I have proposed a joint effort by both the Legislative and Executive branches of the federal government to conduct an in-depth investigation into all phases of the economy.

I first made this proposal in a resolution to the Democratic Caucus on November 21. It was unanimously adopted. Later I made the proposal on the floor of the Senate.

The purpose of this recommendation is to bring the Congress and the President together, first on the facts, then together on questions of policy and finally on legislation. This will be a search for the full facts on all major aspects of the economy for use by the Congress, by the President and by the public at large.

I would propose that the investigation dig deeply into several specific areas:

(1) *Raw Material/Retail Price Spread.* A perfect example of this situation that has a tremendous impact in Mississippi is the difference between the cost of beef on the hoof and a pound of beef on the grocery shelf. In the past few months that spread has been as high as 56¢ per pound. At the present price of beef on the hoof, many cattlemen cannot even make enough money to pay for their feed, much less the other costs they must recover. If the farmer doesn't start getting a larger part of that spread, he is going to be out of business and the public is going to be out of beef. At the same time the housewife is having to pay record high prices. We simply must know why!

(2) *Possible Price-fixing Conspiracies.* There is a serious question in the public's mind as to whether or not conspiracies have played any part in the tremendous escalation of prices of some common items in the market place. Although I don't charge, at this time, that such conspiracies do exist, I believe that an in-depth study will disclose at least the probability of some anti-trust violations. Certainly, hearings should be held as to the conditions that create monopolies, whether there is evidence of conspiracy or not.

President Ford said in his October economic message to Congress that he would seek vigorous enforcement of anti-trust laws. The Attorney General has supported this approach and I urge prompt prosecution of any offenders.

(3) *Impact of Foreign Trade.* With ever rising prices and continued projections of possible shortages, we must fully explore the effects of import and export policies on domestic prices, commodity trading and foreign participation in these matters and the operation of corporations in many different countries. There is much suspicion in the public's mind about these effects.

(4) *Multiple Pricing Policies.* One area of great concern to everyone who shops at the

grocery store and other retail outlets is the re-pricing of items already on the shelf. It is not at all uncommon for housewives to be able to peel as many as five or six price labels off the same product. Each sticker carries a higher price than the preceding one.

Various explanations have been heard about averaging stocks on hand with new shipments, but the fact remains that this is a subject of public suspicion and all the facts need developing.

#### SUGAR PRICES MUST COME DOWN

The prices our citizens are having to pay for sugar are an outrage. Although there is considerable disagreement about what exactly caused these tremendous increases, there is no disagreement that the consumers are the helpless victims of circumstances beyond their control and they are entitled to prompt relief.

There is a strong and growing demand for sugar worldwide which has been accelerated by the increased world population and the enlarged purchasing power of the peoples of many nations of the world. In each of the past four years, sugar consumption has outstripped production on a world wide basis.

In this regard, I have urged the U.S. Attorney General to fully investigate the possibility of anti-trust violations and he has announced that such an investigation is underway. I sincerely hope that the Department of Justice will leave no stone unturned in this matter.

This year there have been crop failures in many areas. There has been speculation that unlawful manipulation of the previously unregulated commodities market played a significant role. This commodity exchange was brought under regulation by a bill signed into law on October 23, 1974. Although inflation has played a major role, it seems that some of the sugar companies are reaping profits far beyond what is considered fair and reasonable.

The Council on Wage and Price Stability has started hearings into the sugar situation and a House Agriculture Subcommittee has hearings scheduled for next week. I urge both groups to make their reports as soon as possible so that necessary actions may be enacted.

In the long run the only solution to the rising cost of sugar will be to increase both production and refining capacity in the United States. Normally we produce 55 percent of the sugar we use. This year we will import over half of the sugar necessary to meet our demands. The booming worldwide demand for sugar has pushed the world price up and we are having to pay the additional amount on imports.

I am sure that domestic producers will recognize the need to increase production and respond accordingly. Likewise, I am not convinced that the present confusion over the high price of sugar will continue much longer. However, I am convinced that there are too many unknowns remaining about the current situation, including the role of the speculators in the commodity market. Some of them may be in for a rude awakening when all the facts are developed. I will certainly continue my efforts to secure a full and complete investigation.

Sincerely your friend,

JOHN C. STENNIS,  
U.S. Senator.

#### SOME OF OUR FREEWAYS ARE MISSING

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker. Joseph C. Houghteling is a

former member of the California Highway Commission and currently serves on the San Francisco Bay Area Conservation and Development Commission and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The following article by him takes a very interesting look at what is happening to our freeway system as we change our priorities to public transportation systems:

#### THE END OF AN ERA—SOME OF OUR FREEWAYS ARE MISSING

(By Joseph C. Houghteling)

There may be those who think this title a bit overblown, something the mid-1920s *New York Graphic* might have displayed in type intended only for the announcement of Doomsday. Actually, it's modest. Of equal validity would be "California's Missing Five Billion Dollars," an eye-catcher that would gain attention even in these days of high crimes and misdemeanors.

For as beauty is truth and truth, beauty, freeways and dollars are interchangeable. In the heyday of freeway building during the 25 years after World War II, having dollars was having freeways. Indeed, for ardent admirers of the Santa Monica and the Embarcadero, the Long Beach and the Nimitz, there was even the beauty-truth relationship; the beauty of freeways was the truth that they facilitated the growth that made California first among the then 48 states.

In the mid-1960s, when I was on the California Highway Commission, it was believed with justification that there was a perpetual-motion money machine in the back room. This marvelous mechanism cranked out gas-tax revenues that constructed freeways that promoted higher consumption of gasoline that generated more gas-tax revenues to construct more freeways *ad infinitum*. Platoons of surveyors were dotting California's landscape with straight-lined markers, presaging the construction to follow.

During that time, the public issues, disputes, hearings and delegation presentations to the Highway Commission concerned freeway-route adoptions. In 1965 alone, 158 miles of new freeway alignments appeared on California's map. Once the routes were adopted, attention turned to the highway budget that inevitably would transform the line on the map into concrete, asphalt, and opening-day ceremonies.

Communities petitioned and received the blessings of prompt adoption of freeway routes, regardless of the fiscal fact that construction was a task reserved for the next generation. But the early positioning of routes allowed local development planning to proceed, using freeway and interchange locations as base lines; the promise of future freeways became the reality for immediate decisions. Subdivisions, industrial plants and shopping centers came into being long before the freeway; to doubt its ultimate construction was to question tomorrow's sunrise.

Well, the sun continues to rise, but the marvelous perpetual-motion money machine is gone, taking with it, perhaps permanently, many if not most of the freeways of the future. Who took the machine? Certainly the Arabs or stagflation, or both, depending on which economist you believe, are major dismantlers.

Gas taxes for highway purposes are based on gallonage, not price—seven cents per gallon for the state, four cents for the "feds." Thus as gasoline consumption has been lessened by shortages and higher costs, the endless sequence of new freeways resulting in new highway revenues has been broken on the income side.

Even with admittedly "many large unknowns in the future," a presentation given the Highway Commission in August estimated 26 percent (about \$350 million) less in total resources annually available for all

highway purposes over the next several years than was forecast in 1972.

Not only is gas usage an income factor, but changing allocations from highway trust funds have been significant. Even before the present jolt of gasoline constraints and stagflation, the amounts of funding available for freeway construction have been eroding. On the federal level, interstate and urban highway funds now also go for transit capital outlay; on the state level, Proposition 5, passed by California voters in June, allows diversion of up to 25 percent, again to transit capital outlay.

Lest antifreeway adherents be overly pleased by the "missing freeways," let there be the caution that their disappearance means more than fewer miles of concrete. For the marvelous perpetual-motion money machine has also been a source of funding, and is looked to for further funding, for the alternate mobility offered by public transit.

Were the income squeeze and uncertainties not enough, freeway construction costs are rising at an angle that would challenge an experienced alpinist. In the first three months of 1974, the construction dollar's value eroded 32 cents. Over an even longer span, assuming a larger view of the past tells more of the future, the California construction index is one of the growth shocks of our time. When I left the Highway Commission on January 1, 1967, the index was at 100; seven and a half years later, on May 31, 1974, it was at 219.

What this had already done to freeway planning and construction can more than be imagined. Early in 1973, it was estimated that \$7.8 billion would be available for construction of projects in the state highway program over the eight years beginning July 1, 1975.

Then last May, a new forecast, revised in the light of intervening events, showed only \$3.9 billion would be available for the same period. As if this reduced amount were not bad enough news for the Highway Commission to bear, the added second factor of inflation lowered the estimate to only \$2.7 billion worth of actual construction during the eight years.

By most measures, \$2.7 billion is a considerable sum, unless it was once expected to be \$7.8 billion. The \$5-billion difference is what made the freeways disappear; missing money means missing freeways.

Unlike the ancient emperor who decapitated the bearer of bad tidings, the Highway Commission has confined itself to lopping off adopted freeway routes. Since unpleasant chores are best performed under the mantle of an agreeable name, the process is called "recycling," a term used more happily in the environmentalist jargon.

One of the significant recyclings does have a cheerful environmental tone. Lake Tahoe's westside freeway, Route 89, has been through the process—the adopted line has been rescinded and the acquired rights-of-way offered for sale. For many, this action recalls the long, heated arguments of the early 1960s over the route's missing link in the unique Emerald Bay area. With Route 89 freeway adoptions to both the north and south of the D. L. Bliss and Emerald Bay state parks, the debate centered on the lower bridge route versus the upper hillside location, with a tunnel sometimes thrown in as a diversion.

Few thought then the Route 89 freeway might never be built. A highway engineer predicted at a 1961 Tahoe hearing that it would be constructed sometime after the next five years; that wasn't a definite time, of course, but it was far from saying "never."

Eligible for the recycling process, like Route 89, is any freeway-route adoption for which it is unlikely construction funds will be found in the next two decades. As of August this year, the commission was considering 20 present freeway-route adoptions for

recycling, the "bottomline" of the process being disadoption. These represent 177 miles of freeway, mostly rural, which if constructed would cost \$770 million at current projections.

In addition, there are 70 more unfinanced freeway-route alignments in the present 20-year Highway Program Guide. These are in limbo, still shown as adopted lines on the planning maps, but lacking any foreseeable funding. As with most future freeways in urban areas, their fate is tied to transportation planning in the various regions of California, where regional plans are to become part of the State Transportation Plan directed by Assembled Bill 69 of 1972.

A note in passing—"disadoption" by the commission is different from legislative action removing a route from California's Freeway and Expressway System, although the end reality is quite similar.

Responding mostly to local concerns, and usually with considerable local publicity, legislative bills have removed various routes from the F&E category. Route 1 along the Los Angeles coast was once to be a freeway; it's now in the more humble highway system in most areas. Two proposed freeways, the causes of San Francisco's "granddaddy" freeway revolt of the mid-sixties, are gone from the higher status, the sub ends of the city's Embarcadero and Central freeways being monuments to this change.

Some indication of earlier legislative ambitions is that there are 12,333 miles authorized in the California F&E system. As of 1974, only 4,394 miles, a little more than a third, have been constructed or are in future budgets.

Returning to what the Highway Commission is now doing, it's useful to know the biography of one unconstructed freeway route. Unlike the attention given when the legislature removes a route from the freeway system, there seems less general awareness of the consequences of the financial squeeze on construction funds, even though it's all on the public record. Neither recycled nor financed in the foreseeable future is a major section of Santa Clara County's Route 85. Part of the route is a real-life freeway, connecting Bayshore, Route 101, with Junipero Serra, Interstate 280, and going a little farther before spilling traffic onto a city street.

The 19-mile unfinished portion, known locally as "The West Valley Freeway," passes through Cupertino, Saratoga, Los Gatos and San Jose before rejoining Route 101 south of San Jose. The alignment was adopted by the Highway Commission in 1956 with little controversy; most of the mileage went through open land, the enormous growth of Santa Clara County just then beginning.

The freeway was conceived as a westerly bypass of San Jose, giving mobility between largely residential areas and employment centers to the north and south. Few of the homes and plants existed in 1956; the adoption of the route, though, stimulated their construction as part of the golden future envisioned for the "Valley of Heart's Delight," even matching Los Angeles!

Once the line was there, the story of Route 85 turns to funding, and it's an Horatio Alger tale in reverse. In the eight-year projected Planning Program the Highway Commission adopts annually as a construction schedule, Route 85 first made a cameo appearance in 1965, listed for construction "after 1970-71."

In 1967, there was some firming: one mile was scheduled for 1971-72; two miles for 1974-75; the balance "after 1974-75." In 1970, backward went the financing: two miles were to be built in 1974-75; 16 miles "after 1978-79;" and foretelling an ominous future, one mile was left out completely.

These changes were largely influenced by higher priorities given to other projects, especially completion of the interstate free-

ways in the area. Once Route 85 lost its place, however, the present funding bind had a maximum impact; by 1974, all portions were left out of the Planning Program except for two miles "sometimes after 1982-83."

Looking beyond the eight-year plan, the less definite 20-year Highway Program Guide suggests Route 85, once to be an eight-lane freeway, should be "rescoped" downward. There might be a five-mile, four- to six-lane freeway at the south end, connecting Route 101 with the still-to-be-built Route 87, the Guadalupe Freeway. The rest of the 14 miles might become just a four-lane expressway, a roadway design considerably more limited in size and capacity than a freeway.

The source of funding for even this "rescoped" Route 85 isn't resolved. For its part, Santa Clara County proposes to use some of its federal aid urban-road funds for the next three years to "protect the corridor" against private building within the alignment. Such local action will most likely keep Route 85 from being recycled, at least long enough for alternate plans to be considered. Since the county's development presupposed construction of the freeway, a need for mobility still exists along the line. To meet it, there is the concept that an expressway plus a transit mode will perform what once was to be the function of the noblest expression of the highway engineer's art, an eight-lane freeway.

What happened to Tahoe's westside freeway and what is happening along Santa Clara County's Route 85 are not exceptional; ask not for which freeway the commission recycles—it may be for yours, anywhere in California.

#### MICRONESIA AND THE DOD: A COSTLY LIAISON?

### HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, in the November 27, 1974, issue of the prestigious publication, the New York Times, a most thought-provoking article on U.S. intentions in Micronesia written by two gentlemen, Donald F. McHenry and Ernest C. Downs from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, pointed out that few Americans are aware that this country is about to make its first territorial acquisition in the Pacific since 1898. Nor, are we aware, for the most part, that a direct consequence of this acquisition may place America on the hook for as much as \$2 billion.

The principle thrust of their well-written piece is to question whether Congress really understands what is transpiring 9,000 miles from its hallowed halls.

The administration is deeply committed toward the establishment of a multi-billion-dollar military installation in the Marianas. In exchange for these bases we have pledged to bring the estimated 15,000 residents of the Northern Mariana Islands permanently into the American political embrace. Our interest is not so much one of a sociological or moral concern: Rather, it is the desire to expand our strategic base of operations and thus prevent these islands from falling under the influence of nations less friendly toward us.

What the residents of these islands will gain is U.S. citizenship and access to

substantial Federal funds. What we get, is a major new military base 100 miles from Guam on the Island of Tinian. The remainder of Micronesia, the Caroline and Marshall Islands, with their 85,000 some residents, will be offered a less binding tie with America, more money, and within 15 years, independence after they have signed a mutual security pact with the United States.

Since the Spanish first came to our part of the world 400 years ago, Guam and its sister islands in Micronesia have been tossed and turned in the political winds, never knowing under whose flag we would land. First came Spain, then Germany, then Britain, America and then Japan, not necessarily in that order.

For the most part, Guam has been exceedingly fortunate as we have been under American rule since 1898. But for the most part of Micronesia the picture has not been so peaceful. After World War I, Japan moved in only to be kicked out by 1945. Since that time, we have administered Micronesia under a UN Friendship agreement. But they also need funds to develop and for the most part that money came from the United States.

In my previous comments on this subject, I have supported the efforts of my fellow Micronesians to improve their status. It is time that this country acted to resolve this last remaining question of sovereignty left over from World War II. I also support adequate funding by Congress to permit these people to improve their condition and, for the people of the Northern Marianas, most of them whom are ethnically and culturally related to the people of Guam, I welcome their efforts to acquire U.S. citizenship as we did in 1950.

Messrs. McHenry and Downs, however, question the propriety of this country expending huge sums at this time to build another military base so close to the major facilities on Guam. After Guam's tragic lesson in World War II, when we were invaded and conquered, I will always support a sound defense posture for this country but, can we truly afford and justify at this critical time, the expenditure of an estimated \$300 millions for yet another military base when we are cutting back on our funding of vital programs here at home?

Closely coupled with the question of expenditures is the methodology used in acquiring the Northern Marianas. As I have previously mentioned, Guam is a part of the Mariana Islands. When we were acquired by the United States, Guam was, unfortunately, forcefully separated from its sister islands and to this day the United States has made no effort at all to reunite us after 76 years. Even during the most recent round of discussions between United States and Saipan representatives, the matter of making the Marianas one family again was never broached.

Obviously, there is no way to be certain that unification would work out to everyone's mutual benefit. But, if the Federal Government will not assume responsibility for such action, then I shall be certain to bring it to the attention of

my colleagues in Congress when and if Commonwealth status for the Northern Marianas is considered.

What we intend to do in Micronesia and how much we intend to spend in the process is a matter of great interest for all taxpayers. I therefore urge my colleagues to give this crucial issue increasing attention in the months to come. In this context, I also urge that Messrs. McHenry and Downs' article entitled "Forcing Congress Hand on Micronesia" be read and I insert it in the RECORD at this time.

MICRONESIA AND DOD: A COSTLY LIAISON  
(By Donald F. McHenry and Ernest C. Downs)

WASHINGTON.—Sometimes a little problem raises a large issue. This is the case with current Administration requests to increase authorized spending in Micronesia from \$60 million to \$75 million in 1975 and \$80 million in 1976. These requests amount to a back-door attempt to force Congress's hand ahead of time on the larger, sensitive issue of the United States' formal relationship to Micronesia, the western Pacific island group the United States has administered as a United Nations trust since 1947.

Few people are aware that after five years of negotiations the United States is close to its first territorial acquisition since 1900. The result will be new long-term financial and defense commitments and the establishment of a major new military base. Such major steps should involve public debate, but the Administration's strategy seeks to avoid controversy by asking Congress to approve the major implementing provisions of the negotiated agreement before Congress considers the agreement itself.

The sums requested, small now, will lead to major United States investments of as much as \$2 billion.

Under the final agreements, the people of the new Mariana Islands commonwealth would become United States citizens, and Tinian, the second largest island in the group, would be the site of the base. On these points the current budget requests attempt to anticipate future Congressional approval by calling for \$1.5 million to aid in the transition of the Marianas to a new United States-owned territory with commonwealth status.

The rest of Micronesia, the Marshall and Caroline chains, are to gain "qualified sovereignty" allowing them to control internal affairs but delegating to the United States complete control of defense and virtually complete control of foreign affairs. Fifteen years later, after signing a mutual security pact with the United States, the Micronesians could declare independence.

But for the request on the Marianas Congress might be justified in not focusing on Administration plans until asked to approve the agreements. Whatever the area's future political status, the capital-improvement funds are desperately needed. The United States has a long-overdue obligation as trustee to provide basic improvements, and their provision now would in no way prejudice future status.

But Congress cannot provide transition funds for the Marianas without taking a position on the major issues facing the area. One is whether the Marianas should be allowed to break away from Micronesia and possibly encourage other separatist movements, which already exist in the Palau and Marshall Islands.

Approval of the Marianas transition would put the United States Congress in direct conflict with the territory-wide legislature, which has opposed United States negotiations with the Marianas and likened separate negotiations to a United States policy of divide and rule.

By far the major issue is the unexamined premise underlying United States policy that Micronesia is essential to United States security interests. This premise is advanced as justification for new long-term economic, political and military commitments. But even if the area is essential, does it follow that America needs to construct, particularly in a time of economic stringency, a major multi-million-dollar military base? If so, why did the House Appropriations Committee express doubt that construction could be justified given the present United States defense posture in Asia?

Finally, Congress needs to consider the stakes for the Micronesians, whose location seems to be the only commodity on which they can rely to finance plans for economic development. The proposed agreements may best reconcile conflicting Micronesia and American interests. But Congress ought to insure that that is so and that Micronesia's trustee has not made its own interests overriding.

A resolution of Micronesia's future political status is long overdue. Continued United States trusteeship is an anachronism and would be so even if the United States record of trusteeship had not been dismal. It may be that detailed Congressional examination would result in approval of the tentative agreements. But the Administration's approach avoids such an examination. If the Micronesia bills are passed without debate, Congress will find itself in the embarrassing position of being asked to approve agreements whose implementation it has already approved.

#### JUSTICE IN MEXICO—V

### HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, since Monday, December 9, the Los Angeles Times has been running a series of stories on what is happening to Americans arrested and incarcerated in Mexico. The articles have been horrifying. The conduct of the U.S. Embassy personnel in Mexico City, and of Drug Enforcement Agency officials in Washington and Mexico has been despicable and inexcusable. In their efforts to combat trafficking in narcotics these Government officials have allowed the rights of Americans to be ignored, they have failed to assist families and friends in this country, they have even failed to warn these families of extortion rackets and dishonorable attorneys.

Mr. Speaker, I vigorously support international efforts to reduce and hopefully one day eliminate the flow of narcotics throughout the world. As a Member of the House Special Subcommittee on International Narcotics Traffic I have committed myself to this goal. It is possible that many of the Americans arrested in Mexico were guilty of violating the law. In those cases I believe they should be held accountable to the judicial system in either this country or Mexico.

The issue here, however, is not drugs. The issue is the role of the U.S. Embassy in assisting and insuring that Americans in Mexico, or any other foreign country, receive justice.

Today's article from the Times may bring this point home. The families who have suffered the agony and despair of

facing the Mexican system of "justice" without the assistance or cooperation of their own Government's Embassy tell the story better than I can. These are normal, average American families. We are not dealing with the Mafia, we are not dealing with an organized drug ring. We are dealing with families like our own.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Los Angeles Times. Their series is courageous, well documented, and timely. The Times assigned four of their best reporters to this investigation and their combined, coordinated effort may well be the first step in insuring justice for the hundreds of Americans involved. Jack Nelson, Paul Houston, Stanley Meisler, and Frank Del Olmo may not become household words for their efforts, but I am sure there are, in fact, many households where these men and their work is most appreciated—those homes where this tragic story carries a most personal message:

[From the Los Angeles Times]

MEXICAN DRUG BUSTS: THE FAMILIES  
ALSO PAY

(By Frank Del Olmo)

For Mrs. Jane Smith of Granada Hills, the nightmare began on an otherwise routine Friday morning last February with a tersely worded telegram to her home.

It stated that her son Jim—whom she thought was on a skiing trip—had been arrested in Mexico City two days earlier "for numerous charges involving narcotics violations."

It directed Mrs. Smith (not the real name) to contact two attorneys, Jorge Aviles of Mexico City and Daniel Davis of Los Angeles, for more information. She telephoned Davis and a meeting was arranged for the next evening in Davis' downtown office.

"From Friday to Saturday you can imagine how the tension built," her husband recalled in an interview.

"We went to one of those tall buildings downtown where Davis had this big, impressive office," he said.

"Aviles was there," Smith said. "He said they wanted us to come up with \$3,000—just like that, cold turkey."

Aviles, Smith recalled, "was exceptionally polite and as business-like as any lawyer could be, but what he told us scared the living daylights out of us."

Aviles told the Smiths their son had been arrested at the Mexico City airport with a small amount of cocaine in his possession and had been charged with a variety of offenses under Mexico's stiff drug laws.

Now he faced a long term in Mexico's tough prisons, unless he received immediate legal assistance.

The entire deal to free their son would cost \$25,000, Aviles told the Smiths. The \$3,000 he wanted immediately would serve as a retainer and cover initial expenses when Aviles returned to Mexico in two days.

A young friend of their son attended the meeting with the Smiths and he cautioned them to delay paying the attorney until he could check with another lawyer.

The Smiths left the meeting shaken, promising to contact Aviles before he left for Mexico.

They never contacted either attorney again, however, because "we finally decided that we just didn't have \$25,000, so what good would the \$3,000 do?" Mrs. Smith said.

Jorge Aviles is one of a corps of Mexican attorneys who have been paid thousands of dollars by anguished relatives and friends of American citizens imprisoned in Mexico on narcotics charges.

U.S. Embassy officials credit Aviles with helping free one American prisoner in Mexico

in 1973, and possibly three others. The freed prisoner's case was apparently the first drug-related case handled by Aviles.

After the Smiths decided not to deal with Aviles, they were able to make contact with their son and began to experience a common form of extortion faced by many families with relatives in Mexican prisons.

One of their son's first requests from Mexico City's Lecumberri Prison was for \$1,500 which he had to pay in order to keep from being beaten by fellow inmates and to avoid being assigned to harsh, unpleasant work details.

The Smiths sent the money. They have sent \$100 every month since then so their son can pay for his room and board in jail.

Both the payment of extortion fees and monthly "rent" are common practices in Mexican prisons. However, they are new to the 528 U.S. citizens imprisoned there, and also more expensive for them than for Mexican prisoners.

The Smiths' story is one of about 100 such cases compiled by staff members of Rep. Fortney H. Stark (D-Calif.), a member of the House special subcommittee on international narcotics traffic.

Of the 100 cases in Stark's files, more than 50 families of prisoners claim they have experienced extortion in Mexican jails or attempted manipulation by Mexican attorneys. About 40 of the cases involve California families.

The Times interviewed a dozen families in Southern California and the San Francisco Bay area about their experiences in trying to help relatives in Mexican prisons. Most of them are middle-class families with well-educated children.

While a few insist that their relatives are innocent, most will admit they were wrong—and certainly very stupid—to have tried to smuggle drugs, regardless of how small the amount involved.

The stories these families relate are appallingly similar.

All complain about the lack of concern on the part of the U.S. Embassy, the high-pressure techniques of Mexican attorneys and the heavy-handed methods used by Mexican criminals to extort money from the imprisoned Americans.

"I realize now how stupid we were," said an Oakland woman who lost \$6,000 to one attorney. "But we didn't know what else to do, who to turn to or who to ask for help."

Mexican attorneys have been known to demand up to \$45,000 to represent U.S. citizens. Some of the money is ostensibly for legal costs, and some will be passed along to prison authorities to pay for better living quarters and conditions for the prisoners.

High legal fees are often the rule in Mexico.

The extortion fees demanded by prison kingpins range from \$800 to \$2,000 for the initial payment, and usually \$100 to \$300 a month thereafter.

The families of imprisoned Americans say the U.S. embassy in Mexico has been almost useless in helping them deal with the complexities and quirks of the Mexican legal system.

All the embassy does, some said, is provide a list of lawyers to all prisoners.

That list includes a disclaimer indicating that the embassy "assumes no responsibility for the professional ability or integrity of the persons or firms" listed.

It is only fair to point out that some Mexican attorneys have assisted U.S. prisoners in that country, working in the best interests of their clients.

An official of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, which has encouraged and assisted the Mexican government in the crackdown which has led to many of the recent arrests of Americans in that country, agreed that American prisoners are "a fountain of money" for certain Mexican lawyers.

The official told The Times of a case in which a DEA informant was inadvertently arrested by Mexican authorities and his parents paid \$13,000 to a Mexican attorney before the informant was eventually freed.

One well-to-do Los Angeles woman who went to Mexico with personal references to prominent corporate and criminal attorneys was told by many of them that "it would hurt their reputations" to become involved in her daughter's case.

Like many of these families, the Oakland woman—let us call her Mrs. Jones—first learned of her son's arrest not from the U.S. embassy, but through a collect call from attorney Aviles, the same man who contacted the Smith family in Los Angeles.

According to the Joneses, Aviles told them their son would go to prison for 60 years without his services and asked for money. Aviles was turned down initially but over the next three days—a holiday weekend—he called three more times telling the Joneses their son was facing a major court appearance without counsel.

In one of the calls, Aviles called an American to the phone, identifying him as Dan Root, a consular officer at the U.S. embassy in Mexico. The American recommended Aviles to the family as a reputable lawyer. (Root has since denied making any such call.)

The Joneses said they finally sent \$6,000 to Aviles and did not hear from him again.

But this family's experience did have one positive effect. The apparent involvement of the American who identified himself as consular official Root led Mrs. Jones to write to her congressman about the incident. Her congressman is Fortney Stark.

A staff member for Stark said that at first Mrs. Jones' letter was handled as "an individual case, an inquiry from a single constituent that would be answered individually."

But in July of this year, Stark's aide read newspaper reports about a hunger strike by Americans held prisoner in Lecumberri Prison.

He "began to wonder if there might be a pattern here, so we started looking further into it."

His inquiries eventually turned up the names of half a dozen families with experiences similar to the Joneses.

One person he contacted was Mrs. Juanita Carter of Hawthorne, whose son had been in prison since October, 1973, and who told Stark's aide she also had a brief unpleasant encounter with Aviles.

Mrs. Carter first learned of her son's arrest through collect telephone calls from several attorneys in Mexico City all "saying for me to come to Mexico and to bring as much money as possible."

Mrs. Carter told The Times she went to Mexico hoping to find an attorney for her son and was surprised to be met at the airport by a lawyer she never had heard of before named Jorge Aviles.

Aviles accompanied Mrs. Carter to Lecumberri the next day and after she visited her son, offered to represent him. Mrs. Carter said he asked for \$1,400 to pay her son's initial extortion fee.

She wrote Aviles \$1,400 worth of travelers checks on the spot.

But two days later, just before leaving Mexico, she was called in her hotel room by the "mayor" of the prison dormitory where her son was kept.

(The "mayor" is an inmate appointed by prison authorities to supervise the dormitory. It is assumed the mayor pays for his job by sharing whatever he can extort from his fellow prisoners with the authorities.)

The mayor said no extortion fee had been paid, and according to Mrs. Carter he threatened to have her son killed if it was not paid before she left.

Angry and fearful, Mrs. Carter went to Aviles' home in Mexico City's suburbs and,

accompanied by a heavy-set Mexican cab driver, demanded her money back.

Mrs. Carter said he returned it—less \$370—and warned her that "he had powerful friends at the American embassy and that my son would suffer greatly."

Mrs. Carter has returned to Mexico periodically since that first visit. It was during a visit in June that she decided "someone had to start some communication among the families of the kids down there."

"Nobody was helping us," she said. "I thought maybe we could at least help each other."

On that visit she began to compile a list of names and addresses of the families of the American prisoners and began corresponding with many of them.

As a result, when Stark's staff made contact with Mrs. Carter, her unofficial organization of families proved to be the key element in firmly establishing the pattern of abuse and manipulation of the families of the imprisoned Americans.

In their interviews with The Times, some of the California families who have cooperated with Stark offered a variety of vignettes which illustrate their disillusioning experiences with the Mexican legal system.

An Orange County woman on her first visit with a son in Lecumberri met briefly with the mayor of the dormitory where her son is confined. The mayor lives in a carpeted cell complete with a stereo set.

The woman still has a copy of the blank check she wrote for the man in the amount of \$1,500, the initial extortion fee. It was cashed at a Mexican bank by someone who sloppily printed C-A-S-H in the blank space.

Another Orange County woman went to visit her husband in Lecumberri accompanied by a Mexican friend and another woman with an imprisoned relative who was represented by attorney Aviles. The young woman's friend had a brief conversation with Aviles and later warned her against dealing with him.

Her friend said "Aviles admitted he could do little for the Americans in prison there. But if the gringos were willing to pay him to try, he'd take what he could from them," according to the woman.

—A West Los Angeles woman recalled how she and her husband, a doctor, sent a color television set to a close friend who is a prisoner. It was to be a gift to a commanding officer at the prison in the hope of winning better treatment for the prisoner.

"We never heard what happened to it, or to the money we have sent," she said. "I swear, it's like dropping it all down a fell."

—An Orange County couple recalled a meeting with Aviles and Davis last February, not unlike the meeting the attorneys had with the Smith family.

The couple said Davis contacted them first and said their son had been arrested in Mexico and "was facing torture and 25 to 40 years imprisonment and said his cousin, Mr. Aviles, could help him."

Davis arranged a meeting between the prisoners' parents—we will call them Mr. and Mrs. Brown—and Aviles that weekend in a Marina del Rey hotel. There, Aviles requested \$20,000 to represent their son, with a \$10,000 retainer. He said he already had paid \$2,500 to get their son better treatment in prison.

During the meeting, according to the Browns, Aviles placed a telephone call to the prison and had the Browns' son called to the phone. The young man, who apparently was familiar with Aviles' reputation among the American prisoners in Mexico, warned his parents against dealing with him.

Brown later agreed to pay Aviles only \$2,500 he said he had paid out in extortion money. It turned out that Aviles apparently had paid no money at all. The Browns said they later had to send \$500 to the mayor of the dormitory where their son remains confined.

The Browns' story illustrates the strange role played by Los Angeles attorney Daniel Davis in at least four cases where Aviles is mentioned by families who have contacted Rep. Stark.

The 28-year-old attorney was admitted to practice by the California Bar Assn. last year. He worked for a time with a prestigious local law firm but is no longer associated with it.

A distant cousin of Aviles, Davis declined to discuss in any detail his dealings with the Mexican attorney when contacted by *The Times*.

Davis said he has been informed by the State Bar that it is investigating his involvement with Aviles. He said he preferred to tell his story to the State Bar first "since they are my professional and ethical monitors."

Davis said he has nothing to hide because "the problems (in dealing with Aviles) were things I could not control."

One family interviewed by *The Times* credited Davis with making an apparently sincere but unsuccessful effort to recover their money from Aviles.

They said Davis expressed to them doubts as to Aviles' honesty and personal qualms over having become involved with the Mexican attorney.

Aviles himself emerges as a rather contradictory character from what little can be gleaned about him in interviews with people who have dealt with him.

One prisoner represented by Aviles described him as "by all outward appearances a very respectable man" with a wife and son, who lives in a comfortable home in a fashionable Mexico City suburb.

"He really believes most Americans arrested down there are working for the Mafia and he has a right to get his share of the action," the young man said of Aviles.

Aviles has been unavailable for comment since a civil suit charging fraud was filed against him in Mexico City by the parents of an American prisoner. The U.S. embassy assisted them in the lawsuit.

Aviles is mentioned in 23 of the 100 files compiled by Stark on U.S. citizens imprisoned in Mexico on narcotics charges. Other Mexican attorneys are also mentioned in many of the files.

How many families have dealt with attorneys like Aviles has yet to be determined.

Mrs. Carter said that another attorney recently planted a rumor among the American prisoners that, for a flat fee of \$30,000, he can not only win their freedom but have their arrest records destroyed.

"I'm truly afraid there are still families out there that think they can buy their kids out of prison," she said.

#### TRIBUTE TO H. R. GROSS

### HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to join with my many colleagues in the House in paying tribute to Congressman H. R. Gross of Iowa on the occasion of his retirement from this body.

While I have only had the privilege of serving with Mr. Gross for a small part of his 26 years in the House, I consider myself indeed fortunate to have had the chance to know first had this outstanding American. His reputation will endure and new Members of the 94th and succeeding Congresses will look to the mark he leaves on history, but they will be the poorer

for not having had the opportunity to serve with him.

The remarks always entered into the *RECORD* by Members from both sides of the aisle are abundant proof of the tremendous respect and affection H. R. Gross has earned in his long tenure. Even those of us who have served only briefly with this outstanding legislator have profited greatly from the association and should be better equipped to carry out the duties for having been exposed to the example of H. R. Gross.

We are not witnessing the poignant occasion of the retirement of a champion at the height of his prowess, for H. R. Gross is truly a champion. Since his first election to the House in 1948, he has been a champion of the best interests of the country.

While he has often been on the losing side in his efforts, he has always had the attention of his colleagues. Through the use of incisive analysis, enlightening humor, and most of all, common sense, Mr. Gross has always contributed more than his share to debate in the House. His departure will leave a tremendous void in the Congress and he will be sorely missed, not only by his colleagues, but by the beleaguered taxpayer he labored so long and hard to protect.

While my words can add little to the tributes of the many Members who had known H.R. personally far longer than I, there is one observation which perhaps can be made best by a freshman Member: Legends are often diminished by exposure to their source, but personal exposure to H. R. Gross only serves to enhance the legendary quality of his service to his people and his country.

GEORGE LEWIS ALLISON, SR.

### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there is, I think, no finer title than that of "professional," whether the profession be brick laying, law, medicine or newspapering. Today I would like to honor a man, George Lewis Allison, Sr., who earned that title of "professional" and imparted that professionalism to his sons and to hundreds of newspapermen and women during his 38-year newspaper career.

Mr. Allison, who died December 6, 1974, of cancer in a Long Beach hospital, was until 5 months ago news editor of the Long Beach Press-Telegram. In that job he worked fiercely and in his own way joyously to produce each day a newspaper better than the day before. The effort to improve the quality of the newspapers on which he worked was Mr. Allison's personal trademark.

His colleagues in a moving editorial have paid tribute to George Lewis "Lew" Allison, Sr. in words far better than mine but before asking that editorial be reprinted in this *RECORD*, I would like to add to it one item not mentioned. The editorial relates how Lew Allison responded to the news of the assassination

of John Kennedy and produced the best account of that dreadful event published in the Los Angeles area. The editorial is accurate if incomplete when it mentions that "the publisher and all the brass" gathered in the wire room to read the fast moving bulletins. It is incomplete in that it does not mention the first step taken by Mr. Allison who told the publisher and the brass in no uncertain words "to get out" for there was work to be done and they were in the way. They did, and as he did every working day of his 38-year career, Mr. Allison produced the best newspaper possible.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the December 8, 1974 editorial of the Long Beach Independent Press-Telegram in this *RECORD*:

A GOOD NEWSPAPERMAN

Until five months ago, when his doctor told him he had only a short time to live, George Lewis Allison Sr. was news editor, which is to say midwife, for the Press-Telegram.

Except when he wrote an outdoor column or a story about fishing on Northern California's Shasta Lake, no article in the Press-Telegram had his name on it, but the entire paper bore Lew Allison's signature. He was proud of it, but he was never wholly pleased by it, even after he had pushed reporters, city editors, copy editors, wire services and printers in a daily chase to catch and correct every error, every hint of bias, every story that had been superseded by some late news. There was no day when Lew Allison was not peeved that his newspaper had not been perfect.

"You'd come to him with a story that sparked," a reporter mused the other day. "All the quality of a Hemingway. Done in two minutes. 'What took you so long?' Lew would say. In 20 years he never told me a story of mine was good. But sometimes I knew he liked something I wrote—because he didn't say anything."

Why, then, did the reporter add: "I love him"? Perhaps because Lew Allison gave everyone around the feeling they were joined with him in an important enterprise. He cared about news, about the language, about people, about newspapers. He could be as passionate about whether Harry S. Truman's middle initial took a period—it was his firm opinion that it did—as he was about seeing that Richard Nixon and George McGovern got a fair shake in the news columns.

His decisions were unerring and swift. "When President Kennedy was assassinated," a colleague recalls, "the news broke right on deadline and the publisher and all the brass were in the newsroom wondering what we should do. It was Lew who told them. He told them to take the adds off pages 2, 3 and 4. He planned a picture page. He laid out the whole paper right there for them."

In the composing room that day, Lew Allison, reading the type upside down and backward because there was no time for proofs, wrote headlines and put the pages together, so that his paper was the first one in the Los Angeles area to have the complete story in readers' hands.

He came from a newspaper family. His father had published a small paper in Mesa, Ariz., a paper on which Lew Allison got his start more than a decade after his father had relinquished ownership. Lew's brother Bob was sports editor of the Phoenix Gazette. Lew Allison transmitted his love of journalism—a word he never used—to his children, although none can tell you exactly how he did it.

His oldest son, Larry, is managing editor of the Independent, Press-Telegram. Lew Allison Jr. is Midwest news director—and former Vietnam bureau chief—for the National Broadcasting Company. Jack Allison is a reporter for a Salt Lake City television station. Brian Allison worked part-time as a San Francisco Examiner copy editor while in

college. Mike Allison will be a newsman after his graduation from UCLA. Only Lew Allison's daughter Helene did not ever work as a journalist. She is a teacher. But then her father was a teacher, too, as all fine editors are.

Lew Allison was a realistic man. When his doctor told him death was near, he took the doctor's word, just as he expected reporters, copy editors and publishers to take his word when he spoke on a matter within his professional competence. He went fishing one last time at Shasta Lake. He went to football games. When his strength began to fall, he read. The last book he borrowed from a friend was Gay Talese's *The Kingdom and the Power*, which is about the New York Times.

He hadn't finished it when death came Friday evening. No matter. No book about newspapers had anything important to teach Lew Allison. He was what old hands in the business call "a good newspaperman." Being one is a craft and an art, and Lew Allison pursued his craft and art with unfailing mastery.

## A DAY IN THE LIFE OF A VISITING NURSE

### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, H.R. 17085, the Nurse Training Act of 1974, will be considered by the full House of Representatives. This legislation provides for an extension of assistance programs for nurse training, under the Public Health Service Act, and I fully support this vital legislation.

One of the continuing concerns of this Congress is how we can see that adequate health services are available to all people who need them and yet hold down health care costs.

We are seeing an increasing emphasis on home health services, caring for people in their homes, whenever possible, as an alternative to institutional care.

The registered nurse is the central figure in providing health services to people in their homes. Some people probably would not be getting any health care at all if it were not for these visiting nurses.

A recent article in the Washington Post takes us through a typical day in the life of a visiting nurse in the District of Columbia. It illustrates the kind of training and education the nurse needs for this role and it also shows the dedication that is required. We need more nurses like the one described here. I insert the complete text of the article, "The Visiting Nurse: Healing and Feeling Pain in Homes Where Time Moves Slowly" in the RECORD:

THE VISITING NURSE: HEALING AND FEELING PAIN IN HOMES WHERE TIME MOVES SLOWLY

(By Emily Fisher)

Marylyn Mason, in navy blue nurse's uniform unblemished by detail, hair squared back by a barrette and face pinched by the fall chill, is part of the morning's crispness. She has a long-boned basketball player's gait, a tiny overbite and lisps. She is 26 but looks like a schoolgirl in a pinafore. Only the black shoes, losing their heels and, split at the sides, tell of wear. She has worn them daily for the two years she's been with the Visiting Nurse Association (VNA).

10 a.m.—A street in the center of the Adams-Morgan area between Harvard and R

Streets, 16th and Connecticut. A mix of faded affluence, incipient slum and renovation, its population, much of it Spanish-speaking, is heavily transient—moving in, moving out, as one building is condemned, one is renovated. The sidewalk is clotted at intervals with remnants of a lifetime's possessions.

"How ya doing?" Marylyn Mason greets a drunk sprawled in the sun on the sidewalk. "How ya doing?" as she picks her way through teen-agers pitching pennies on the steps. "How ya doing?" to two large young men in leather lounging in the doorway's shadows. They eye her askance, head to toe, then smile as recognition comes.

And again, once inside the patient's apartment, "How ya doing?"

The six shapes there, murky in the room's stale light, seem at first oblivious to her coming. A woman with a withered foot rests chin on cane; a man leans heavily upon a crutch; another mechanically sharpens a knife; a foot taps, a spool of tobacco spittle hangs. All are aged, all wear overcoats though the room is heated well into the 80s. All stares are fixed as if toward some transcendental point.

Cardboard boxes function as furniture. The walls are bare but for a "Home Beneficial Life" calendar and stains that stray down the door panels. It looks like a room waiting to be moved—no television, no radio, no telephone.

"Bout this time" someone wheezes, the first human sound.

And as if on cue, the patient rises to have a skin ulcer dressed. He is recovering from a stroke, he can't weigh more than 80 pounds and his body is all knobs. "Well people in this world just don't know how blessed they are," he says. And he inches on his cane, first to fetch the nurse a chair, then to the lone bed, where he sits, hands demure on his lap.

"Mr. J, show me the exercises you've learned," says the nurse.

"I go like this . . ." Mr. J moves an uncertain hand toward his face, then drops it as his face goes blank. And Marylyn Mason—as she has done scores of times before—guides the hand through the exercise it needs, up, down, crosswise. Briskly, she takes his blood pressure, temperature, pulse, sterilizes equipment, changes his dressing, checks cupboard and refrigerator to make sure that the food supply is adequate, disturbing nothing of the room's clutter. ("That's private," she says later.) J never drops his eyes from her face.

"Did you eat anything today?" she asks. His speech is garbled, most would find it unintelligible. "Potatoes, you say? You should eat fruit, too. You have it in a can, you say?"

"Sure," he answers every question with quick nods aimed to please. "You should do your food shopping with Willie—he eats fruit." "Sure." "You go out?" "Sure." "Much?" "Sure. Went across the street yesterday." "You go out alone?" "Sure." (Later Marylyn would express doubt that J really does do all that. She knows he can't manage it physically, and she worries.)

"I can move my leg, sure," he says and flaps his arms like bellows. "Thirty-five times I do it."

"Wow. Great," Marylyn cheers him. "That's the way to go." (Later she would doubt this feat as well.)

After about an hour and a half of this, after J's ulcer is dressed, medical instructions for the next two days given and recited—repeat after me, she had bid him—just when Marylyn reaches for her black bag, J discovers whole new nests of pains. There in his chin, now here in his foot, the back, too, and the arm. "Now Mr. J, I'm coming back Thursday, remember?" The pains are forgotten. "Yeah, that's right," he nods to himself. And the room, as the nurse leaves, returns to a silence broken only by the clock's patient ticking.

Noon Adams-Morgan—A street of vacant and boarded up storefronts is deserted in the midday sun, and wind scatters pop tops and cigarette butts like confetti across the

sidewalk. The visit is to an old and skeletal man, bedridden years ago by lateral sclerosis. Sores cap bones outlined sharply behind his skin, and almost all the nerves of his body have decayed. His muscular strength has left him, but his mind is still agile.

He would die were he left alone, but a Mrs. D, triple his size, two-thirds his age and no relation to him, lives with him. It is a devotion few fully fathom. "He's a three-shift job, I'll tell you," she says. "And I'm not getting anything from his people but hell." You should go out more, the nurse tells her, we'll see about getting you a home health aide. But Mrs. D, for all her complaints, is resistant to the suggestion. She gets out, she says, to the store, the laundromat, too.

"You're free," Marylyn Mason says. "Do what you want to."

"I do do that," says Mrs. D. "I got nowhere to go." Then after a bit, "You know, you hear a lot 'bout how someone like Mr. H here needs nursing home kind of care."

"But if you can handle him here, like you're doing . . ." says Marylyn. "It's for the two of you to decide. And if you're happy with the decision, that's all that's important."

There is no urgent medical need here. Mrs. D takes care of that. But there are, says Marylyn, other needs that bear watching. She couldn't do all that Mrs. D does, she says—it would leave her well-nigh dead, and Mrs. D gets no outside support.

"I'm the sick one today," says Mrs. D, and arches her back as if to wrench out a pain. "Who's sick?" Marylyn stiffens. "Oh, it's my arthritis acting up." Marylyn changes the subject. The arthritis, he says later, may be more in the mind than limbs, but she will in any case check Mrs. D's medical history.

This room, like the last, is tropical in temperature. The ceiling's plaster is cracked and every spare space crowded; a blessing Jesus, two Bibles but no other books, a plastic-coated portrait of John F. Kennedy, paper flowers, pillows, pill bottles, a TV that is rarely turned off. The patient's eyes swing like pendulums after the nurse's every movement.

"What's on TV?" she asks Mrs. D.

"I don't know, something like blackjack." And then she drifts: "I heard that Liz Taylor and Burton are gonna break up. Hmmm. They found that Hearst girl yet? I believe she's dead, brainwashed, too. Oh, sakes. Them that's in unemployment that's able to work just don't want to. You just gotta be patient." It is a running theme of her talk. "The doctor, he's busy, awful busy. You can't find them these days that makes housecalls. You just gotta be patient." H lets out a groaning aaahh; tears run down his cheeks. He has just wet his bedclothes and both women spring to change him. Then a rubdown, bath, feeding, turning him this way and that.

"I tell you, what a day, sliding his butt around, turning him over and over, getting these old joints to move," says Mrs. D, cuddling H's head in the cup of her hand.

"Mrs. D," says Mason, "That's just great. Wow. That's the way." Mrs. D goes somber, studies her feet. "Why thank you dear," and sets about fussing with H's pillow, sheets, bibs. And Marylyn, no less a whirlwind, continues her check-check-checking—food supply, air, gas outlets, exercises, popping each query with a grin and plucking laughs from the air.

"Mrs. D, I'm going to go now—you're doing just great."

"Onnnhhh," rises from the bed. "Oh, my arthritis," from Mrs. D. She cuts her cry short to catch the phone. "Yes, I'm fine . . ." She motions goodbye to the nurse. "Nothing, No, I'm just setting here in front of the TV."

As Marylyn closes the door, Mrs. D is holding H's hand, both turned to the TV, he with the grimace that is as much of a smile as he can manage.



"We (the VNA) will carry him until he dies," Says Marylyn. And Mrs D? No one yet can say.

2 p.m., Chevy Chase—The lawn out front is as groomed as a golf green, and inside is the accumulation of a long and comfortable life—oaken furniture new with the century, delftware and eggshell porcelain on a sideboard, photographs of a bloomer clad childhood. The patient, at 94, has watched one sister enter a nursing home. Dreading that for herself, she stays here with her daughter, alone during the day while the daughter writes copy for the National Geographic.

A small line furrows Marylyn Mason's brow. The visit was to be brief—R's orders call only for a bi-weekly injection of B-12 for macrocytic anemia—but R stretches the time with chatter. It is sort of self-peptalk, launched off the bat. "Somebody asked me if I told Dr. K about this pain I got. Boy, you should have been here to see it. My arm swelled up so it looked like the Green Giant's. And I said no, pshaw an old arthritic like me can't tell about all her pains. They're going on all the time."

She winks, and as Marylyn sticks the thermometer in, she screws up her eyes, clown-face, but doesn't stop the patter: "Why, I bet I could beat the tall-off most folks my age. I tell you, 20 years ago I was playing basketball. And I was 70 then. Hmph." She seems not to notice the shot Marylyn administers—just pats her hair and winks. "But that's all water under the bridge."

She is tiny, with colorless eyes, a perky drawl and skin that swings in folds when she moves, which she does in hyper, spiky gestures. She has dressed for the visit in rust-toned cashmere shirtdress and matching organdy scarf; even the hair tint matches.

The B-12 has been injected, but R is rambling through her past, spewing it out in disordered patches. "You know, my Annie (daughter) was such a sunny sweetheart. If she hadn't been here when they took Nan (the sister) away . . . I remember I told her to go ahead and write and darned if she didn't turn bent and horn-rimmed like him (her husband?)."

She hopscoches through time as she speaks, eyes fastened on the nurse. "Annie pounds on everything she can touch, the little devil. She wriggles out of her diaper before you can say scot, and then, heck, it's cute, she leaves a nice wet mess behind the drapes."

Marylyn tries to curb the flood: "How's the heat here?"

But R talks as if a dam had broken somewhere in her head. She talks even while trailing the nurse on her safety check through the house.

"Hey, you already told me that," Marylyn butts in. For a second R looks crestfallen, "Well, I guess I've told you so many things . . ." Then revs up again: "But I'd say I do purty good for 94. Yes sree, 20 years ago I was playing basketball." Marylyn moves for her bag, R trips suddenly over her cane, then makes herself small against the wall, a naughty kid caught, and shame-faced.

"Mrs. R," Marylyn grasps her. "Will you listen to me? You're not steady—you need another person here." Stubborn, R clamps her jaws tight, NO. Marylyn warns again, and again, before R begins to yield. "I won't fall, I promise, I won't because I know I got to be steady."

"I'm going to talk to your daughter," threatens Marylyn.

"Don't," clowning again, "she'll kill me."

They compromise—R will use her cane.

"Take care," calls Marylyn from her car.

"I've lived long enough," says R, and pivots quickly on the cane so that the nurse will see.

(The clinical physician referral had indicated that Homemaker Health Aid Service was pending for R, but when Marylyn had called the hospital to verify this, she found that the patient's family had failed to con-

tact the hospital, and that no Homemaker aide had been assigned. She would try again.)

"What a cool lady," says Marylyn. "But you've got to be so careful. On the surface she's the liveliest person in the world, but beneath that pride, that whatever, is someone very shaky." A smile hangs thoughtful on her face till R is safely up the steps.

3:30 p.m.—It is the day's last visit, back to Adams-Morgan and boarded up and broken windows, trash-littered streets and more liquor stores than markets.

It is also to be the day's toughest: an old incontinent woman was referred to the VNA and Marylyn, on her first visit a week ago, discovered that her 17-year-old daughter was as much in need of care. She had just given birth by Caesarean section; neither has any source of income; both sleep squeezed in one bed in a room, otherwise empty except for a TV and a crib.

Marylyn stops at a payphone on the street to verify medical orders with the VNA's Public Health liaison at Freedmen's Hospital. She phones the Adams-Morgan clinic, a community link with Children's Hospital, about registering the family to receive supplemental foods, and she checks in with the VNA.

The line in Marylyn's brow has deepened and her shoulders slump. Inside, four flights up to the patient's apartment, no one answers her ring. And the only sounds in the minutes that pass are a cough that reverberates from below, a radio whining up from the pavement outside, sounds of heels clapping on the steps that fade, then die. "It's Mrs. Mason, the nurse," she yells at the keyhole. The hall reeks of old urine. "Mrs. R?"

Finally the door opens, heat rushes out. It must be 95 inside—the oven has been left on and the thermostat turned to top temperature; blood from a cut is running down the woman's leg, and a kitten is locked screaming in a closet. The woman starts to fall and Marylyn grabs her, but the woman fights her off. As the nurse races to turn off the stove, to release the kitten, the woman lunges for a corner and nuzzles her face into the wall. "Ye, ye, ye," she moans.

The daughter isn't there (she was supposed to stay with the mother), the apartments down the hall are all empty, and the woman is disoriented. She ignores Marylyn's questions—about how she cut herself, who left the stove on, who locked up the kitten, how long has she been alone. She cradles her stomach, hunches against the wall. Her speech, when it comes, is incoherent. "Don't know, don't know," she sings. Monosyllables spill out in monotone, then a wall rises, "Lord have mercy." She slurps the water Marylyn brings her, forgets it; the water not swallowed drips in puddles at her feet. Only her fingers move, curling and uncurling.

The daughter, all in skin-tight red, arms coddling a baby wrapped in a dishtowel, peeks through the door. She spots the nurse and edges, shy, toward the closet as if to hide there. She balks when Marylyn spies her, and turns sullen in answer, "I fed her, I did. She's okay. So what if she pees on herself? I can't sit home all day." "Yes, no, don't know," voice dull and eyes glazed.

(The daughter cannot understand the mental deterioration setting in here, says Marylyn later, and it leaves her feeling powerless, walled in.)

It is when Marylyn asks her what she will name the baby that the first smile flashes. "Juanita." Marylyn leaps to hold the smile—"It's just great the way you fixed the crib" (blankets knotted between the slats so the child wouldn't fall out). "I gave her a bath, too," says M. and holds the baby up for the nurse's inspection. At which point Marylyn becomes a talking encyclopedia of childcare know-how—how to feed, wash, sleeping habits, signs of sickness.

A lesson in temperature-taking causes problems. As Mason inserts the thermometer

in the baby's rectum and the baby winces, forewarning the scream to come, M beats the baby to it: "You're hurting her." She snatches the child. But when the nurse's hand guides hers—Marylyn tells her she must—M finds that it isn't after all, that difficult. Reading the thermometer is, however. It is clear, as M twirls the glass rod like a baton, that she cannot count. And that 98.6 has no more meaning for her than the baby.

Learning to read numbers may come, though, as it has for so many of Marylyn Mason's patients. First there are other basics to be mastered, the Caesarean incision to heal, an income to be secured. For now, Marylyn tells her how nice she looks, how perfect the baby is, and together they chat about what clothes to buy the child.

Meanwhile the evening sun lights the room in gold. The old one curls and uncurls her fingers, the kitten plays tug of war with the blinds.

Footnote: Marylyn has done a great deal of background legwork on this case. Concerned by the family's lack of income, she has contacted the VNA's social worker, who in turn called the hospital that referred the case. Marylyn learned that the daughter had applied for public assistance three months ago. Why it never came is unclear: perhaps the application was lost; more probably the daughter did not make the post-application contacts she was supposed to, perhaps because she failed to understand instructions "The red tape involved is enormous, confusing to anyone," she says. "But what counts most is teaching the patient how to get through it." With Marylyn's help, the daughter does.

Her days are often like this, says Marylyn. The illnesses change, as do the faces, the settings, the lives she moves into. But the other needs—social, emotional, psychiatric, the hunger and the aloneness—does not. And she seems to step always into places where time passes somehow more slowly.

It is now close to 5 p.m., and Marylyn has come back to the VNA offices to consult a social worker about her last case. Not safe, that old one, she says. She meets with her supervisor to talk about new problems she has spotted. She picks up new cases ("admissions" they are called), studies medical histories, doctors' orders, schedules visits. There is more paperwork, more calls: to a clinic, hospital or doctor, to Family and Children's Services or senior centers in the city, to the Homemaker Health Aide Service or Public Health or the Sanitation Department—and to the social worker who in turn will call a food stamp aide program, the Welfare Department, Protective Services.

Later Marylyn will go to her Spanish class at George Washington University—so she can better treat her Spanish-speaking patients in Adams-Morgan. Then she'll go home, where her husband, 29 and a law student, will cook and both will do the housework, perhaps do some shopping or go to a movie. Maybe both will study.

Marylyn Mason doesn't know how long she'll stay with the VNA. But she will not, "not on your life," she says, go back to a hospital—too many patients, too few on staff, not enough time—to talk, to make contact. Too often fixing, she says, not healing.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MRS.  
EILEEN TAYLOR

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my best wishes and

heartiest congratulations to Mrs. Eileen Taylor on the occasion of her birthday.

A lifelong resident of San Luis Obispo in California, Mrs. Taylor is a friend of many years standing. Eileen's contributions to public and political life are numerous, including her present service as vice chairman of the Central Division of Republican Women. She has also served as vice chairman of the San Luis Obispo County Republican Central Committee, and was a charter member of the Santa Lucia, Calif., Republican Women. Coworkers know Eileen can be counted upon to get a job done, and to give every task her best. She is also extremely active in the Arroyo Grande, Calif., Women's Club.

Married to Edwin Taylor, president of the Western Growers Association, Eileen has three children—John and Joan Taylor and Mrs. Vicky Edmondson. She always finds time in her busy schedule to enjoy her five grandchildren.

I could go on at great length about Eileen's talents, and her service to her community, her government, and her family. Like all of her friends, I take great pride in knowing her, and have the utmost respect for her accomplishments. I know that my colleagues here in the House will join me in extending happiest birthday wishes to this fine woman.

#### KEY VOTE ON UNITED STATES-RHODESIA TRADE DUE IN HOUSE

#### HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, events in recent days in southern Africa have only heightened the importance attached to passage of S. 1868 repealing the Byrd amendment which allows importation of Rhodesian chrome against U.N. sanctions. Our vote on this measure, now scheduled for early next week, could not come at a more opportune time at which to make our position on this matter abundantly clear.

The Journal of Commerce today ran an article on what is happening in Rhodesia and the ramifications of our vote next week. The article follows:

TODAY OR MONDAY—KEY VOTE DUE IN HOUSE ON UNITED STATES-RHODESIA TRADE

(By Peter T. Leach)

Journal of Commerce Staff

The agreement announced Wednesday in Salisbury ending the black African nationalists' guerilla war in Rhodesia will intensify international economic pressures on the white minority government to reach a political settlement with the country's vast black majority, according to diplomatic sources in Washington.

One of the most immediate moves to increase the economic pressure against the regime of Prime Minister Ian D. Smith is a vote today or Monday in the U.S. House of Representatives on a bill repealing the Byrd Amendment which allows the import of certain strategic raw materials from Rhodesia.

ALREADY PASSED BY SENATE

The repeal bill, which has already passed the Senate and the House Rules Committee, is strongly supported by the Ford Administra-

tion, which believes it essential as a means of ensuring U.S. access to these same raw materials once a fully representative government is chosen to succeed the Smith regime.

The State Department believes the U.S. will risk losing future supplies of Rhodesian ferrochromium, ferromanganese, asbestos and nickel if a future black government decides the current U.S. imports of these strategic minerals were a means of supporting the Smith regime.

The Byrd Amendment, which was named after its chief sponsor, Sen. Harry Byrd, D-Va., was passed in 1971 to allow the U.S. to bend the United Nations economic sanctions against Rhodesia enough to import these raw materials. The amendment was passed by a coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats who deemed it preferable to import chrome ore from the white minority government than from the Soviet Union at double the Rhodesian price.

Since the Byrd Amendment was passed, the U.S. has imported more than \$50 million worth of Rhodesian ores, but only about 4 percent of the U.S. supply of imported chrome is being imported from Rhodesia. The Soviet Union and South Africa remain the largest suppliers of U.S. chrome ore.

The U.N. economic sanctions against Rhodesia were imposed when Rhodesia made its Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) from Great Britain in 1965 and have remained in effect for 10 years during which a minority of 240,000 white settlers has ruled a population of 5.7 million mostly black Africans.

The key U.S. vote on shutting off purchases of the only goods it imports from Rhodesia comes at a time when the Smith regime is moving toward a political settlement with the country's black African nationalists and the black-ruled countries surrounding it.

But official sources both here and in Rhodesia warn against any expectation that the U.N. economic sanctions will soon be lifted. Before the ban on trade with Rhodesia can be lifted, official sources say, Rhodesia will have to work out a political settlement that is acceptable to African nationalists and to Great Britain, which was the sponsor of the U.N. sanctions.

Most observers think the Smith regime's move toward a more moderate stance on governing the country was forced by the external realities that threaten Rhodesia's communications lifeline. Rhodesia depends on neighboring Mozambique and its port of Beira for much of its external trade.

With the Portuguese withdrawal and the emergence of a partially black government in Mozambique, Mr. Smith evidently began to fear Rhodesia's outlet to the sea could be broken.

#### AGREE ON CEASEFIRE

Mr. Smith announced in a national broadcast Wednesday that his government and the black nationalists have agreed upon a ceasefire to end the prolonged fighting on the northern frontier. The announcement followed his release of two African nationalist leaders, who had been held in detention in Rhodesia since UDI 10 years ago.

The two nationalists, the Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole, leader of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU); and Joshua Nkomo, president of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) were allowed to attend talks in Lusaka in neighboring Zambia with other black African leaders that led to the agreement on the ceasefire.

South Africa, which has remained Rhodesia's one ally throughout the years of UN sanctions, has been instrumental in pushing the warring sides in Rhodesia into an agreement. Prime Minister John Vorster has made two secret trips into Africa in the past two months for talks with African leaders.

Within an hour of Mr. Smith's statement Wednesday, Mr. Vorster said South Africa would withdraw its 2,000-man police force

from Rhodesia's borders as soon as it has confirmation hostilities have ended.

U.S. Government sources think the ceasefire will pave the way for an initial settlement allowing black participation in the Rhodesian Government, a participation that will slowly increase to allow full majority rule. Once majority rule is achieved, they said, the UN sanctions will quickly be lifted.

The political shape of the future Rhodesian Government is relatively unknown, although most observers think the government will probably reflect the strongly nationalist ideologies of its African neighbors.

All observers agree, however, that the country will be renamed Zimbabwe after the native African civilization that ruled this region before the arrival of white colonists.

With the lifting of the UN sanction, U.S. exporters will be free once again to sell goods into the Rhodesian market. Traders observe that the market will undoubtedly have changed a great deal in the 10 years of sanctions, since it has had to become increasingly self-sufficient in such goods as clothing, food, and mining supplies, which were once the staple of U.S. exports to Rhodesia.

Based on an analysis of 1965 trade statistics from the period before UDI, one trade specialist figures the U.S. will be able to sell the future African country substantial quantities of mining machinery, agricultural equipment, motor vehicles, aircraft, power generating equipment, spare parts and office machinery.

#### ANDOVER SQUEAKS BY SALEM IN 21 TO 20 OVERTIME THRILLER

#### HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, I had the privilege of watching my hometown high school football team win the super bowl at Boston University's Nickerson Field. Of all the football games I have ever seen—be they high school, collegiate, or professional—I have never seen a more exciting game as this one. The performance of each and every one of these young men, most of them playing for the first time on the astroturf, was incredible. The courageous performance of quarterback Jeff Winters who time after time, despite serious injuries to his arm and ankle, was able to spark the team to make the necessary gains; a key tackle by John McDonald in the final moments; and the final point after kick by Peter Reilly were outstanding.

When quarterback Winters was forced by his injuries to leave the game, he was replaced by Mike McCormick and Bill Alexander. It was a pass from Alexander to Glenn Verrette that allowed Andover to tie the game in overtime. Many of these young men were responsible in key instances for the overall team effort that produced the victory: Mark Farnham's touchdown with 11 seconds to go; Bill Kenney's recovery of the fumble to set up the tie; brilliant defensive plays by John Drivas, Russell Tassinari, Dan Billings, Ralph Borelli, the two Fabiani brothers—Steve, who had to leave the game with a knee injury, and John—Dave Tallini, Jerry Stabile, and also many others who proved that there are still young men in America who under-

stand the value of winning and who combine in a team effort no matter what the odds to give their best.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an article from the Lawrence Eagle Tribune about this exciting game and add my congratulations and, I am sure, those of the House of Representatives for this outstanding performance.

The article follows:

**ANDOVER SQUEAKS BY SALEM IN 21 TO 20 OVERTIME THRILLER**

Andover High's Golden Warriors came busting back from the brink of an overtime defeat today to post a 21-20 Super Bowl victory over Salem High at E.U.

The Golden Warriors, who, like Salem, came into the game with a perfect 10-0 record, had tied it at 14-14 in the waning moments of regulation play.

In the latter session Salem scored first to lead 20-14 before Andover finally made its last dramatic rush to victory.

Andover High missed three golden first-half scoring opportunities and Salem High took an 8-7 half-time lead in the Eastern Massachusetts Division 2 Schoolboy Super Bowl game this morning at Boston University's Nickerson Field.

Andover kicked off to open the game and took possession on the Salem 31-yard line when Paul Rindone recovered a Salem fumble on the kick-off. Andover could not move the ball, however, and was forced to punt.

Later in the first period from the nine-yard line three Andover players gained no yardage and Peter Reilly was wide with a 25-yard field goal attempt.

Andover finally took a 7-0 lead on a 26-yard touchdown pass from Jeff Winters to Glenn Verrette with 1:07 left in the first period. Peter Reilly kicked the point.

Salem took the lead midway through the second period after Mark Dubile intercepted a Winters pass at the Salem 15 and returned it to the Andover 36. Two plays later, Salem's Chuck Razney took a pitch-out and went 28 yards to score. The two-point conversion pass was good from Quarterback Bill Pinto to his brother, Steve.

**SUPPORT OF MARCH OF DIMES BIRTH DEFECTS JOINT RESOLUTION**

**HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the March of Dimes' Birth Defects joint resolution which I sponsored with my colleagues PAUL ROGERS of Florida, Dr. TIM LEE CARTER of Kentucky, and JOHN SEIBERLING of Ohio.

My special thanks go to House Judiciary Subcommittee Chairman, DON EDWARDS of California whose leadership and hard work have made action on this joint resolution possible during this 93d Congress.

The joint resolution, which has already been approved by the Senate, would establish January 1975 as "March of Dimes' Birth Defects Month." As a member of the House Health Subcommittee, I know birth defects are a major health problem affecting 250,000 American infants each year. One in every 14 births or approximately 700 babies each day are born with some type of defect or handicap.

CXX—2519—Part 30

More tragically, birth defects cause more than 129,000 deaths a year according to a 10-year study by University of Florida medical researchers. Birth defects are implicated in more than half the deaths of preschool children and are responsible for the deaths of almost 40 percent of elementary age young people.

This joint resolution is a measure of the kind of Federal interest and attention which is needed so research, treatment, and counseling of all those affected by birth defects can go forward. For the information of my colleagues and the public, I insert the highlights of my remarks of June 28, 1974, on sponsorship of this joint resolution be made part of the House discussion of this needed measure:

**REMARKS OF HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON PROGRAMS FOR PREVENTION OF BIRTH DEFECTS**

Every child should enter the world undamaged by defects, events that take place during pregnancy. Statistics prove that a program of prevention is a necessity.

Programs of prevention require great emphasis on prenatal care. The National Foundation/March of Dimes through its more than 2,300 chapters covering every county in the United States, has initiated numerous programs at the local level to see that expectant mothers receive adequate prenatal care. Working with all elements of the community, prenatal care projects have been established that now help bring medical services and health education to families in an increasing number of localities. The National Foundation helped initiate nationwide programs such as "Operation Stork," "Better Infant Births," and "Stork Nests" in conjunction with other volunteer groups. It has cosponsored prenatal care clinics with hospitals and public health departments in inner city and rural areas. Beside adequate medical care, the prenatal care programs stress the importance of nutrition to mothers both before and during pregnancy and to the newborn.

Congress has also responded to these problems through the passage of the maternal and child health services provisions of the Social Security Act. This act has resulted in the establishment of 61 maternity and infant projects in 34 States and 8 intensive care projects for high risk infants. The National Foundation/March of Dimes programs have acted as referrals to these projects.

In addition, Congress has established the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children—(WIC program)—under section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. The National/March of Dimes has been working closely with the Department of Agriculture and the local communities to implement this program and to develop appropriate systems of evaluation.

Next year, our House Health Subcommittee with the bipartisan leadership of Paul Rogers and Dr. Tim Lee Carter will continue its support of Public Health Service Act research funds for work into the causes and treatment of birth defects as part of the total Federal medical research effort.

The National Foundation/March of Dimes makes extensive grants each year for research into the underlying causes of birth defects and also into the best methods of diagnosis and treatment. The internationally famous Salk Institute for research has been built and largely supported by March of Dimes funds.

The National Foundation/March of Dimes sponsors a network of medical service programs throughout the country. Through these programs children with birth defects receive diagnosis and treatment by teams of medical experts. More than half of the programs also provide genetic counseling. At

others, high risk pregnancies are monitored and intensive care is given to critically ill newborns. These programs are administered by hospital medical centers.

**EDUCATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION**

The education and training of professionals to provide the broad range of services required is another goal. The National Foundation/March of Dimes provides leadership in this area with symposia to educate family practitioners in genetics and courses for nurses in intensive care of critically ill newborns as examples. Fellowships are awarded to outstanding investigators and clinicians and scholarships are made available in the health specialties. Of particular importance is the dissemination of knowledge about birth defects and their treatment through the publication of original articles and reprints, the distribution of audiovisual films on genetics and the publication of a "Birth Defects Atlas and Compendium" as a resource tool for doctors.

Of equal importance is the dissemination of knowledge to the public and especially to the prospective mother. The National Foundation/March of Dimes volunteers throughout the country carry the word in person and through hundreds of thousands of pamphlets and booklets to all parts of the community. Prospective mothers must know the importance of early and regular medical attention in pregnancy and why it is her best safeguard in reducing the risk of maternal complications and hazards to her unborn baby.

**FOCUSING ON THE NEED**

In the crusade against birth defects, it is necessary for the people of the United States to consider fully the nationwide problem and its effect on present and future generations. By authorizing the President to designate January of 1975 as "March of Dimes Birth Defects Prevention Month" will be the vehicle through which information about education, nutrition, and prevention of birth defects is transmitted to the public. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

**ROAD TO DÉTENTE MUST BE BASED ON COMMON DECENCY**

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much legitimate criticism of the policy of détente which has been implemented during the past period of American foreign policy.

The New York Times, for example, has noted that—

No one is going to oppose the ideal of Soviet-American détente . . . The issue is whether the pursuit of détente is being wisely conducted, with proper regard for fundamental interests and full realization of pitfalls as well as rewards.

The Times' conclusion is that—

The danger of détente as it has been pursued . . . is that the United States may get an eloquently expressed design for interrelationships, while the Russians get a new generation of computers. Compounding this imbalance, principles of behavior—however solemnly agreed—can be readily revoked; technological knowledge once disclosed can never be withdrawn.

Recently, George Meany, head of the AFL-CIO, stated in testimony before the

Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the policy of détente with the Soviet Union was "one-sided appeasement." While détente has produced a "silly euphoria" in the West, Mr. Meany said, it is viewed with cold calculation in the Soviet Union which, he pointed out, sees it as based on U.S. weakness, as a means of intensifying ideological warfare, as a means of undermining NATO, and as a means of attaining ultimate military superiority over the West.

An important analysis of the current détente policy has been written by Isaac Don Levine, a man whose long and eminent career in journalism, spans more than half a century. Mr. Levine, himself a native of Russia, covered the Russian Revolution as a reporter for the New York Herald Tribune, and has been a keen observer of Soviet affairs ever since.

Mr. Levine expresses the view that—  
All experience with expanding totalitarian powers, from Mussolini's Fascism, Hitler's National Socialism and Stalin's Communist imperialism, has shown that a workable accord with such a regime can be achieved only on the basis of superiority of force enjoyed by the free world.

Yielding ground to such a power, Mr. Levine declares:

In the expectation of gaining favor with it or cementing a true friendship is a sure invitation to aggression, as little Finland learned in November 1939 when she yielded to Soviet pressure to withdraw her troops from the border zone. On November 30, the Soviet forces attacked Finland and bombed Helsinki. . . .

Unfortunately, our détente policy seems to be one which has shown little concern for national strength. Mr. Levine states that to ignore history's lessons—

Is to expose the very life of a free society to mortal danger. The United States took to that road in the course of the protracted SALT negotiations initiated in Helsinki and Vienna by the Nixon Administration and then virtually stalemated for years until the spring of 1972 when President Nixon made his well publicized journey to Moscow which resulted in the SALT treaty. . . . It is now a matter of common knowledge that under these suddenly improvised pacts the President conceded to the Soviets a steep increase of land-based ballistic missiles to the number of 1,618 as against 1,054 for the U.S. and an even more awesome advance in submarine nuclear missiles.

Mr. Levine concludes that—

The road to a genuine détente in our relations with Russia can only be found by a free world leadership convinced, in the words of Orwell, "that human society must be based on common decency."

I wish to share with my colleagues the article by Isaac Don Levine which originally appeared in the Strategic Review and was reprinted in the October 5, 1974, issue of Human Events, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

ROAD TO DÉTENTE MUST BE BASED ON COMMON DECENCY

(By Isaac Don Levine)

From President Franklin D. Roosevelt to former President Richard Nixon, the United States has vigorously pursued a grand design for an era of peace premised on the cooperation of the Soviet government.

U.S. hopes have repeatedly been dashed by the hostility of Soviet responses, but the basic design has not been abandoned. SALT

I and the October War reveal how far the United States has gone and how costly its pursuit of peace can be. Presidents should forswear summit negotiations and meet there only to sign previously agreed-to documents.

Disarmament should take the place where belligerency reigns—in the Middle East and Southeast Asia. Oil wealth should be committed to the development of blighted lands. And cooperation in trade should be extended only to countries in which labor is not enslaved.

The principles of freedom should be voiced vigorously in all forums. There can be no true détente except on the basis of common decency.

The grand design for an era of peace sketched and promoted by Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins over 40 years ago, and recently refurbished and pursued with renewed vigor under the label of détente by Nixon and Henry Kissinger, is now undergoing its acid and final test.

President Nixon's histrionic hajj to Mao Tse-tung's red Mecca was carried out in the spirit and tradition of FDR's pilgrimages to Soviet-occupied Teheran and to Yalta for his long-coveted meetings with Stalin. And although the framework of this latest model of a durable world peace has not yet been completed, it is already creaking at every joint.

It is scarcely necessary to recapitulate here the score of well-known occasions when the United States went far out to chase the *fata morgana* of an enduring settlement with the Kremlin.

From Nov. 16, 1933, when Roosevelt and Maxim Litvinov signed the accord which extended recognition to the Soviet dictatorship, to our own days, the air has been reverberating with the familiar tunes of the grand design.

And what did that design promise to the American people and to the rest of the free world? Peace in our lifetime. Lucrative trade to the merchants. High profits to the financiers. Increased employment to industry and labor. Liberalization of the despotic system within the Soviet Union.

The rationale for seeking an understanding with the Communist outcasts was sounded by FDR in his groundbreaking message of Oct. 10, 1933, to the head of the Soviet government, proposing to put an end to the "present abnormal relations between the 125 million people of the United States and the 160 million people of Russia."

Since then, this keynote has been struck again and again by American policy-makers and replayed as a stirring novelty by President Nixon when he ushered in his ping-pong diplomacy.

It is a theme which evokes the noble ideal of the brotherhood of man and it is imbedded in at least four outstanding instruments of the grand design: the Roosevelt-Litvinov recognition agreement and the subsequent Consulate Treaty, the Atlantic Charter of Aug. 14, 1941, subscribed to by the USSR, in the Declaration of the United Nations of Jan. 1, 1942, and the Teheran Declaration of Dec. 1, 1943.

These pacts, to which the Soviet government is a solemn party, contain pledges to uphold and practice the principles without which normal relations among civilized nations are impossible.

The pledges included, under the aegis of a common dedication to peace and the enactment of measures of disarmament to ease "the crushing burden of armaments," assurances that "all men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want," permitting "all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance," securing "the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance" and aiming "to preserve human rights and justice in their own land as well as in other lands."

By living up to these contractual conditions, the freedom of emigration and the untrammelled flow of news and ideas among the people of all countries would be guaranteed. Reinforcing these undertakings is the covenant of the United Nations dedicated, among other things, to faith in "fundamental human rights."

While the world press and other organs of public opinion were debating the pros and cons of the looming crisis for the détente policy, the New York Times in a dispatch from Moscow dated April 12, 1974, reported an incident which in itself posed no threat to world peace, but which nevertheless goes to the very heart of the problem of how to build an enduring understanding between the West and the Kremlin. The report read in part:

"Soviet policemen today grabbed and marched off a middle-aged Russian couple who tried to enter the American Embassy, then drove them away in an unmarked black sedan, apparently for interrogation."

"The noontime incident, witnessed by a handful of bystanders that included some American diplomats and their wives, was the latest in an apparent new effort by Soviet authorities to restrict access to the embassy."

"Yesterday, two Soviet nationals were taken into custody by policemen when they sought to enter the embassy's consular section to discuss prospects for joining relatives in the United States."

"Both were carrying written invitations from the embassy, which has taken to issuing such letters to help Soviet visitors get past the policemen on duty outside."

"The two were physically intercepted. . . . According to eyewitnesses, two policemen hustled them roughly off in the rain to a warming shack on a side street under the supervision of the senior police officer on duty."

"Several diplomats who rushed out heard shouts and screams from inside the shack. They could not confirm whether the would-be visitors were beaten by the police, as was initially reported."

No serious student of Soviet affairs will doubt that the incident in Moscow occurred on orders from the highest authorities.

Did Washington issue a clear warning against any further violation of the elementary code of conduct among civilized governments which might involve a rupture of diplomatic relations between the two powers?

Quite the contrary. Secretary Kissinger had spelled out his stand unmistakably during the tempestuous deportation of Nobel Prize-winner Alexander Solzhenitsyn which caused a worldwide revulsion. Dr. Kissinger then publicly conceded that the Kremlin action was a matter of internal Soviet politics.

Without even a remote allusion to Moscow's various pledges in international pacts to observe "fundamental human rights," the secretary of state virtually assured the Brezhnev junta that its domestic barbarities would "in no way be standing in the way of détente."

President Nixon, a few days before the "ugly" Moscow incident, had urged then German Chancellor Willy Brandt, in a meeting in Paris, to "be a little nicer to the Russians."

Would it be so far from reality to suggest that the state of mind of the Nixon White House encouraged the Kremlin, because of the adverse developments for the Soviets in the Middle East, to renew its old bullying tactics by intensifying its siege of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow?

If Solzhenitsyn had compiled a volume recording the cases of affronts, scurrilities, injuries and other instances of uncivilized conduct inflicted upon the United States by the Soviet rulers during the past 40 years—a volume which the State Department

could easily fill with massive evidence—he would probably sum it all up in one of his characteristic comments as follows:

"Dig up the precedents from the courts of Genghis Khan and Ivan the Terrible and you will have the bones of the Communist doctrine of coexistence."

It is, however, to Alexander Solzhenitsyn and nuclear scientist Andrei Sakharov that we owe a great debt for exposing the theory of Soviet diplomacy which the Kremlin demonstrated in Moscow in front of the U.S. Embassy.

Those two valorous Russian spokesmen were the first in our generation to raise their voices and warn the West that without observing fundamental human rights, no lasting *modus vivendi* with the totalitarian regime is attainable.

Responsible American and European statesmen took up their cry. Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D.-Mass.), in his conference with Leonid Brezhnev in the Kremlin on April 21, joined it when he obliquely raised the issue of "the free emigration of peoples," not as a high international obligation, but in the form of a plea for "magnanimous action" on the part of the Soviets that would promote the "condition needed for our own progress in controlling nuclear arms."

The record cited here should suffice to formulate the precondition of a workable relationship with the Soviet oligarchy which would command credibility in the courts of world opinion:

A decent mutual regard for all members of the family nations, with the unswerving observation of solemn pledges guaranteeing unobstructed intercourse among citizens of all countries, are indispensable to an enduring structure of peace.

All experience with expanding totalitarian powers, from Mussolini's Fascism, Hitler's National Socialism and Stalin's Communist imperialism, has shown that a workable accord with such a regime can be achieved only on the basis of superiority of force enjoyed by the free world.

To assure a viable peace, this superiority must rest on a force in being, wielded with restraint, without resort to bullying, to exercises in violence, to threats, blackmail or other forms of extreme pressure.

As all totalitarian rulers are deeply ridden with fear, usually rooted in the illegitimacy of their governments, it is not surprising that common to them all are bluster and aggression. The history of our times has demonstrated that equality is not a workable principle in dealing with a modern out-and-out dictatorship.

Yielding an inch to such a power in the expectation of gaining favor with it or cementing a true friendship is a sure invitation to aggression, as little Finland learned in November 1939, when she yielded to Soviet pressure to withdraw her troops from the border zone. On November 30, the Soviet forces attacked Finland and bombed Helsinki, which led to Russia's expulsion from the League of Nations two weeks later.

To ignore this experience is to expose the very life of a free society to mortal danger. The United States took to that road in the course of the protracted SALT negotiations initiated in Helsinki and Vienna by the Nixon Administration and then virtually stalemated for years until the spring of 1972 when President Nixon made his well-publicized journey to Moscow which resulted in the SALT treaty and interim agreement.

It is now a matter of common knowledge that under these suddenly improvised pacts the President conceded to the Soviets a steep increase of land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles to the number of 1,618 as against 1,054 for the United States and an even more awesome advantage in submarine nuclear missiles.

It was claimed in explanation of this concession that the U.S. superiority in numbers

of MIRV warheads offset the Soviet superiority in missiles; though our representatives knew that Soviet MIRVs would soon dispel this advantage.

What has never been authoritatively divulged to the American people are the considerations of political expediency which led our diplomacy to make such a major concession to the Kremlin. It was widely proclaimed that the next round in the negotiations, SALT II, would lead to a substantial reduction of nuclear arms on both sides.

However, sober observers warned at the time that the great concession to the Soviets would boomerang and, instead of meeting Washington halfway in an accord for curbing offensive weapons, Moscow would take our sacrifice as a sign of weakness and seek further advantages.

In March 1974, during Secretary Kissinger's mission to the Kremlin to pave the way for the President's trip to Moscow in June, Brezhnev made his unyielding position clear.

And the following month the Soviet army was testing in Syria, under actual war conditions against Israel, its latest model missiles with multiple warheads, according to the Beirut *Al Moharrer*, which revealed that these missiles "could fire between three and seven warheads." Another paper, *Al Safir*, described the new weapons as "SAM 9s, among the most sophisticated surface-to-air missiles in the Soviet arsenal."

What does this mean to the security of the United States? A rapid escalation of the nuclear arms race brought about by a diplomatic game of short-sighted diplomacy. In the face of the blank wall behind which the Soviet leadership has taken its stand on the top critical issues involved in SALT II, it is not too late to redress some of our lost ground.

Would a return to the time-honored principle of conduct among heads of state, consonant with the status of the United States in the ranks of world powers, not be a salubrious riposte to Moscow's increasing appetite and intransigence? Such a breakthrough in reverse is now called for.

Thirty-six years ago, before Solzhenitsyn's message rang out around the globe, George Orwell foresaw the ultimate evolution of the Soviet state and dedicated himself to the promotion "of intellectual decency, which has been responsible for all true progress for centuries past, and without which the very continuance of civilized life is by no means certain."

The road to a genuine détente in our relations with Russia can only be found by a free world leadership convinced, in the words of Orwell, "that human society must be based on common decency."

#### OUR NATION SALUTES THE PREAKNESS VOLUNTEER FIRE CO. NO. 4, WAYNE, N.J., ON ITS GOLDEN 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

### HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my privilege and honor to call to the attention of you and our colleagues here in the Congress a most historic celebration that is taking place in my Eighth Congressional District, State of New Jersey, and request that you join with me in extending greetings and felicitations to the officers and members of the Preakness Volunteer Fire Co. No. 4, on its observance of 50 years of selfless dedication and

exemplary service in safeguarding and protecting the people and property of our community, State, and Nation.

May I commend to you the following public safety officers and ladies auxiliary of Preakness Volunteer Fire Co. No. 4, who continue to carry on the sterling tradition of the firefighters of America, second to none, with distinction and honor:

#### LINE OFFICERS

The Honorable: Robert Daniels, Chief; Phil Teresi, Assistant Chief; George Kar-amanol, Captain; Robert Kuiken, 1st Lieutenant; Walter Johnson, 2d Lieutenant.

#### FORMER CHIEFS

Robert Gordon; James Jarvis; John Kooreman; and Matt Perkins, Sr.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Robert Gordon, President; John Babitz; David Herman, Sr.; John Kooreman; and Chuck Neidlein.

#### FIREMEN

Charlie Bogert; Bob Chetirkin; Tom Duncan; Jerry Elia; Greg Froehner; Brian Hamilton; Mike Jaco.

Nick Kuipers; John Nee; Matt Perkins, Jr.; Walter Riker; Dan Shuler; Wayne Shell; Bob Smith; Charlie Valt; and John Wozniak.

#### THE LADIES AUXILIARY

Dale Wielenga, President; Gayle Babitz; Evelyn Duncan; Marilyn Elia; Louise Gordon; Virginia Gross.

Amy Hillwong; Barbara Johnson; Mary Kuiper; Mary Mechan; Viola Muller; Barbara Nee; and Loys Neidlein.

Harriet Perkins; Jenny Perkins; Ellen Ridgway; Jenny Ridgway; Betty Schuler; Jean Simon; and Marie Terica.

To acquaint you with the early beginnings of the Preakness Volunteer Fire Co. No. 4 and its progress over this past half-century, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in our historical journal of Congress, the story of this most distinguished fire company which was presented to me and other guests at the 50th Firemen's Anniversary Ball held at the Wayne Manor on November 30, 1974, in celebration of this historical occasion. The statement of its history is as follows:

#### EAST PREAKNESS SCHOOL NO. 6 WAS ONCE PREAKNESS CO. 4 HEADQUARTERS

When Nick Cassidy's barn on Ratzter Road in East Preakness burned down and the spectacular blaze destroyed all the livestock in it, the residents of that extremely rural section of Wayne decided it was time to do something to fortify their fire protection.

Thus it was, early in 1924, that Preakness Volunteer Fire Company Number 4 was formed. The first meeting was held in the home of the late Passaic County Freeholder, James Ratcliffe, father of Jack Ratcliffe, who served Wayne as committeeman for almost a quarter of a century and grandfather of Robert Ratcliffe, presently president of Wayne's Board of Education.

The Company's first fire-fighting force was comprised of 12 volunteers. Their meeting headquarters was old East Preakness School No. 6 which stood on the site now occupied by Giannone's Service Station on Ratzter Road. The new Company's first fire engine was a Day Elder and it was housed in the late Harry Tintle's Garage on the corner of Ratzter Road and Hamburg Turnpike. Tintle, it will be recalled, also served as township committeeman for more than 20 years.

The ground on which the present firehouse stands was purchased from Frank Torbet, Sr., "for a song". It was due to the generosity of three area families that the company was able to meet its financial commitments. They were Hobart, Gaede and Mills families. This is the same Hobart who was Vice President of the United States. The Gaede (Gaede's Hill is named after them) owned a prosperous silk mill in Paterson while the Mills family owned and operated the well known Mills Wholesale Hardware business in Paterson. It should also be noted that Paterson State College is now on the site of the Hobart Estate which was bequeathed to the State for that purpose.

The original firehouse was completed in 1925. A large addition was completed in 1953. A third addition was completed in 1973. The 35 active members under Fire Chief Robert Daniels now operate two pumpers, one truck plus an auxiliary wagon and the chief's car.

The township at the time the fire company was formed was largely rural. Its schools were for the most part two room buildings. There were six such schools. One was in what later became the municipal building and American Legion building; the second, Lower Preakness, stood on the site of the present Anthony Wayne Junior High School; the third, in Upper Preakness, was on the site of the present modern school and is now a library; the fourth was the Pompton Falls School on Hamburg Turnpike, near the North Jersey Butchers; Number 5 was at Black Oak Ridge Road and Ratzler Road and Number 6, as has been stated, was Earl Preakness School on Ratzler Road.

Although there has been a population and building explosion in Wayne and the population has jumped from under 5,000 at the time Preakness 4 was formed to more than 60,000 now, 50 years later, one similar fire problem exists . . . distance. That is why Preakness Volunteer Fire Company No. 4 believes in buying, maintaining and operating extremely fast and mobile equipment designed to cope with fire hazards of a community which is essentially residential and in which even new industry has preferred to build, for the most part, one story structures.

Mr. Speaker, we are all proud of the dedicated men of the public safety corps throughout our country and today I seek this congressional recognition of the fire-fighting volunteers of our community in tribute to their outstanding contribution to the history of our Nation and the safety and well-being of our people. Our Nation does indeed salute the members and families of the Preakness Volunteer Fire Co. No. 4 with deepest appreciation for their outstanding public service to mankind.

#### SCHOOLS, PARENTS, AND TEXTBOOKS

### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks there has been a great deal said and written about the school textbook controversy. One of the most recent speeches on the subject was by U.S. Commissioner of Education Terrel Bell in a December 2 meeting of the Association of American Publishers. Because the Commissioner's speech created so much interest in the press, I am inserting the full text

of that address so that my colleagues may have the opportunity to read his actual remarks in full context:

The speech follows:

#### SCHOOLS, PARENTS, AND TEXTBOOKS

(By Terrel H. Bell)

As I look around and see how many publishing houses are represented here today, I feel somewhat like Dorothy and her friends confronting the Wizard. Remember that vast hall, those flashing lights, the booming voice, all those symbols of absolute spine-tingling authority?

I could be similarly intimidated by this audience, because you are the wizards, the power structure of the children's trade and textbook industry. The member companies of AAP's School Division produce more than 80 percent of all instructional materials used in the Nation's schools, and other AAP divisions increase the total to 90 percent or more.

But I am not intimidated by all this because, first, I know that you are accomplished professionals doing your best to give educators the materials they need and want; and, second, I know that after a few scary passages Dorothy and her friends came out all right.

You have a tremendous job to do, and you do it very well. To turn a profit, even to stay in business, you have to sell enough school officials in 50 States and some 17,000 school districts on the quality and relevance of your products. That alone requires you to keep up with changes in teaching methods, subject matter, and social attitudes, not to mention changes necessitated by legislation on civil rights, women's rights, and other matters by Congress and the State legislatures and by court decisions.

Yet I believe you have a responsibility above and beyond your responsibility to your stockholders to produce books, films, and other materials that schools will buy. This larger responsibility is to parents and students and communities. It has to do with the school as an institution that must be responsive to the community that supports it. It has to do with the wishes of parents who entrust the education of impressionable young children to teachers they scarcely know, or don't know at all, whose values may differ somewhat from their own. It has to do with the subjects you select for books and other materials and how these subjects are handled.

The *Wizard of Oz*, corny as it may seem to TV-oriented young people today has always struck me as about the right combination of suspense, which naturally appeals to children, and the happy ending that takes the edge off the spooky parts. This children's classic is a far cry from some of the current juvenile literature that appears to emphasize violence—and obscenity—and moral judgments that run counter to tradition—all in the name of keeping up with the real world.

What is really taught in a story about a boy who drowns a favorite family cat to make his parents love him more? What is really conveyed to children when they are asked to debate the pros and cons of stealing, the implication being that sometimes it is all right to steal? To be relevant do high schools really need to offer a story about a hundred-dollar whore? Assuming that there are great concepts to be taught in the stories about prostitutes, stealing, and drowning cats, do we need to dwell so much on the sordid details?

In recent weeks such books and films have provoked literally violent reactions from parents. Certainly I deplore this violence. It is no solution. But there are fundamental issues involved. I would like to comment on some of these issues and talk about the content and selection of instructional materials and about where I think the respon-

sibilities of publishers and educators and parents begin and end.

I think we all need to go back to the basic question: What is the purpose of the American education system and how can instructional materials be used more effectively to fulfill that purpose?

There are the obvious and immediate answers. Clearly, a primary function of education is to give children and young people the skills—from the Three Rs up—to function in a complex, highly technical society. Beyond that is the need to broaden their intellectual horizons and enhance their problem solving abilities.

But America has always asked more of its schools and colleges. Many of you remember the children's books written by Abraham Rosenbach in the 1930s. Dr. Rosenbach made a profound observation about juvenile literature. He said that subjects dealt with in children's books, more than in any other class of literature, reflect the attitudes of the generation that produces the books. By implication, these attitudes cover the range of social concerns—politics, religion, ethics, race relations, boy-girl relations, work, family, country, and individual goals and aspirations. School books, in other words, are a distillation of the values and attitudes that one generation wants to pass on to the next.

With the Nation's Bicentennial approaching, we are increasingly conscious of our heritage and our beginnings, and in historical perspective I think Dr. Rosenbach's theory holds up well.

Children in the Massachusetts Bay Colony were taught to read in order to read the Bible and further their religious education. Writing and arithmetic had much lower orders of priority. This conscious decision by parents was undoubtedly based on strong conviction—increased, no doubt, by the hardships the colonists were enduring to give their children a new start in a new land.

Similarly, McGuffey's famous readers stressed the values that Americans in the late 1800s wanted to instill in their children—patriotism, integrity, honesty, industry, temperance, courage, and politeness. These readers sold 120 million copies. While McGuffey's selections from great literature would seem stilted by today's standards, there was certainly nothing wrong with the values they taught. We could use more emphasis on some of those values today.

I do not mean to imply that parents today expect the same things from the education system that parents did in colonial America or the Victorian period. Actually, they expect far more. Parents are better educated, more widely traveled, and—thanks largely to television—more aware of the world than parents of any previous generation. So are students. Publishers must be aware of this sophistication. At the same time, they must recognize that we have compulsory attendance laws and that children are the captive audience of the schools. Parents have a right to expect that the schools, in their teaching approaches and selection of instructional materials, will support the values and standards that their children are taught at home. And if the schools cannot support those values they must at least avoid deliberate destruction of them.

One of the real problems in the production and selection of instructional materials is that parents and communities differ so widely in what they consider appropriate. We are probably the world's most polyglot nation, with many subcultures increasingly interested in maintaining or re-establishing their identity in the larger society. We come from many socio-economic backgrounds. We have many divergent religious viewpoints. Our positions on politics and education and other things that matter run the gamut from ultra-conservative to ultra-liberal.

Your companies are doing a fine job in responding to the needs of these various sub-

cultures and communities. You are beginning to offer materials that reflect the rich cultural heritage and values of our Native American, Spanish speaking, and other minority populations. You are also beginning to get a handle on the sex stereotype problem, getting the girls out of the kitchen and the boys out of the treehouse—or at least letting the girls join them.

Certainly, these new materials need to include an introduction to the problems and pitfalls that children are likely to encounter as they grow up. Learning about the adult world is fundamental to the learning process itself. Surely this can be done without resorting to explicit violence, or explicit sex, or four-letter words. Most of the mass media are still pretty careful, rightly I think, about controlling the use of obscene language in TV and radio programming and in printed materials that reach into millions of American homes. (There are some exceptions, of course.) And I am happy to see that violence on television is not quite so gory as it used to be.

True, some people say that children are still exposed to more violence on television in a single evening than they are likely to encounter at school in a whole term. This may be true, but it is not the issue. What children are exposed to in the home is totally the responsibility of their parents. Parental judgments may vary a great deal, and what children are allowed to watch on TV will reflect these judgments. But when parents send their children to school they delegate some of this authority to school administrators and teachers. These professionals should in turn respect the broad spectrum of parental attitudes represented by the children in their classrooms.

Let me turn now to the question of academic freedom and the implied threat of academic censorship that some people may read into what I have said.

I recognize that much of the world's great literature is full of violent scenes and situations. As a teenager, I shuddered as I read the closing pages of *A Tale of Two Cities*. . . Madame Defarge knitting as the tumbrils rolled up to the guillotine.

It was high drama. Madame symbolized the Reign of Terror. But overriding her glee at the fall of the French aristocracy was the nobility of the sacrifice being made by Sydney Carton as he mounted the scaffold. Violence served as the vehicle to say some powerful things about love and honor and trust and responsibility. There are basic human values, and they are the forces that make great books great. I am not sure they are present to the extent they should be in some of the current literature purchased by schools for classroom and library use.

As scholars prepare new textbooks and other materials, as you publish them and schools select them, I hope everyone involved will keep in mind the idea behind an anecdote I heard the other day.

Following some dispute or other, Johnny poked his classmate Robert in the nose. Naturally, the teacher chastised Johnny for this action, and Johnny replied: "It's a free country. I know my rights."

"Well, yes," the teacher said, "you have rights, the same rights your classmates have and every American has. But your rights end where Robert's nose begins."

I think this little story says some important things. In writing textbooks and other materials for school use, scholars do have the right, indeed the obligation, to present new knowledge and to comment on social changes in ways that will stimulate and motivate students, excite their curiosity, and make them to learn. Teachers have both the right and obligation to use these materials in ways that will enhance the learning program. Indeed, teachers are getting to be very creative in developing supplementary materials to illustrate and expand on textbook themes, and this creatively should be encouraged.

But I feel strongly that the scholar's freedom of choice and the teacher's freedom of choice must have the approval and support of most parents. I do not suggest that we seek to win approval of all parents, for that would not be attainable—but schools without parental support and approval are headed for failure. Without having books and materials that are so namby-pamby they avoid all controversy, we must seek published materials that do not insult the values of most parents. Where there is basic conflict, no one really wins, and children suffer. However, parents have the ultimate responsibility for the upbringing of their children, and their desires should take precedence. The school's authority ends where it infringes on this parental right.

I say these things knowing that parents, being human, can also be dead wrong, at least in the opinion of some educators and other members of society. I know that parents can have religious convictions or moral convictions that differ from those of the school people. And every society has at least a few holdouts against legal and established institutions. Nevertheless, of whatever ethnic background or philosophical persuasion, most parents are responsible arbiters of their children's best interests. We must pay more attention to their values and seek their advice more frequently.

So I think the children's book publishing industry, and the schools, need to chart a middle course between the scholar's legitimate claim to academic freedom in presenting new knowledge and social commentary on the one hand, and the legitimate expectations of parents that schools will respect their moral and ethical values on the other.

Fortunately, some of the newer instructional approaches will help to dehorn the dilemma in time. Certainly, wider use of individualized instruction for each child will give his or her parents the opportunity to rule out an objectionable book or film without affecting other children.

What the present controversy comes down to, I believe, is a growing concern on the part of parents that they have lost control over their children's education and therefore over their children's future.

You can do much to restore that confidence. We need instructional programs, for instance, that teach the principles of modern mathematics but also show pupils how to add and subtract. Parents are uptight about this one. We need programs that incorporate the career education concept into academic studies so that young people will know where they are heading when they leave school or college for the world of work. We need good literature that will appeal to children without relying too much on blood and guts and street language for their own sake. We need films and other materials that are realistic about the world we live in yet make young people want to be a part of it.

For impressionable young minds, it is easy to document and decry the world's evils. It is more difficult to end on an upbeat note that gives youngsters something to hang on to. Young people need faith and hope and confidence in the future. They need a yellow brick road. And I don't see much wrong with a rainbow either.

#### GETTING THE BIGGEST BANG FOR THE BUCK

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Ford's feeble effort against inflation

consists primarily of an attack on Government spending for human needs, and leaves our bloated military budget untouched. Not only is this approach ineffective, but it places the heaviest burden on those who have suffered most from inflation—the elderly, the poor, and those living on fixed incomes.

We must reorder our priorities to focus on the country's domestic needs: on the economy, employment, education, health, housing, and the environment. We must consider each proposed Government expenditure, not only in terms of how much it adds to the Federal budget, but in terms of what else might be bought with those funds.

The following table prepared by Prof. Seymour Melman illustrates this choice dramatically by showing the cost in domestic programs of various military expenditures. I commend this table—which appeared in the *New York Times* on December 4, 1974—to my colleagues in the hope that they will join me in trying to direct Government efforts to the real problems and needs of our constituents.

The table follows:

GETTING THE BIGGEST BANG FOR THE BUCK . . .

(By Seymour Melman)

Following is a list of some civilian and military trade-offs adapted from the book "The Permanent War Economy." The author is professor of industrial engineering at Columbia University and national co-chairman of SANE.

66 low-cost houses equals \$1 million equals 1 Huey helicopter.

Unfunded housing assistance in Arkansas equals \$100 million equals 1 DD-963 destroyer.

257 apartments in New York City equals \$9 million equals 1 Navy A6-E Intruder plane. Impounded Federal housing funds, 1972 equals \$130 million equals 8 F-14 aircraft.

Vetoed Environmental Protection Agency plan to depollute the Great Lakes equals \$141 million equals 1973 request for new airborne nuclear-war command post.

1973 unfunded Housing and Urban Development water and sewer requests equals \$4 billion equals cost excess on F-111 aircraft.

National water-pollution abatement, 1970-75 equals \$38 billion equals cost excess for 45 weapons systems.

National solid-waste-treatment program equals \$43.5 billion equals B-1 bomber program.

Total environment cleanup equals \$105.2 billion equals new weapons systems in development or procurement.

1 high school in Oregon equals \$6.25 million equals amount paid by 1 Oregon county to support military.

Unfunded program to upgrade rural American life equals \$300 million equals 5 C-5A aircraft.

Unfunded 1973 rural health care equals \$22 million equals 50 per cent of Lockheed Cheyenne helicopter funding increase, 1973.

Child-nutrition programs funding cut equals \$69 million equals 2 DE-1052 destroyer escorts.

Special Milk Program funding equals \$1 million equals 1 Main Battle Tank.

Health, Education, and Welfare public assistance cut, 1973, equals \$567 million equals 3 nuclear attack submarines.

To bring all poor Americans above poverty line, 1971, equals \$11.4 billion equals B-1 bomber program, low estimate.

To eliminate hunger in America equals \$4.5 billion equals C-5A aircraft program.

Vetoed child-care program equals \$2.1 billion equals development excess on B-1 bomber program.

Philadelphia 1971 schools deficit equals \$40 million equals 1 B-1 bomber.

Reopening New York Public Library weekends and holidays equals \$900,000 equals 1-year operation 6 Huey helicopters.

For each of 250 communities, 3 equipped schools; also, 1-year salaries for 35,714 teachers equals \$6 billion equals 6,000 aircraft lost in Indochina by October, 1969.

Graduate fellowship funding cut, 1973, equals \$175 million equals 1 nuclear aircraft carrier.

New Orleans unfunded urban development, 1973, equals \$94 million equals 2 months' Laos bombing.

1972 housing funds impounded equals \$50 million equals 3 F-14 aircraft (\$57.6 million).

1973 Newark needs for urban renewal equals \$125 million equals 4 DE-1052 destroyer escorts.

1973 cities' needs to rebuild blighted areas equals \$3 billion equals 1 nuclear aircraft carrier, equipped, and escorts.

1971 Detroit city deficit equals \$303 million equals 3 F-15 fighters (\$27 million).

1972 Federal health budget deficiency equals \$2.3 billion equals overruns on C-5A aircraft and Main Battle Tank.

1972-73 cut in Federal mental-health budgets equals \$65 million equals 1 C-5A aircraft (\$60 million).

1972-73 funds reduction for training health personnel equals \$140.9 million equals 1 DE-1052 destroyer escort, and 1 DD-963 destroyer (\$134 million).

1973 unfunded medical school construction equals \$250 million equals cost excess on M-60 Sheridan tank.

#### MOTHER ELIZABETH SETON

### HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Pope Paul VI announced the confirmation of the sainthood of Mother Elizabeth Seton, the first native-born American to be so named. Her canonization will be formalized on September 14, 1975 as part of the Church's holy year celebrations.

As an American Roman Catholic I am proud of Mother Seton, but I feel I have an even greater reason to exult in her sainthood; for back home in my district in Pennsylvania there is a small women's liberal arts college, known as Seton Hill, that has, for more than 100 years, been a marvelous religious, cultural and community-minded commemoration of all that projected Elizabeth Seton to sainthood.

Elizabeth Ann Bayley was born in New York City on August 28, 1774, just 2 years before this great country achieved its independence. She married William Seton at the age of 19, and they had five children. Seton, however, died of tuberculosis in 1803, leaving his family penniless in Italy, where they had traveled for his health. Elizabeth had been born and reared in the Episcopal Church, but partially because of the friendship of a Roman Catholic family in Italy she became interested in the Catholic faith, and she converted 2 years later.

Returning from Italy to America, Elizabeth Seton began teaching school in Baltimore in order to support her young family. Several years later she opened what was to prove to be the first Catholic free school in the United States,

providing the seed and the philosophy for the parochial school system in this country. In fact, Mother Seton's endeavors at Emmitsburg, Md., led to the formation of the Sisters of Charity, the first religious order for women in the United States. That order now numbers some 8,000 members. Elizabeth Ann Seton died in 1821, and in 1963 she was beatified by Pope John XXIII.

I like to feel that I am particularly lucky because I live in the shadow of Seton Hill College. Everyone at home has, at one time or another, felt the effects of the important work that the Sisters of Charity are involved in, continuously. Many thousands of children in the parochial school systems of my district have received, from the Sisters of Charity, not only a quality education, but also an impetus toward the goals that Elizabeth Seton found important. Throughout the years the opinions and ideas of members of the Sisters of Charity have been valued in our community affairs. And Seton Hill has long been held as a shining example of the importance of the women's college in cultural and philosophical endeavors. Elizabeth Seton began a tradition that has amply served and benefited the people of the 21st District and in her sainthood she will at last be properly revered and respected for the great and holy woman that she was.

#### INFLATION IS REAL SOURCE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

### HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the rising unemployment rate, and the painful fact that more than 6 million Americans do not have jobs. But the bill which passed this House yesterday, the Emergency Jobs Act of 1974, will not cure the underlying causes of unemployment, and will indeed only serve to worsen our economic problems. For that reason, I consider the bill unwise and voted against it.

Inflation is the real source of the current unemployment, and a return to a livable inflation rate would bring about a corresponding drop in unemployment figures. I believe there is a widespread consensus that inflation will never be brought under control until Federal spending is brought into line with Federal income. Yet, here we have a bill costing billions of dollars, with no explanation of where the funds to pay for it will come from. So we simply added to the already outrageous Federal deficit, and did considerably more to worsen inflation.

There are two ways in which our citizens could pay for all these new jobs. We could obtain additional revenue by raising taxes. I think most of my colleagues realize the folly of that course. But if we do not come up with increased taxes, the people will pay anyway, with a hidden tax—a higher rate of inflation and another jump in the cost of living.

So, whatever short-term benefits this bill may provide for a few, it will invariably make things worse for everyone in the long run.

We do not even know how much this bill will cost us. The Senate has been considerably more generous than the House on this matter, and I anticipate that the conference report will recommend expenditures greatly in excess of what we approved yesterday.

What we need to do here, is to enact a type of bill that encourages the private sector to hire more people, to add to their training programs, and to stimulate economic growth. More government spending is not going to make unemployment go away; it never has. What it will do, is perpetuate the kind of fiscal irresponsibility that has become all too common in this Congress, and aggravate our economic woes.

I, therefore, regret the passage of this bill, and hope Congress will undertake some long-term solutions to our problems.

HON. H. R. GROSS

### HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Congressman H. R. Gross, of Iowa, who is retiring at the end of the 93d Congress.

I have known Congressman Gross for a number of years now and in my judgment he is one of the most able Members to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As we all know so well, Congressman Gross has focused much of his attention on the need to reduce Federal spending. In my judgment, he has contributed a great deal toward maintaining a sensible approach to funding various programs. He has rendered a real service to the people of this Nation.

His consistent questioning of the need for new spending programs and his constant prodding into why more money is needed for established programs has led to a substantial savings for American taxpayers.

His unrelenting efforts to eliminate all unnecessary spending have, at times, made him the subject of derision by many who opposed him. But he has maintained an unwavering position and been true to his beliefs.

Most often called a conservative H. R. Gross has been called many other things by his detractors. But this has only reinforced his determination to see that the House retains some fiscal sanity. And even among his detractors he is regarded as one who always has the courage to stand by his convictions.

His work in the Congress has given ample evidence of his devotion to duty and love of country. If other Members had more often followed his lead in fiscal matters, in my view we would not be in our present economic situation.

In his departure from public life, the Nation, the State of Iowa and his own



district will lose a valuable public servant whose place will be hard to fill.

It is my earnest hope that the coming years of retirement for Congressman GROSS will be filled with good fortune and happiness.

#### OUR PRISONS ARE POWDER KEGS

### HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, in 1973, the House Committee on Internal Security conducted a wide-ranging inquiry into the exploitation of prison unrest by extremist groups seeking to enlist prisoners in revolutionary movements.

Our committee investigation, especially as it concentrated on conditions in New York, Ohio, and California, marked the first public ventilation of a growing problem in our correctional institutions.

The Reader's Digest, in October of this year, has summed up many of our findings and brought the subject even more up to date in an article by Nathan Adams which I recommend to my colleagues by inserting it at this point in the RECORD. I agree with the quote therein from the top FBI official, "Somebody better wake up before it's too late."

The article follows:

#### OUR PRISONS ARE POWDER KEGS

(By Nathan M. Adams)

On the morning of May 31, 1973, two inmate-spokesmen for Black Muslim convicts at Pennsylvania's Holmesburg Prison were granted a "grievance hearing" with Warden Patrick Curran and his deputy, Robert Fromhold. No sooner was the meeting under way than the inmates lunged at the officials. Curran and Fromhold were dead within seconds, each stabbed repeatedly with daggers fashioned from table knives. Investigators called it a preplanned, cold-blooded murder. However, such criminals are hailed as heroes and "political prisoners" by both radical inmates and outside extremist groups.

Police and FBI agents in Ohio are monitoring the activities of an extremist group—including former Weathermen—which last year almost succeeded in breaking out a dozen inmates from the Southern Ohio Correctional Institute. The plan called for taking the convicts to a hideout in the hills of West Virginia, where they would undergo training in urban guerrilla warfare. Meanwhile, attacks on the prison staff by militant inmates have increased dramatically. And radical "prison-reform" groups have forced state corrections officials to relax discipline to the extent that one inmate group has been permitted to hold military maneuvers togged out in combat boots and berets.

Early last March, a letter intercepted by California corrections investigators disclosed a chilling plot to free several of the state's most dangerous convicts. Terrorists of the Symbionese Liberation Army planned to hijack a busload of schoolchildren who were dependents of guards at Folsom Prison. Until the inmates were released, the letter made clear, the hostages were to be beheaded, one a day. Strict new security provisions were immediately enacted, and the plot failed.

#### STATE OF SIEGE

These shocking incidents are typical of what is happening today in America's prisons. Indeed, extremists have been so successful in their assaults on our antiquated and unwieldy correctional system, and so ef-

fective at intimidating administrators and organizing inmates, that they hold many of the nation's 350 federal and state institutions in a state of near siege. "There is not a major prison in this country," reports a top FBI official, "where revolutionaries are not recruiting inmates. Somebody better wake up before it's too late."

How do the agitators do it? For one thing, they now have near-total access to convicts—thanks to a series of recent federal-court decisions relaxing curbs on inmate-mail censorship and visitation privileges. In most of our large prisons, extremists have enlisted more than ten percent of the inmates, forming them into revolutionary cadres which control the majority of convicts through muscle and intimidation.

The arithmetic of the potential danger is frightening. Authorities estimate that 94 percent of the quarter-million or more offenders presently incarcerated in state and federal institutions will be returned to society within five years. Prison officials agree with radical organizers that thousands of them could emerge as hardened political terrorists. "A ticking time bomb," reports the House Committee on Internal Security, which has probed the situation throughout the country.

#### LOCKDOWN

California, with the nation's largest inmate population (23,800), has been singled out by radicals as a prime target—with devastating results. In the past four years, 92 convicts have been murdered there, and 265 guards assaulted; 11 of the latter were stabbed to death. The last, Officer Jerry Sanders, was reportedly clubbed and stabbed by two black militants on November 27, 1973, at the Deue Vocational Institution.

Sanders' murder was the final straw for California's Director of Corrections Raymond Procunier. Investigators learned that prison revolutionaries were planning to kill a guard a week. Two days after Sanders' death, Procunier ordered the wardens of four of the state's penal institutions to confine all inmates to their cells in a "lockdown." Once this was done, prison officials classified and isolated extremist inmates.

The tactic worked—temporarily. From December 1973 through last March, the assault rate fell 63 percent. But radicals' criticism of the crackdown has been strong. Militant organizers even publicized a plan to stage a public execution of Director Procunier.

"What is happening here," says Procunier, "is a highly organized attempt to destroy our system of correctional justice. These agitators mean to bring anarchy to the prisons, and, through them, to the streets of our cities. It is an explosive situation."

A look behind the scenes at San Quentin tells why. Originally built in 1852, "Q," as it is known to inmates, has been enlarged and today confines 3500 of the state's most dangerous convicts. Inmates are shoehorned together as many as eight to a cell. Their days are spent aimlessly, wandering the corridors of the four main cellblocks or basking in the sun of the exercise yard. They have only time on their hands—and nothing to do with it.

Under such conditions, it is little wonder that San Quentin is the most violent institution in the United States. Last year, 54 "Q" inmates were stabbed. Narcotics there are almost as easy to come by as they are on the street. Homosexual rape is a daily occurrence. So, too, is revolution. The comic books and girls' magazines once popular with convicts have long since been replaced by the works of Marx and Mao, Che Guevara and Eldridge Cleaver. San Quentin administrators estimate that 85 percent of the magazines and newspapers subscribed to by inmates advocate revolution. In fear of provoking legal action, censors withhold only the most inflammatory literature. Yet what is denied militants through mail inspection reaches them by other means.

Last year, a virulent pamphlet on urban guerrilla warfare was smuggled into San Quentin, reproduced on a mimeograph machine and widely distributed among inmates before guards seized it. A sample of the lesson plan: "Kidnaping is important to the release of political prisoners. Harm to the victim should not be entertained until it has become obvious that demands will not be met. At such a time he should be executed at once. His face should be disfigured by small-arms fire and pictures of the results sent to the newspapers and television stations across the country."

#### A NATIONAL PATTERN

While California's experience with prison disruption and radical organizers has been the most severe, prisons in other states are increasingly coming under attack. On June 22, 1973, inmates of the State Penitentiary at Florence, Ariz., went on a rampage of destruction. Before state police brought the riot under control, two corrections officers had been killed.

Five weeks later, the Oklahoma State Prison at McAlester exploded in violence, "Let's go!" convicts screamed. "This is a revolution!" Three inmates, reluctant to join in the riot were murdered. Only days later, it was the turn of the Federal Prison at Leavenworth, Kan., where militants rioted and a guard was killed.

Why are these disturbances plaguing our correctional system? And who or what is behind them?

To begin with, the U.S. prison system is, in the words of one warden, "the most violent system in the civilized world, and the most in need of urgent reform." In New York State, four of the seven state prisons were built before the turn of the century—one, incredibly, in 1816. Three of the four penitentiaries in Illinois date back to the 19th century.

Nor is age the only factor. In most American prisons—and in local jails, too—prisoners are squeezed together cheek by jowl in conditions that approach the subhuman. Young, first-time offenders, shoved into overcrowded cells with hardened criminals, are easy prey for homosexual rapists. (A recently paroled mobster promised to shoot his own son before he'd see him incarcerated in an American prison.) Prisons are frequently understaffed, and their guards and administrators poorly trained. Classification of inmates is too often nonexistent.

#### LEGAL ACCOMPLICES

But if our corrections system has fallen victim to official neglect and public apathy, it has not escaped the attention of others who see in it a unique opportunity to sow the seeds of unrest. FBI and corrections administrators single out the radical National Lawyers Guild (NLG) as perhaps the most important leader of revolutionary prison movements. An organization of activist attorneys formed in 1936, the Guild has grown to 4000 members nationwide. In the past, it was a powerful force in the fight for black civil rights in the deep South. However, in the last decade the leadership has become increasingly radical, and today includes outspoken revolutionaries. Its lawyers have figured prominently in prison disturbances from coast to coast.

In February 1971, the Guild's National Executive Board received a staff report calling for the political organizing of inmates. "The prison work is crucial," said the report, "for only lawyers have relatively free access to jails and penitentiaries. We must see that access is used carefully . . . in providing legal support for prison militancy and organizing." A year later, one militant faction submitted a prison position report stating: "Prisoners are the revolutionary vanguard of our struggle. When prisoners come out, they will lead us in the streets."

One of the most radical Guild chapters in the nation, with a membership of no fewer than 800 practicing attorneys and legal as-

sistants, is located in San Francisco. While Guild officials deny any illegal activity, some evidence has appeared to the contrary. One reported example of the Guild's work; In July 1973, Lee Arthur Smith, a recently paroled inmate at the California Men's Colony at San Luis Obispo, told a Congressional committee, under oath, that he had been ordered by a fellow NLG organizer inside the prison to assault a guard to gain attention for a prisoners' strike. Indeed, he testified, before the assault the planning for the strike was submitted to outside NLG contacts who approved and set a time and date. Badly beaten, the guard survived.

Nor are radical lawyers the only organizers of prison movements in the United States. Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW) has founded a splinter group specifically to concentrate on politicizing inmates. Called the Winter Soldier Organization, it recently staged widespread demonstrations in support of the Leavenworth inmates indicted as a result of the 1973 riots in which the guard was killed. Then there is the National Prisoners' Reform Association, based in Rhode Island, which has managed to organize inmates in nearly every New England penal institution. From March through May 1973, the Association's organizers simply took over Walpole Prison outside Boston. Inmates who refused to join in were stabbed and beaten. In the three months that the Association controlled the institution, prison administrators reported nearly 50 convicts were knifed or badly beaten by Association thugs.

#### FACING THE SHAME

With the great majority of convicts in U.S. institutions due for parole in the next five years, what can be done to counteract the revolutionary menace? At a minimum, authorities agree, progress must be made, and soon, in the following three areas:

At present, only a handful of penal institutions have investigators trained to recognize the activities of revolutionary organizers. Thus, prison officials are often unaware of what is going on until a prison erupts. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is currently spending \$113 million to assist states in running prison programs. Clearly, some of these funds should be used to train investigators.

Despite mounting evidence, state bar associations have refused to take disciplinary action against extremist attorneys. The American Bar Association itself should launch an immediate investigation of the links between prison revolutionaries and outside groups like the Guild.

Finally, the public must be made to recognize the shame of its prisons. New prisons must be built, much smaller than current institutions, where regular inmates can be kept separate from violent offenders and agitators. State and federal governments must begin to make badly needed reforms in such areas as medical care, job-training, rehabilitation and work-release programs. This is not a matter of coddling criminals. It is, instead, the satisfaction of basic human needs.

Time and again, warnings about the state of our prisons have fallen on deaf ears. The time to act is now, before it is too late.

#### THE ECONOMIC SUMMIT AND THE FUTURE

### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share with my colleagues a position paper prepared by Nasrollah S.

Fatemi, director of the Graduate Institute of International Studies, at Fairleigh Dickinson University, which is located in Teaneck, N.J. The paper is entitled "The Economic Summit and the Future," and was prepared by Mr. Fatemi after he attended the recent Economic Summit Conference in Washington.

In his paper, Mr. Fatemi offers many perceptive observations and insights concerning the problems which plague our economy. Copies of his comments already have been sent to President Ford and White House Economic Adviser William Seidman, and today I would like to take this opportunity to share his remarks with my colleagues. The paper follows:

#### THE ECONOMIC SUMMIT AND THE FUTURE

(By Nasrollah S. Fatemi)

To find a solution to the present economic crisis—soaring inflation, serious recession, high interest rates, and productivity slump, we need major changes in the way in which economic, monetary, and fiscal policies are made in Washington. For three decades the policy makers in Washington have paid attention only to the symptoms of economic problems while continuing policies and practices that have failed to alleviate the critical situation. We have been bandaging wounds which need "radical surgery."

Real improvement—a stable, productive, prosperous economy—will elude us unless the Administration and the Congress, management, labor and consumers are willing to recognize the causes of the present crisis and meet the challenge with courage, boldness, creativity, and pragmatism.

Basically the present situation was caused by the belief both here and abroad that the economic and financial resources of the United States were inexhaustible. This notion, shared and encouraged by successive post-war administrations, encouraged us to spend more than \$250 billion on foreign and military expenditures, plus \$150 billion on the longest and the second most expensive war in the history of the United States.

Lack of attention to our fiscal and monetary policy, and the belief that the country can spend \$400 billion on foreign wars and giveaway projects without some control over wages, prices, interest, and credits, has produced in five years close to a \$100 billion budget deficit; an \$80 billion deficit in balance of payments and, for the first time in eighty years, a balance-of-trade deficit.

As inflation, recession, and unemployment developed, immense effort was being spent on a deceptive public relations campaign to convince the country that "the economic bliss of a generation of peace" was around the corner. Successive economic promises of the past five years have done nothing but apply "time-frames" to ever-worsening domestic conditions. Scapegoats, domestic and foreign, have been sought, identified, and blamed, but inflationary and recessionary drives have accelerated. Why?

1. Strong, steady, honest and courageous leadership was lacking in both the Johnson and Nixon Administrations.

This country needed effective wage, price, profit, interest, and credit controls in 1967. If, at that time, we had understood that it was impossible to spend \$30 billion a year on the war and continue business as usual, most of the present problems could have been avoided. It is tempting for some to point out that Nixon's Wage and Price Control policy failed, forgetting that when it was initiated in 1971, it was a case of too little and too late. Controls cannot be effective if profits, interest, credits, and commodities are exempt from restraints. Furthermore, what was the use of locking the barn door after the horse had been stolen? By 1971, infla-

tion was already in full swing, the cost of living having risen 21 percent in four years. And then the wheat deal with the Soviet Union not only deprived the United States of a vital food reserve but caused the price of wheat to quadruple throughout the world.

2. The wrong monetary remedy was applied to fiscal policy. The purpose of the Federal Reserve Bank is to sustain a stable monetary system, beneficial to the economic development of the country and to the welfare of the people. During the past five years those who make our monetary policy have failed either to evaluate the situation correctly or to help the economy.

A part of the present "inflation, recession, and associated financial crises is rooted in perverse monetary and fiscal policies. Monetary policy is good or bad depending on whether or not the Federal Reserve System uses its power with moderation; soundly, sensibly, and in the public interest."

Since 1970 most of the monetary policies of the Federal Reserve System have been confused, fluctuating, and political rather than economic in nature. They have resulted in financial disruption and an unprecedented rise in interest rates. In eight years we have had alternating cycles of too rapid and too slow monetary growth, resulting in financial disintegration, sharp increases in interest rates, drying up of long-term credit, and the collapse of the stock market.

From January 1967 to December 1968, and from January to December 1972, the Federal Reserve System increased money supply faster than the Joint Economic Committee's 6 percent per year upper-limit guideline. In 1967, 1969, 1970, and 1973-4, money supply growth was kept under 2 percent. Each money cycle was accompanied by over-heating, high interest rates, financial crisis, and finally recession.

Events of the last eight years suggest that there is a great need for financial reform and possibly for the accountability of the Federal Reserve System to the House Banking Committee. While the Federal Reserve can directly control the reserve base with some accuracy, it cannot evaluate or exert direct guidance on the long-term economic planning of the country. "In some ways, the nation's economy can be viewed as a giant ocean liner and its policy instruments as controls. The controls are set broadly to bring the ship to its destination and, though there may be adjustments for currents or storms, the course is not changed from hour to hour—nor is any captain foolish enough to think that he can turn the ship around sharply, as if it were a speedboat." Future economic planning should not depend on a volatile interest rate policy. How can industry, agriculture, and consumers fight inflation, if the Federal Reserve in three years allows a 300 percent increase in interest rates?

Dr. Andrew Brimmer, a former member of the Federal Reserve Board, has admitted that the agency miscalculated economic trends in the country. Many participants at the Summit Economic conference conceded that there have been serious errors of judgment by the Federal Reserve—errors that have created high interest rates, restricted economic growth, and as a result have contributed to the present inflation. What the Federal Reserve directors have not contemplated is that usually the high rates of interest are a sure guarantee for continuing inflation.

3. Neither the Administration nor the Federal Reserve had a plan to cope with the sudden demand for American agricultural and industrial goods all over the world.

Before 1967, there was a demand for American food and industrial goods, but very few countries could afford them. The Vietnam War, the increase in purchasing power of the Western European countries, the Soviet Union and Japan created both inflation and demand for raw materials. Many developing

nations seized on this opportunity to demand a fair price for their undervalued raw materials. This process was intensified by the expansion of a consumer's market and by the rapid depletion of basic raw materials. In the short span of three years the price of gold, copper, cotton, rice, wheat, bauxite, silver, sugar, soybeans and petroleum was increased by 200 percent and in some cases 400 percent. For the first time in history 500 million people from Indonesia to Venezuela have realized an annual income of \$150 billion. This sudden increase of affluence has created a great demand for American agricultural and industrial goods.

Unfortunately, even at this late date, the President's advisers do not realize that they are confronted not with one enemy but three: inflation, recession and a shortage of all kinds of raw materials. As a result of this three-fold problem, financial planning for the next five years must be designed not only to fight inflation but to ease credits and provide low interest rates for the expansion of American agricultural and industrial production which will pay for the imports of raw materials and meet domestic needs. Cuts in government spending—assuming they take place must come in the form of cutting foreign aid and military expenditures abroad.

The rate of unemployment may or may not be affected by the public service employment program, depending on how it is funded. If it is funded by diverting government expenditures from other sectors, there will be little net effect on the unemployment rate. In the long run, the solution to unemployment is expansion of production, increase in productivity and competition in international markets.

The September labor force statistics are bleak: the last time 5.3 million people were without work was sometime in 1941. Reflecting the slump in housing, the jobless rate for construction workers is now the highest in four years. As to the labor force in general, more people are working part-time involuntarily than at anytime since early 1961.

So far the suggestions, recommendations and decisions made in Washington do not indicate that the administration has a plan to remedy the nation's financial maladies or to confront the greatest economic challenge ever faced by this country.

4. In the area of international trade and investment, an exceptional transition is developing in favor of the United States. Some of the changes in trade stem from major currency realignments in developing nations which are in the market for cash purchase of American goods.

The volume of world trade increased by some 12 percent between 1972 and 1973, compared with 9 percent in the previous year. Since the middle of 1973, there has been a greater demand by the developing nations for agricultural and industrial goods, but a tapering of expansion in American industry and agriculture has failed to satisfy the needs of the eager customers. As a result, limited supplies in an expanding market have contributed to the rise in prices. Very few people have paid attention to the fact that the current high rate of interest, recession and limitations of supply have been the major contributing factors to the upward pressure on prices.

5. The Economic Summit meeting showed that there can be many approaches to the problem of inflation. It is true that leadership and planning must come from the administration in Washington; however, the private sector can join in the fight too. One important factor is productivity. According to all data available, in the key manufacturing sector, output per man-hour has not risen at all for more than a year, while the cost of labor has risen 10 percent over the past 14 months. Although average hours worked have fallen one percent during this

period, hourly pay has climbed even faster—nearly 11 percent. All this has been translated into higher labor costs. Labor costs per unit of output in manufacturing have risen nearly 11 percent since June, 1973. If we want to succeed in our three-fold war, the cooperation of labor in both planning and increase in productivity is essential.

6. Economic indicators at this juncture show that we have reached the peak of inflation. The gross national product, adjusted for inflation, has dropped through the year 1974. During the summer there was a substantial decline in business inventory building, as well as a worsening of our foreign trade balance because we have not enough products to export at this time. During recent quarters businessmen have had much difficulty keeping inventories at desired levels. Shortages and bottlenecks have caused stockpiling to drop far below intended levels. In the fourth quarter of last year, business inventories were rising at a \$29 billion annual rate. This growth declined to \$13.5 billion by midyear; now it is down to \$5.8 billion. Consumer spending picked up in the third quarter, but jobless and interest rate increases have undermined confidence in a rapid economic recovery.

Business spending on new plants and equipment fell last quarter. In real terms the level of capital goods outlays is no higher today than it was a year ago. The big corporations concede that they need more capital for expansion, but this will come only when the interest rate drops to 7 or 8 percent. Several surveys of businessmen's capital spending intentions show that for 1975 American industrialists would like to spend from 10 to 15 percent more on new productive facilities.

The 1975 investment programs, aimed at correcting supply shortages in the basic material industries, should be encouraged, so that new capacity will develop steadily and, by restoring a better supply-demand balance, help to bring down the artificially high prices of many materials. This program can succeed if, at the same time that interest rates decline, agricultural production increases.

It certainly will not be possible to solve present economic problems by adhering to the "old-time religion" or by retaining the advisers who have been directly or indirectly responsible for the present crisis. I respectfully recommend the following suggestions:

(1) It is essential that President Ford continue his policy of consultation and establish a permanent economic planning committee composed of economists, businessmen, labor and consumers. Their job should be to study economic trends both at home and abroad and prepare immediate and long-term plans for the President and the Congress.

(2) There should be a full disclosure on economic policy making. The Federal Reserve must coordinate its activity with the general economic planning approved by the Congress and executed by the President. It has to cease its up and down "rollercoaster" policy on money supply. The nation needs moderate expansion of money supply, reasonable interest rates, and stable long-term growth consistent with the real economic expansion of the country.

(3) The establishment of a direct loan program for housing should be accomplished through the establishment of a development bank. The loans could be at low interest—not to exceed the discount rate established by the Federal Reserve.

(4) Tax incentives for agricultural and industrial expansion should be carefully studied. The immediate removal of all economic laws which hinder industrial and agricultural production is essential to the recovery of the economy. Many of our problems can be traced to the crippling effects of bureaucracy and diminished public confi-

dence in the ability and integrity of the administration. The new council on wage and price stability and the commission on productivity must be strengthened and utilized.

(5) Our export and import policies must be re-examined. Included in this evaluation should be a review of policies toward investments by foreign corporations in the United States and toward the operations of American-based multinational corporations and banks. In this new policy, we must cooperate with other nations in establishing, on the one hand, principles of accountability for multinational corporations and, on the other hand, policies designed to protect their operations from arbitrary seizure or nationalization by the host countries.

For many years I have advocated the establishment of an international bank for stabilization of the prices of raw materials and industrial goods. The future of the developed and the developing nations depend on a new program and pact based on mutual trust, mutual interest and a fair and stable price for both raw materials and industrial products. The world is ready for a new but fair deal which would put an end to the exploitation of the developing nations and provide the developed nations with stable prices for their raw materials. It is wrong to blame the oil producing countries for raising the price of oil while in the United States during the last 3 years the price of wheat has gone up 300 percent, soybean 400 percent, sugar 500 percent, cotton 300 percent, and industrial goods 200 percent.

Developing countries should be convinced that they cannot exist without the technology, managerial skills, capital investment and agricultural and industrial products of the developed nations, and the developed nations must admit that without the cooperation of the developing nations and a systematic effort to bring together all the nations of the world in the search of solutions there could be no end to starvation, poverty, inflation, unemployment and recession.

Therefore, I believe that the United States today is faced with the greatest challenge in the history of this nation. It is my earnest hope that we can meet this great challenge with courage, confidence, humility and compassion.

PITY THE MAILMAN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we enter into the Christmas season which also coincides with the advent of winter weather, we too often take for granted the occupational hazards facing mailmen as they cover their mail routes. This point is very effectively made in an editorial of December 8, in the Homewood-Flossmoor Star Tribune serving West Cook County, Ill.

By working my way through college as a post office clerk-carrier, I can certainly attest to the practical emphasis of this very timely editorial:

[From the Homewood-Flossmoor (Ill.) Star-Tribune, Dec. 8, 1974]

Winter has its own unique brand of beauty, to be sure, but it also poses special problems for some people.

Among those who are understandably apprehensive about winter weather are individuals with jobs that require them to get around a great deal on foot, such as mailmen. Snow and ice make their job more difficult.

Last winter, according to area U.S. Postal Service officials, a number of mailmen were injured, several seriously, in falls on icy or snow-covered sidewalks.

Failure to keep sidewalks and other approaches to homes and places of business clear of such hazards can delay or even force suspension of mail delivery for an indefinite period. On rural mail routes, responsibility for clearing the area around roadside mailboxes rests with the boxholder, not the Postal Service. Mailmen are not required to leave their vehicles to make deliveries.

And now, with the holidays approaching, the volume of mail arriving at post offices is mounting daily. Keeping one's sidewalks free of ice and snow will be a big help in getting the mail delivered on time. Needless to say, mailmen will be grateful for the favor.

P.S.: So will the Star-Tribune carrier on the route!

#### PRICE-ANDERSON ACT SHOULD BE EXTENDED FOR SHORT PHASE-OUT PERIOD

### HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I hope that upon our return next month we will lose no time in the drafting and passage of Price-Anderson extension and revision permitting the insurance industry to organize effective and needed total coverage for all liabilities incident to the construction and operation of nuclear electric stations.

I regret that President Ford saw fit to veto the Price-Anderson Act passed last month by the Congress. In my opinion, it was a satisfactory fusion of the interests of those who wanted a 20-year extension and the modern view of, in my opinion, the larger majority of the American people that felt it was mandatory that the nuclear industry must insure itself if it is to be believed that it is now safe enough to carry on into the nuclear electric power expansion age.

I happen to believe that we have no route to go but to encourage nuclear power generation. I have defended it in all groups, including sessions of as many as a thousand of Ralph Nader's critical mass 1974 nuclear moratorium advocates.

I believe nuclear power generation is safe, is acceptable, and should be continued. But it will need, in my opinion, a responsible Price-Anderson extension for the interim period so that the private sector of insurance companies can begin coverage of pooled liability as for aircraft and fields where an occasional accident results in catastrophic damage and loss.

Nuclear power generation has an unsurpassable safety record, and the Government, by serving as guarantor for only a few more years will enable the energy companies, both public and private, to complete the funding for their own insurance reserves, at which point the Government coverage will expire.

It is my hope that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will lose no time with the introduction of this legislation at the outset of the 94th Congress.

#### RICHARDSON REMARKS WERE PERCEPTIVE

### HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a very perceptive and lucid speech given recently before the Washington Press Club by Elliot L. Richardson. With customary acuity, Mr. Richardson has located and defined a number of the problems confronting our people and our Government and, in the process, I believe, has suggested remedies that deserve the most serious consideration.

Because I know my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Richardson's remarks, I insert a copy of his speech in the RECORD at this point:

#### RESTORING THE HEALTH OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

(By Elliot Richardson)

Surely all would-be Republican party healers must at least agree on this: that, to put it euphemistically, the "New Republican Majority" must have fallen ill on the way to the polls; clearly the patient-party is not well. If there remains a political physician who is as yet unsure on this point, it must be for failure to have made a House call. Men of sober intelligence and concern can no longer pretend that there is serious question as to the illness; the question now is as to the means to restore health.

Practitioners of politics—if not their academic observers—know well that politics is not yet a science. Diagnosis and prescription are typically risky and frequently specious. But there is, nonetheless, an axiom here or there which provides useful guidance. One such is simply this: In general, elections reflect a look backward not forward. This is in some respects an unfortunate rule. It leads to what I often term "Magnet line" habits of would-be leadership—excessive attention to realities which have been overtaken by events. But it does at least provide a desirable incentive to incumbents: It suggests that they—or their party—will, in fact, be held accountable politically for their stewardship.

This simple—and largely reassuring—axiom of political accountability was exhibited dramatically in the recent Congressional elections. As most analysts agree, the elections were a retrospective judgment upon the quality of Presidential management. They were a vote on Presidential management of Watergate and of the national economy—and here there is disagreement only as to the proportional role of each.

Of course it was unfair, by and large, to hold Congressmen accountable for Presidential management. But the Congressional elections were the only available opportunity for a referendum on the Presidency—a referendum which a concerned electorate understandably did not wish to postpone for two years. The Congressional elections were a means of sending Washington a message—the only available electoral means, in fact.

It was unfair, similarly, to hold President Ford accountable for the actions of his predecessor. On the other hand, President Ford in his first ninety days had not fully succeeded in giving the public confidence that he had no need of an electoral message. With regard to Watergate, the timing of the pardon was disconcerting. With regard to the economy, the summit did serve to suggest a healthy new openness; but it heightened attention to problems without providing any assurance that a coherent approach to their

solution was in the process of being formulated. From the citizens' perspective, this meant that, in spite of the change of leadership, the message still had to be sent. And it was.

The message was sent with sufficient force to insure that it would be unmistakable. And concerned Republicans are now—in one way or another—offering prescriptions for party renewal. Some prescribe "communication" campaigns aimed at imagined—but invisible—majorities. Others would formulate a campaign based on running against the Congress. Some would-be healers prescribe a turn to the "right"; others prescribe a turn to the "left." But turning left or right will not effect a cure. Indeed, all such formulations are mistakenly conceived. One is reminded of the physician in the cartoon who prescribes: "Take one of these every four hours. If pain persists, see another doctor." And one wonders: Can the patient survive another dose of ill-conceived advice?

What voters want is performance. And—in accord with the axiom of retrospective accountability—what voters will judge is performance. The single most important variable affecting the health of the Republican party in 1976—the most important by far—is not likely to be talk of "left" or "right" or "middle" or even "old this" or "new that." The most important variable affecting the health of the Republican party is, to put the matter directly, the performance of the incumbent Republican President.

But having identified the key to recovery, one cannot leap to a favorable prognosis. For the President, these are—for any President these would be—very difficult times in which to perform well. It may be useful, however, to attempt to be clear about where the most significant difficulty does and does not lie.

Current fashion notwithstanding, it cannot in fairness be argued—at least not at this stage—that the principal difficulty lies in the written Constitution, habitual practice, practical necessity, and public expectation render inescapable the conclusion that the executive branch must be held primarily accountable for leadership in policy formulation. Only if the public is first convinced that the executive has managed this responsibility well, can the issue of Congressional responsiveness be joined. And even if Congressional responsiveness is viewed as problematical, the fact remains that the President enjoys a vast freedom of action which is largely independent of the Congress. This is true to a very considerable extent in the exercise of initiative across the board through the power of appointment; in integrative policy formulation and management through the legitimate coordinative activities of the White House staff; in regulatory and administrative policymaking domestically through Cabinet agencies; and in the management of foreign policy generally. The much-discussed "Imperial Presidency" was hardly intended as a reference merely to such symbols of power as the epaulets of White House policemen. The "Imperial Presidency" involved much actual, as well as symbolic, power. And although there have been some dramatic symbolic changes of late, there remains the fact of continuing, vast, real Presidential power. This would be the case even after a sensible readjustment of the Executive-Legislative balance.

The President's difficulty does not derive from a lack of adequate power. Rather, it derives from the complexity of the substantive problems to which the power must, in one way or another, be applied.

Among these complex substantive problems, I would include the following five as especially important—and especially difficult. I enumerate them without intending to suggest a priority among them; they are themselves interrelated.

A first—and certainly, to some, most obvious—problem is the problem of the economy in an increasingly interdependent world. I shall return to this shortly.

A second is the problem of foreign policy in a world of rapidly changing realities. It is a world of decreasingly tense "super-power" relations—in large measure because of the progress in strategic arms limitation managed by Presidents Nixon and Ford. But it is also a world of increasingly fluid pragmatic alignments; a world of increasingly wide rich-poor disparities; a world in which the calculus of power is increasingly complicated by the rising potential of economic weaponry, nuclear proliferation and terrorist blackmail; a world in which the elements of this calculus extend increasingly beyond the traditional narrow range of international actors. It is a world in which problems, by virtue of their increasing complexity, lend themselves less and less well to intermittent, ad hoc crisis or summit intervention—a world in which the need for improved, ongoing institutional problem-solving mechanisms grows increasingly apparent.

A third problem is the problem of equality—or at least some greater degree of fairness—in a world of increasingly limited resources. Neither at home nor abroad have we learned to manage either the ethical or the practical issues of the distribution of resources. As population grows, as expectations rise, as disparities in the distribution of resources become more evident, as economic development is limited by ecological concern and practical necessity, the distributional issues become more difficult. The temptation is to put them aside. Yet if we do not soon develop a humane and orderly set of policies to cope with inequity, we will surely be led to the more painful order which emerges out of violent instability.

A fourth problem—less obvious, perhaps—is the problem of continuity in a world of increasingly rapid "post-industrial" change. It is the problem of preserving the best of our humanistic traditions in the face of the "dehumanizing" pressures of industrialization, bureaucratization, "bigness," institutional heavy-handedness, depersonalization. Without serious attention to continuity—to a selective conservatism in the context of necessary change—we will only feel the more a sense of alienation, of purposelessness, of community lost.

In this respect, I might note that the habits of the "news" media are to some extent both a symptom and a cause of discontinuity. We are supersaturated with information which is typically provided without an integrative framework or perspective—provided, rather, as a form of distractive entertainment. Our sense of proportion is lost. Investigative journalists are our new historians.

Television anchormen are our historical dramatists. Indeed, the continued application of the anachronistic labels "liberal" and "conservative"—the misguided focus on turnings "left" or "right" which earlier I lamented—is but a symptom of the extent to which a proper sense of history and proportion is removed from "coverage" of the news. The issues which once divided so-called "liberals" and "conservatives" have been largely overtaken by events. So far as they remain, they are now largely secondary to emergent issues, for example, of confidence in our institutions, of rights to privacy, of respect for the individual in an increasingly homogenized society—issues for which the old divisive labels are neither appropriate nor helpful. It is hardly a constructive approach to the building of continuity when our political narrators—and, indeed, our political actors—are made to seem (or make themselves seem) like new dummies mouthing the lines of old ventriloquists.

A fifth problem is the problem of intelligibility in the face of increasing complexity.

This is perhaps the least obvious of the problems here discussed. But it is fundamental, nonetheless. For if we cannot comprehend reality, we can hardly expect to govern it—or ourselves—in a manner that would serve us well. Yet complexity may be outpacing the growth in our capacities of comprehension. It is growing exponentially—as a multiplier of population and economic growth. Systems grow upon systems. The simplest of interventions have complex—and often unanticipated—effects. Getting from point A to point B, for all our technological advance, in many respects grows more difficult.

But however we may yearn for a lost simplicity, these are not the times for the Great Simplifier. Complex problems understanding and, typically, complex solutions—solutions which are comprehensive in scope and strategic in their formulation and articulation. This is true not only for the problems identified here, but for virtually every significant problem facing our country today. It is true, in part, because of the inherent nature of modern problems—problems of many interconnected variables. It is true the more because people sense this interconnectedness and wish clearly to understand it in order to have confidence in the relevance and appropriateness of whatever actions are demanded. Without a sense of strategic confidence, an increasingly sophisticated public will, at best, remain skeptical.

It is a curious fact that one unintended consequence of Watergate seems to have been the loss of a sense of strategic comprehensiveness in our approach to major problems. Strategic thinking was a special strength of Richard Nixon's. In his first term—until the election campaign of 1972—he was remarkable for his appreciation of changing realities and for his formulation of strategies which were both adaptive and creative. In foreign policy, this was reflected in the Nixon doctrine and in the "linkage" policies toward the Soviet Union and China. In domestic policy, it was reflected in his early formulation of the "income strategy" and the "New Federalism."

Realities have, of course, changed since the first Nixon term. And, though we need especially a sense of coherent and well-considered strategy, we seem, rather, to be engaged in occasional struggles to catch up—piecemeal. I doubt this will do.

In another context, I might elaborate with reference to each of the problem areas I have touched on. Here I shall touch briefly on only the most topical of these problems; the economy.

As it has now become commonplace to observe, we are experiencing an odd—to many, a baffling—combination of inflation and recession. The bafflement, as far as I am able to discern, derives primarily from a conceptual failure to distinguish demand problems from supply problems and domestic problems from international problems. The fundamental reality not yet fully appreciated is that the current inflation problem is in its origin largely a special supply problem, not a general demand problem, and largely international, not domestic. Inflation in its present form, therefore, is not properly subject to treatment through conventional fiscal and monetary policies—these are better suited for treatment of aggregate domestic demand problems.

It is, of course, true that the inflation we are now experiencing was generated in part by fiscal and monetary policy—by excessive deficit financing in the period of the Vietnam war and by expansionary monetary policy particularly as late as 1972. But since 1972, monetary policy has been anti-inflationary. And, as the current recession would suggest, conventional counter-cyclical policy can still affect demand.

That inflation persists, however, is, as I

have suggested, a phenomenon largely independent of general domestic demand policies. About sixty percent of the current inflation, it is estimated, can be accounted for by two special international supply problems—food and fuel. An anti-inflation strategy, then, must focus specifically on these. For the long term, it must be oriented toward expansion of supply. For the middle and long term, it must—through foreign policy—develop more stable arrangements for the international distribution of key commodities. For the immediate term, the most sensible available adaptation—given that supply cannot be promptly expanded—is a specifically focused adjustment of demand. The obviously preferable specific focus for adjustment of demand is automobile fuel. This focused adjustment of demand might best be effected through a gasoline tax or through a tax on high-consumption automobiles. And because the tax might fall inequitably upon the poor, it ought to be linked with tax and welfare reform—with the "income strategy" which has regrettably dropped from view since 1972.

A first—and certainly, to some, most obvious. It is a time for clear, strategic policy: To counter inflation, a specifically tailored supply policy; to counter recession, conventional counter-cyclical fiscal and monetary policy; to counter inequity, a tax and welfare reform policy. This is not a time for laundry-list solutions.

The American people are more than ready for sophisticated approaches to problem-solving. Too often it has been assumed that the people are of lesser quality than, in fact, they are. Their sophistication and maturity were consistently underrated in the course of Watergate. It would be a mistake to underrate the people again.

Confidence in the economy is dangerously has to a considerable extent been restored. But the problem of confidence in the capacity of government remains to be addressed. People will respond favorably if complex realities are met with clear, conscious, coherent, and comprehensive strategies. But if not, the people will surely send another message.

For Republicans, the message of the moment is simply this: If the health of the party is to be restored, the health of the nation must be restored.

#### INDEPENDENT AMERICAN FILM INSTITUTE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, representing a district and constituency that are dependent on the film industry, I strongly believe in the intent and purpose of this bill—the creation of an independent American Film Institute to be under the direction of a board of trustees made up of representatives from the Federal legislative and executive branches of Government and the private sector.

Although the youngest of arts, film has become the most popular and important medium of today—not only in this country, but also throughout the world.

We, in America, have substantially and uniquely contributed to this valuable art form, and the time has come for the Federal Government to grant film its place among the great art forms of the world.

The American Film Institute would be responsible for preserving, expanding, recognizing, and developing films and programs of film study.

Since its establishment in 1967, the institute has preserved over 12,000 films, established a Center for Advanced Film Studies in Los Angeles, and opened the American Film Institute Theatre in the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Such a firm commitment reestablishes the fact that, as an independent agency, the American Film Institute will prosper and greatly contribute to the global cultural community.

In urging my colleagues to accept this measure, I would like to quote a close friend and former constituent, Mr. Charlton Heston, actor and present chairman of the American Film Institute:

We have only begun to see what film can do to enrich the lives and expand the opportunities for the American people . . . all the people. It will write the poetry of our time, and build bridges for us as well, to all the world.

#### DESTROY-TO-REVIVE FANTASY

### HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. Speaker, The Nation bears the dual burdens of inflation and recession. Prices continue to rise at record rates and it is estimated that unemployment may pass 8 percent next summer.

In the face of this economic chaos, President Ford seeks to press on the country half-baked remedies left over from the administration of Richard Nixon and Herbert Hoover. I commend to my colleagues the article by Sidney E. Weintraub, a University of Pennsylvania professor, who offers some provocative thoughts about, in his words, the President's "destroy-to-revive" economic policy. While we may not agree with all that Professor Weintraub says, his ideas are useful because they break with the past and offer new approaches to the problems we face.

The article follows:

#### THE DESTROY-TO-REVIVE ECONOMIC FANTASY (By Sidney E. Weintraub)

PHILADELPHIA.—The Democratic party can forget Herbert Hoover: President Ford promises a fresher identification with economic shambles. With a crumbling economy, Prosperity Around the Corner buttons may yet replace WIN.

Economic discussion has become spurious, with an eerie air of history repeating itself. A half century ago, the British "Treasury view" held that Government borrowing would siphon off funds destined for private enterprise, as if the moneys came from a stagnant pool.

Secretary of the Treasury William E. Simon has exhumed this myth, elevating it as a profound insight. What has not been explained is how more savings can enter the capital markets when incomes, the source of savings, are vanishing through unemployment.

An illusion is also being perpetrated that the budget can be significantly cut when prices jump by over 10 per cent a year. Merely to maintain existing programs will cost about \$30 billion more.

Our Treasury people have not discovered that prices fell in the early Roosevelt years despite huge 50 percent deficits. Flaying Government largesse makes virtuous political copy, but budget-balancing will not end the modern inflation.

Beyond these conceptual confusions at the Treasury, any appraisal of current Administration policy must conclude that it is madly inept: production falling, unemployment rising, prices surging. The Administration has gone far to make it the worst of times.

There is a claim that we must deflate—that we must tighten money and cut expenditures to compress inflation. There is the shallow pretense that inflation, and the Administration's pseudo-remedies, began yesterday rather than five years ago.

Can unemployment and falling production whip inflation? Hitherto, we have been taught that to subdue inflation requires more production. It is a callous policy farce to throw people out of work wittingly, and slow production, in order to hire them back at a later date to speed output.

Destroy-to-revise is a warped caricature of economic doctrine and strategy. Our housing deficiencies, the appalling state of our cities, and our woeful public transportation hardly signal a lack of useful work to perform.

If high-level employment and output are desirable next spring or next fall, why not now? Why are they meritorious for the future and an extravagance now?

The conventional rationalization of this absurd exercise in economic yoyolism is that it will stop inflation. By keeping money tight, creating a recession, and extending human misery, inflation is supposed to fade away. To prevent the inflation evil, we must inject the unemployment and lost-production virus.

It may yet dawn on the Administration, as well as the Democratic majorities in Congress, that regardless of the employment-unemployment level, inflation becomes inevitable so long as money incomes per employe mount faster than production.

Over the last year productivity has been falling by about 3 percent. Employe compensation has advanced by about 11 percent. How money income per employe—wages, salaries, interest, rents, dividends—can climb with productivity dropping, without the difference erupting in inflation, is the supreme economic feat on which silence reigns, by the Administration, Congress, labor unions, and advocates of tight money hocus-pocus as an inflation weapon.

Increases in employe money incomes along with declining labor productivity promise to perpetuate double-digit inflation. What monetary policy can do about it, besides creating unemployment and inviting a depression tailspin, is dubious.

If the Federal Reserve could prevent inflation it would long ago have succeeded, with the authorities grabbing off the kudos.

The last six years provide cumulating evidence that monetary policy can destroy the housing industry and lift unemployment without ushering in stable prices. What failed for Richard M. Nixon will not WIN for President Ford despite the learn-nothing ideology of Secretary Simon.

Restoring the economy will require moderation in money-income expansion, involving a new look at incomes policy covering wages, salaries and executive pay, as well as a tax cut and monetary easing at the Federal Reserve.

Should we not consider a handout to the auto industry? This may be cheaper than to watch it delay before building more functional vehicles. While Detroit writhes, the economy suffers.

#### IT IS TIME TO CUT TAXES

### HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert A. Mundell, a Canadian economist, believes inflation and unemployment are separate problems. In order to curtail these problems, we must enforce tight money and a \$30 billion tax cut. For my colleagues' information, I wish to insert the following Wall Street Journal article which further explains Professor Mundell's prescription to beat inflation and unemployment:

IT IS TIME TO CUT TAXES

(By Jude Wanniski)

Robert A. Mundell, a Canadian economist now at Columbia University, does not believe the United States can Whip Inflation Now and climb out of the deepening recession by harking to either the classical economic advice of tight money and balanced budgets or to the neo-Keynesian nostrum of easier money, public-service employment and wage-and-price controls.

The correct prescription, says Professor Mundell, is a \$30 billion tax cut and the temporary halting of open-market operations by the Federal Reserve to assure monetary restraint.

Furthermore, asserts the placid professor, whose voice in conversations rarely rises above a whisper—if this medicine is not taken soon, there will be by mid-1975 more than seven million or even eight million Americans unemployed, an inflation rate perhaps double the consensus prediction of 7% per annum, and a huge budget deficit arising from the recession-level tax revenues and widespread company and household bankruptcies.

Professor Mundell's prescription is obviously not part of mainstream thinking in the United States, but it bears consideration for no other reason than the 42-year-old Canadian's standing and reputation among international economists. "He's the most creative, innovative international economist I know of," says Harold B. Van Cleveland, vice president and economist at First National City Bank. Sir Roy Harrod, J. M. Keynes' biographer has toasted him as one of the "greatest economists in the world." And Lord Robbins, chairman of the court of governors of the London School of Economics, said of him at the Bologna conference on global inflation in 1971: "Bob—and here I lay down a sociological law—is seldom wrong. And even when you disagree with him, you must disagree with your hat in the hand."

The heart of the current problem, Mr. Mundell believes, lies in the international arena. Inflation is, and has been for several years, a global phenomenon. The collapse of discipline of the balance of payments has unleashed a wave of inflation on the world. He believes that the eventual solution must involve not only control of the dollar supply produced in the United States, but regulation of the Eurodollar market, the restabilization of gold and a return to the fixed system. With Professor Arthur B. Laffer of the University of Chicago, he has worked out an economic model to deal with this problem.

To deal with the immediate crisis of simultaneous inflation and recession, though, Professor Mundell departs from the traditional belief that monetary and fiscal policies should always be working in the same direction. He believes that inflation and unemployment are separable

problems and that to combat them distinct policy instruments are required. He believes that tight money should be used to combat the inflation, while expansive fiscal policies—preferably through lower taxes—can be used to combat the recession in a way that also works against inflation.

#### A CAUSE OF INFLATION

He argues that monetary expansion no longer works as a means of stimulating production; it simply causes inflation. To some degree and for short periods it may have been a reasonably good anti-cyclical weapon during the best years of the Bretton Woods system. But now, in the regime of floating exchange rates, monetary stimulation by the Fed not only increases wage demands, but is immediately perceived by the foreign-exchange markets, causing depreciation of the dollar and an automatic increase in the price of imports. This raises costs and aggravates inflation directly. It also raises wages and thus quickly shows up in the Cost of Living Index.

To eliminate at least this cause of inflation, he says the Fed should temporarily halt open-market purchases of government securities, the traditional means through which it increases the basic money supply. The thrust of demand expansion must come from fiscal stimuli, and when the U.S. economy responds to that stimulus, growth in the real money supply can come about through a resumption in open-market purchases. At the same time, the reviving U.S. economy would draw money from Europe and the Middle East and thus protect the U.S. balance of payments. Something else would occur as the economy's growth responds to the fiscal stimulus while monetary growth is checked. The dollar would appreciate against foreign currencies, which means the U.S. would then be able to buy a greater share of the world's goods and services with the same number of dollars.

Real economic growth would be stimulated by the big tax cut on both personal and corporate incomes. He would adjust income-tax brackets across the board and index them to correct for future inflation, as is now the practice in Canada, and he would get the corporate tax bite down closer to Canada's 40%.

"The level of U.S. taxes has become a drag on economic growth in the United States," he says. "The national economy is being choked by taxes—asphyxiated. Taxes have increased even while output has fallen, because of the inflation. The unemployment has created vast segments of excess capacity greater than the size of the entire Belgian economy. If you could put the sub-economy to work, you would not only eliminate the social and economic costs of unemployment, you would increase aggregate supply sufficiently to reduce inflation. It is simply absurd to argue that increasing unemployment will stop inflation. To stop inflation you need more goods, not less."

As it is, he believes U.S. policymakers are unwittingly creating a larger sub-economy of the unemployed guaranteed to reduce aggregate supply, and thereby aggravate inflation. A \$30 billion tax cut implies a large initial federal deficit. But if taxes are not cut now, the size of the unemployed sub-economy will expand. Tax revenues of state, local and federal governments will decline. At the same time their outlays for unemployment relief and welfare will expand. Combined government deficits might even exceed the amount implied by a tax cut. But what's worse, the nation would be no closer to turning the economy around.

He disagrees with both the Keynesians and the classical economists on the economic effects of a tax cut. "The Keynesians only look at its effect on demand and have

always considered it inflationary," he says. "They neglect the financing side, aggregate supply and inventory effects."

"The classical economists are only concerned about the 'crowding-out' effect," by which he means the effect of deficit financing on the private capital markets, i.e., government financing needs crowd out private borrowing that would otherwise go into capital expansion. "Both of these extreme views do not see that there is a middle position."

A tax cut not only increases demand, but increases the incentive to produce. "The government budget recycles tax dollars into the spending stream through expenditures, but in so doing it reduces the incentive to produce and lowers total production. After all, if total taxes and expenditures become confiscatory, all economic activity will cease and the government tax bite would be 100% of nothing." With lower taxes, it is more attractive to invest and more attractive to work; demand is increased but so is supply.

So too with the "crowding-out" effect, an argument against tax cuts that was popular in the 1920s. The government sale of bonds to finance a tax cut indeed crowds private borrowers out of the capital market. This is only one effect, he says. Four other things occur. Because capital and labor are the main recipients of the proceeds of the government bond sale that finances the tax cut, they are in effect receiving a gift \$30 billion they would otherwise have to borrow. In this sense, they are happily crowded out of the credit market.

Secondly, the finance required for the tax cut would be less than what would be needed if the recession is allowed to deepen. Third, Professor Mundell believes the size of the credit pool would automatically expand as the prospect of real economic growth engendered by the tax cut allows a recovery of real savings. That is, dollar holders will have a higher incentive to invest in capital goods the larger and more rapid is the recovery from the recession. The fourth effect is that the bond-sale method of financing the tax cut will draw money from abroad.

#### HELPING CAPITAL FLOWS

The international effects of a tax cut are particularly important, he asserts. With announcement of a major tax cut, the capital market would instantly perceive that it is more profitable to do business in the United States than the rest of the world. Capital that is now flowing out would remain; foreign capital going elsewhere would come in. The increased real economic growth would mean the U.S. would run a sizable trade deficit as the U.S. would keep more of what it produces and buy more goods from abroad. Offsetting this in the short run would be an inventory effect caused by tighter monetary conditions; the expectation of slower inflation would cause a reduction in optimal inventory levels.

There would be balance-of-payments equilibrium, he says, because the capital flows would cover any residual trade deficit until market opportunities were arbitrated worldwide. The U.S. tax cut would help to pull the whole industrial world out of its slump, he maintains.

In a real sense, he sees the \$30 billion tax cut as a future public's investment in the current private, productive sector of the economy that is now unutilized. He argues that the unemployed sub-economy would respond not only by producing goods and services sufficient to repay the bonds, but would meanwhile sustain itself with output and would not have to be carried by the government dole. Six months from now, perhaps \$30 billion of that potential output will have been irretrievably lost and the economy will be in much worse shape than it is right now.

As he sees it, there is not now any self-corrective economic force acting to pull the economy out of its inflationary nosedive. At

present there is no control of international reserves and even the value of gold gets indexed with inflation. "Inflation itself breeds even more money which in turn breeds more inflation." There was self-correction to an economic slump during the days of the gold-exchange standard, when deflation raised the purchasing power of gold, and self-correction to inflation when inflation reduced gold's purchasing power. There is none of this today in a world of floating exchange rates, he says. The nation's economic problems feed on themselves.

"They feed on themselves through the effects of inflation on the progressive income-tax schedules and through the negative multiplier effects thus generated," says Professor Mundell. "They feed on themselves through the ever-increasing percentage increases in wages needed to maintain workers' purchasing power. And they feed on themselves through the international escalation of world money supplies that has taken place since the breakdown of the gold-exchange standard. The \$30 billion tax cut is needed immediately to arrest the world slump, and if it is delayed by even one month, the figure required will be higher."

WCBS-TV SUPPORTS CALL FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION HEARINGS

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I requested authorization for oversight hearings by the General Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee into allegations by Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers in New York City, of widespread abuse in the city's bilingual education programs.

Mr. Shanker charged in a New York Times article that unqualified teachers are being hired for the program, that children are being enrolled in bilingual classes whether they need such instruction or not and against their parents' wishes, and that bilingual programs are replacing other specialized educational offerings in some schools.

Shanker's charges are so serious as to threaten to undermine public support for this necessary educational effort, and I am convinced that hearings must be held at the earliest possible date to provide a forum for the airing of these charges. If such allegations are indeed found to be true, then we must immediately correct any practices not in accord with the intent of Congress in providing Federal support for bilingual education. If the charges are not verifiable, then they must be discontinued so that this important program to help children of limited English-speaking ability may proceed with full impact and with the widespread public support it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, we have been clearly put on notice that abuses may exist in a program that the Congress extended and funded this year. Our responsibility to ascertain the facts is clear, and I believe that we must move quickly to dispel any unwarranted suspicions or, alternately, to make whatever improvements we

might find necessary in the interest of the best education for youngsters in the schools of New York City.

I am pleased to be joined in this endeavor by the editorial director of WCBS-TV in New York City who has seconded my request for hearings. The text of the editorial follows:

**BILINGUAL BATTLE**

(Presented by Peter Kohler)

There is a lot of controversy and confusion surrounding the idea of bilingual education.

Basically, the idea is to help children overcome language barriers. If a child can't understand English, bilingual education teaches him some subjects in the language he understands, be it Spanish, Chinese, or Greek. At the same time, though, bilingual education must mean teaching the child English, the language you must speak and understand to function in America.

Some people fear, though, that bilingual programs will neglect English instruction, and become a divisive force. These fears were heightened by Albert Shanker, president of The American Federation of Teachers. Recently, Mr. Shanker charged that bilingual programs in New York City were hiring teachers who could speak little or no English at all. And he also suggested that non-hispanic teachers who were well qualified were losing their jobs to less qualified hispanic teachers.

The Shanker charges brought an angry reply from New York City Congressman Herman Badillo, who called the statements inflammatory and unfounded.

We agree with Congressman Badillo that the charges may have raised unnecessary fears, because Mr. Shanker failed to document his statements. But the issues Mr. Shanker raised are serious indeed.

The whole idea behind bilingual education would be violated if teachers in the program could not speak English. And while bilingual programs provide a good opportunity to hire teachers from hispanic backgrounds and other ethnic groups, bilingual teachers should be hired on the basis of their language skills and ability to teach the subject matter, not on basis of their ethnic background.

If Mr. Shanker and others have evidence about flaws in these fast-expanding bilingual programs, let's get the facts out and act on them. We agree with Congressman Badillo that the House Committee on Education and Labor should hold hearings in New York City to get at the truth.

Reasonable people can act on facts, not on fears.

**DISMANTLING MA BELL**

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the suit against A.T. & T. opposes the effective and efficient service rendered to the American public, by Ma Bell.

Therefore, I was especially pleased to see the outstanding editorial that appeared in the Life newspaper chain, serving suburban Cook County, on December 1, which very appropriately addresses this issue. The article follows:

**DISMANTLING MA BELL**

Hundreds of small telephone companies are still operating in this country. Some of them have a central office, usually in a home, and service may not be of the best because

storms have caused destruction of telephone lines, so hook-ups may be in part along a barbed wire fence. Most of these archaic systems are in small towns of 5,000 or less population.

American Telephone and Telegraph Co., affectionately known as Ma Bell, put together a network of the larger telephone companies in some states and in some cases included several states in its effort to provide a better service.

Ma Bell provided a uniform system of its subsidiaries, maintained that system through a competent repair service, operated Western Electric Co. as its manufacturing arm to provide its main source of equipment at reasonable prices, and created Bell Telephone Laboratories to develop the most modern and sophisticated equipment possible.

The success of Ma Bell has made this country's telephone service the best in the world. Either by dialing or the more modern Touch-tone, a telephone user can reach points all over the world in less time than it used to take to give a central operator a number and then be connected to a local call.

The penalty for success in providing subscribers with the best telephonic communication is the attempt by the U.S. attorney general's office to file an anti-trust suit which seeks divestiture by Ma Bell of its Western Electric affiliate and possibly breaking up the manufacturing arm into two companies, splitting off the Long Lines Department, and opens the door for seeking to have Bell Labs become a separate corporate entity.

Though the case may not come to trial for five years, the first effect of the legal action was Ma Bell's cancellation of a \$600 million bond offering last week with the funds scheduled to be part of a \$10 billion expenditure next year for further improvement of its system.

At a time when hundreds of thousands are out of work because of the recession or strikes, the federal government steps in with an anti-trust suit to halt the efforts of Ma Bell to provide work for thousands of people.

With inflation driving prices up, the government doesn't want Ma Bell to take advantage of the manufacturing efficiency of Western Electric, which has proven that it can provide products at 70 per cent of what it costs to buy from competitors in the field.

The Hawthorne Works, which has just expanded and improved its cable-making plant in Cicero, is now supplying this item at 77 percent of what it would cost from other suppliers, some of which ship copper to Japan to be fabricated with the loss of more jobs in America.

This community and the state of Illinois have a lot at stake in the attempt to dismantle Ma Bell. Western Electric has 32,000 employees in its Illinois plants. There are 16,000 of them employed at the Hawthorne Works and half of these are from Berwyn and Cicero.

Then there are the side effects. Illinois Bell, an A.T. & T. affiliate, purchases \$265,000,000 of its requirements annually from Western Electric, purchases that would cost \$400,000,000 if bought from competitors. WE purchases various items from 5,300 Illinois suppliers, 80 of them from Cicero sources alone.

At what point will Ma Bell and its affiliates no longer be a "trust" that needs to be busted? Will the bureaucratic anti-business nincompoops be satisfied with the present objective? Or will they keep up the dismantling process until the phone companies number into the thousands with the loss of efficiency while costs keep rising?

Oil companies, nearly drowning in their swollen profits, are gobbling up unrelated businesses of major proportions. Huge conglomerates have assembled holding of major industries without restraint. Even a Federal Communications inquiry pays tribute to

Western Electric efficiency in a survey report involving a telephone rate inquiry. Maybe it's time for Congress to step in and call a halt to Ma Bell's proposed dismantling.

**WITH CHARITY FOR FEW**

**HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a column by Anthony Lewis on the catch-22 aspects of President Ford's amnesty plan. Mr. Lewis describes with insight and eloquence the unfair, discriminatory and, indeed, cruelly absurd situation confronting Vietnam deserters and draft evaders under the President's ill-conceived plan.

The column, which appeared in the New York Times on December 12, 1974, follows:

**WITH CHARITY FOR FEW**

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON—Joe Smith avoided the draft during the Vietnam war but does not know whether he technically broke the law or, if he did, whether the Government has any case against him. He is living a quiet life in Indiana now, but he worries that some day he could be prosecuted. If he does face that, he might rather take up President Ford's clemency program. So he decides to ask the Justice Department what his status is.

The department finds that he was never indicted or made the subject of an active investigation. But having been alerted by Joe Smith's question, it looks into his record at Selective Service. If the investigation turns up a case now, the department will proceed against him.

The Smith story is of course a fictional example, but it precisely reflects the Justice Department's policy under the clemency program. It is Catch-22 in action. The man who does not know whether he is in jeopardy puts himself in it by asking.

Moreover, the President's program is due to expire on Jan. 31. The man newly in jeopardy must decide before then whether to accept the "clemency" of up to two years' alternate service, or risk prosecution thereafter. And he must do so without having any real hearing to decide whether he violated the law in the first place.

All this is an acute example of the anomalies and contradictions that hobble President Ford's clemency program. It is not generally realized that there are three quite distinct operations in the program. They seem to be administered with distinct attitudes.

The Presidential Clemency Board, under the chairmanship of former Senator Charles E. Goodell, deals only with men who have already been punished—as deserters or draft evaders. The board keeps all information in confidence, and no one who approaches it can end up any worse off. Its function is to recommend conditional or absolute pardons.

The Defense Department handles the cases of military personnel who went AWOL and were never caught or punished. It has a final list of 12,500 such men and will tell anyone whether he is on the list without his risking being added to it. A man can wipe out his fear of capture and punishment by coming in and, in a day, getting an undesirable discharge. Of the 12,500, some 2,200 have so far come in.

The Justice Department deals with civilian draft evaders. It is authorized to drop all



threats of prosecution against anyone who comes in and accepts alternate service of up to two years. Only 131 men have, so far.

Justice evidently recognizes the value of some repose and finality in the unhappy area of draft offenses. It has instructed its prosecutors, the United States attorneys around the country, to prune their files of all draft cases except those clearly justifying prosecution. It also has a list—of about 4,000 men under indictment and another 2,200 who are the subject of active investigations.

But the list is not final. In the words of a department lawyer working on the clemency program, Bruce Fine, "the fact that your name is not on the list is no guarantee. The list is not a final determinant of all those who may be required to do alternate service"—or be prosecuted.

Mr. Fine saw nothing wrong with this approach. "I'm not terribly sympathetic to someone who escaped prosecution by accident," he said. Our feeling is that somebody ought not to get what amounts to unconditional amnesty merely because he has not been detected."

In that comment Mr. Fine inadvertently exposed the fallacy in the whole Ford clemency program. That is the notion that a fundamentally inequitable situation can be cured by ad hoc decisions for or against a few men.

There never was any equity in the way the law treated those who did not want to fight in Vietnam. By far the largest number got off legally, by luck or because they had better advice or were more articulate or were rich enough to go to college. Of those not legally exempted, many slipped quietly through the system. Only a few became declared fugitives. Among those caught, punishments differed widely.

There is no way to provide equal justice now for all those who avoided service and were treated so differently—or for those who fought, suffered and died. Nor are those Americans who committed crimes of war against the Vietnamese going to be brought to justice. No law will satisfy our sense of equity. All we can hope is to put the trauma behind us. That is the case for a genuine amnesty.

So few persons have responded to the clemency program that Mr. Ford will doubtless have to consider some further action after Jan. 31. His instinct has been right on this issue. This time he should recognize that complicated schemes to balance irreconcilable interests will prolong the agony of Vietnam. The purpose can only be what another President said after our most terrible war until Vietnam: "To bind up the nation's wounds."

#### CAN WE SAVE FREE ENTERPRISE?

### HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, America's free enterprise system is being destroyed. Sadly, a lot of people who ought to be fighting to save it are seemingly ignoring the threat.

Our national economy is already hamstrung with illogical regulations. Signs of more pernicious dangers are becoming increasingly obvious.

For a long time, most of us have dismissed calls for economic regimentation, nationalization, punitive taxation and other anti-free-enterprise proposals as ravings of the lunatic fringe. But now

such measures are often advocated by supposedly responsible elements of the media, academia and the Congress.

How can this be happening to America? This Nation's free economic system is a marvel. It has made possible material abundance beyond the dreams of earlier ages and peoples in less fortunate lands.

Throughout most of our history, free economic institutions have been recognized as underpinning of our free society, the bulwarks of other freedoms—religious, political, intellectual—that are the very essence of the American dream.

But over the years, we have gotten out of the habit of defending free enterprise. And our leaders are now ill-prepared to cope with the increasing clamor of anti-free-enterprise propaganda.

The misguided advocates of economic regimentation do not seem to realize the consequences of their schemes will be an economic catastrophe, signs of which are already evident. Nor do they apparently perceive the loss of economic freedom is almost certain to be followed by the loss of other cherished liberties.

Day after day, new proposals seek to restrict free market, control prices, wages, profits, business practices, and competition or to impose other forms of regimentation, reduce incentives for production, establish punitive tax policy or outright nationalization, proposals which ought to be greeted with howls of outrage are allowed to pass with scarcely a murmur of dissent—indeed, almost with an air of weary resignation—even by those who should know better.

So the antibusiness bias of Government, academic and the media is growing steadily worse. But still only a few voices are raised to defend free economic institutions, to explain why profits are good for everyone including customers and workers as well as managers and owners, the role of prices in allocating resources and fine tuning supply and demand, the fantastic economic efficiency of free enterprise and the failure of central planning and regimentation wherever it has been tried, the inseparable relationship between economic freedom and other civil rights, and other issues desperately in need of forceful advocacy.

In an era when the defense of economic freedom is so timid, it is heartening to read an article of such clarity and power as Henry Hazlitt's essay "Can We Keep Free Enterprise?"

Mr. Hazlitt, a noted economist, author, and editor, is well known to readers of the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Newsweek, the Freeman, and National Review, among some of the many publications for which he has frequently written. He is also the author of several books and is widely recognized for his economic expertise.

In the following article, Mr. Hazlitt says some things sorely in need of saying. I am grateful he has made his arguments with such precision and style:

#### CAN WE KEEP FREE ENTERPRISE?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Nine-tenths of what is written today on economic questions is either an implied or explicit attack on capitalism. The attacks are occasionally answered. But none of the an-

swers, even when they are heard, are ever accepted as conclusive. The attacks keep coming, keep multiplying. You cannot pick up your daily newspaper without encountering half a dozen. The sporadic answers are lost in the torrent of accusation. The charges or implied charges outnumber the rebuttals ten to one.

What is wrong? Does capitalism, after all, have an indefensible case? Have its champions been not only hopelessly outnumbered but hopelessly outargued? We can hardly think so if we recall only a few of the great minds that have undertaken the task of defense, directly or indirectly, in the past—Hume, Adam Smith, Ricardo, Malthus, Bastiat, Senior, Boehm-Bawerk, John Bates Clark; or of the fine minds that have undertaken it in our day—Ludwig von Mises, F. A. Hayek, Milton Friedman, Murray Rothbard, Hans Sennholz, Israel Kirzner, David McCord Wright, and so many others.

What, then, is wrong? I venture to suggest that no defense of capitalism, no matter how brilliant or thorough, will ever be generally accepted as definitive. The attacks on capitalism stem from at least five main impulses or propensities, all of which will probably be with us permanently, because they seem to be inherent in our nature. They are: (1) genuine compassion at the sight of individual misfortune; (2) impatience for a cure; (3) envy; (4) the propensity to think only of the intended or immediate results of any proposed government intervention and to overlook the secondary or long-term results; and (5) the propensity to compare any actual state of affairs, and its inevitable defects, with some hypothetical ideal.

These five drives or tendencies blend and overlap. Let us look at them in order, beginning with compassion. Most of us, at the sight of extreme poverty, are moved to want to do something to relieve it—or to get others to relieve it. And we are so impatient to see the poverty relieved as soon as possible that, no matter how forbidding the dimensions of the problem, we are tempted to think it will yield to some simple, direct, and easy solution.

#### THE ROLE OF ENVY

Let us look now at the role of envy. Few of us are completely free from it. It seems to be part of man's nature never to be satisfied as long as he sees other people better off than himself. Few of us, moreover, are willing to accept the better fortune of others as the result of greater effort or gifts on their part. We are more likely to attribute it at best to "luck" if not to "the system." In any case, the pressure to pull down the rich seems stronger and more persistent in most democracies than the prompting to raise the poor.

Envy reveals itself daily in political speeches and in our laws. It plays a definite role in the popularity of the graduated income tax, which is firmly established in nearly every country today, though it violates every canon of equity. As J. R. McCulloch put it in the 1830's: "The moment you abandon the cardinal principle of exacting from all individuals the same proportion of their income or of their property, you are at sea without rudder or compass, and there is no amount of injustice or folly you may not commit."

McCulloch's prediction has been borne out by events. Historically, almost every time there has been a revision of income-tax rates the progression has become steeper. When the graduated income tax was first adopted in the United States in 1913, the top rate was 7 percent. Some thirty years later it had risen to 91 percent. In Great Britain the top rate went from 8¼ to 97½ percent in a similar period. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that the confiscatory rates yield negligible revenues. The reduction of real income that they cause is certainly greater than the revenue they yield. In brief, they have hurt even the taxpayers in the lower brackets.

Yet envy has played a crucial role in keeping the progressive income tax. The bulk of the taxpayers accept far higher rates of taxation than they would if the rates were uniform; for the taxpayers in each tax bracket console themselves with the thought that their wealthier neighbors must be paying a far higher rate. Thus though about two-thirds (65.5 percent) of the income tax is paid (1969) by those with adjusted gross incomes of \$20,000 or less, there is an almost universal illusion that the real burden of the tax is falling on the very rich.

But perhaps the greatest reason why governments again and again abandon the principles of free enterprise is mere shortsightedness. They attempt to cure some supposed economic evil directly by some simple measure, and completely fail to foresee or even to ask what the secondary or long-term consequences of that measure will be.

#### TAMPERING WITH MONEY

From time immemorial, whenever governments have felt that their country was insufficiently wealthy, or when trade was stagnant or unemployment rife, the theory has arisen that the fundamental trouble was a "shortage of money." After the invention of the printing press, when a government could stamp a slip of paper with any denomination or issue notes without limit, any imaginable increase in the money supply became possible.

What was not understood was that any stimulative effect was temporary, and purchased at excessive costs. If the boom was obtained by an overexpansion of bank credit, it was bound to be followed by a recession or crisis when the new credit was paid off. If the boom was obtained by printing more government fiat money, it temporarily made some people richer only at the cost of making other people (in real terms) poorer.

When the supply of money is increased the purchasing power of each unit must correspondingly fall. In the long run, nothing whatever is gained by increasing the issuance of paper money. Prices of goods tend, other things equal, to rise proportionately with the increase in money supply. If the stock of money is doubled, it can in the long run purchase no more goods and services than the smaller stock of money would have done.

And yet the government of nearly every country in the world today is busily increasing the issuance of paper money, partly if not entirely because of its belief that it is "relieving the shortage of money" and "promoting faster economic growth." This illusion is intensified by the habit of counting the currency unit as if its purchasing power were constant. In 1971 there was a great outburst of hurrahs because the GNP (gross national product) had at last surpassed the magic figure of a trillion dollars. (It reached \$1,046 billion.) It was forgotten that if the putative GNP of 1971 had been stated in terms of dollars at their purchasing power in 1958 this 1971 GNP would have come to \$740 billion, and if stated in terms of the dollar's purchasing power in 1939 would have come to only \$320 billion.

Yet monetary expansion is everywhere today—in every country and in the International Monetary Fund with its SDRs—the official policy. Its inevitable effect is rising prices. But rising prices are not popular. Therefore governments forbid prices to rise.

And this price control has the enormous political advantage of deflecting attention away from the government's own responsibility for creating inflation, and by implication puts the blame for rising prices on the greed of producers and sellers.

#### PRICE CONTROL

The record of price controls goes as far back as human history. They were imposed

by the Pharaohs of ancient Egypt. They were decreed by Hammurabi, king of Babylon, in the eighteenth century B. C. They were tried in ancient Athens.

In 301 A. D., the Roman Emperor Diocletian issued his famous edict fixing prices for nearly eight hundred different items, and punishing violation with death. Out of fear, nothing was offered for sale and the scarcity grew far worse. After a dozen years and many executions, the law was repealed.

In Britain, Henry III tried to regulate the price of wheat and bread in 1202. Antwerp enacted price-fixing in 1585, a measure which some historians believe brought about its downfall. Price-fixing laws enforced by the guillotine were also imposed during the French Revolution, though the soaring prices were caused by the revolutionary government's own policy in issuing enormous amounts of paper currency.

Yet from all this dismal history the governments of today have learned absolutely nothing. They continue to overissue paper money to stimulate employment and "economic growth"; and then they vainly try to prevent the inevitable soaring prices with ukases ordering everybody to hold prices down.

#### HARMFUL INTERVENTION

But though price-fixing laws are always futile, this does not mean that they are harmless. They can do immensely more economic damage than the inflation itself. They are harmful in proportion as the legal price-c ceilings are below what unhampered market prices would be, in proportion to the length of time the price controls remain in effect, and in proportion to the strictness with which they are enforced.

For if the legal price for any commodity, whether it is bread or shoes, is held by edict substantially below what the free market price would be, the low fixed price must over-encourage the demand for it, discourage its production, and bring about a shortage. The profit margin in making or selling it will be too small as compared with the profit margin in producing or selling something else.

In addition to causing scarcities of some commodities, and bottlenecks in output, price control must eventually distort and unbalance the whole structure of production. For not only the absolute quantities, but the proportions in which the tens of thousands of different goods and services are produced, are determined in a free market by the relative supply and demand, the relative money prices, and the relative costs of production of commodities. A, B, C, and N. Market prices have work to do. They are signals to both producers and consumers. They tell where the shortages and surpluses are. They tell which commodities are going to be more profitable to produce and which less. To remove or destroy or forbid these signals must discoordinate and discourage production.

#### SELECTIVE CONTROLS—NO STOPPING PLACE

General price controls are comparatively rare. Governments more often prefer to put a ceiling on one particular price. A favorite scapegoat since World War I has been the rent of apartments and houses.

Rent controls, once imposed, are sometimes continued for a generation or more. When they are imposed, as they nearly always are, in a period of inflation, the frozen rents year by year become less and less realistic. The long-term effect is that the landlords have neither the incentive nor the funds to keep the rental apartments or houses in decent repair, let alone to improve them. Losses often force owners to abandon their properties entirely. Private builders, fearing the same fate, hesitate to erect new rental housing. Slums proliferate, a shortage of housing develops, and the majority of tenants, in whose supposed interest the rent control was imposed in the first place, become worse off than ever.

Perhaps the oldest and most widespread form of price control in the world is control of interest rates. In ancient China, India, and Rome, and nearly everywhere throughout the Middle Ages, all interest was called "usury," and prohibited altogether. This made economic progress all but impossible. Later, the taking of interest was permitted, but fixed legal ceilings were imposed. These held back economic progress but did not, like total prohibition, prevent it entirely.

Yet political hostility to higher-than-customary interest rates never ceases. Today, bureaucrats combat such "exorbitant" rates more often by denunciation than by edict. The favorite government method today for keeping interest rates down is to have the monetary managers flood the market with new loanable funds. This may succeed for a time, but the long-run effect of over-issuance of money and credit is to arouse fears among businessmen that inflation and rising prices will continue. So lenders, to protect themselves against an expected fall in the future purchasing power of their dollars, add a "price premium." This makes the gross market rate of interest higher than ever.

The propensity of politicians to learn nothing about economics is illustrated once again in the laws governing foreign trade. The classical economists of the eighteenth century utterly demolished the arguments for protectionism. They showed that the long-run effect of protective tariffs and other barriers could only be to make production more inefficient, to make consumers pay more and to slow down economic progress. Yet protectionism is nearly as rampant as it was before 1776, when *The Wealth of Nations* was published.

#### THE CONQUEST OF POVERTY

In the same way, all the popular political measures to reduce or relieve poverty are more distinguished for their age than for their effectiveness.

The major effect of minimum-wage laws is to create unemployment, chiefly among the unskilled workers that the law is designed to help. We cannot make a worker's services worth a given amount by making it illegal for anyone to offer him less. We merely deprive him of the right to earn the amount that his abilities and opportunities would permit him to earn, while we deprive the community of the moderate services he is capable of rendering. We drive him on relief.

And by driving more people on relief by minimum-wage laws on the one hand, while on the other hand enticing more and more people to get on relief by constantly increasing the amounts we offer them, we encourage the runaway growth of relief rolls. Now, as a way to "cure" this growth, reformers come forward to propose a guaranteed annual income or a "negative income tax." The distinguishing feature of these handouts is that they are to be given automatically, without a means test, and regardless of whether or not the recipient chooses to work. The result could only be enormously to increase the number of idle, and correspondingly to increase the tax burden on those who work. We can always have as much unemployment as we are willing to pay for.

At bottom, almost every government "anti-poverty" measure in history has consisted of seizing part of the earnings or savings of Peter to support Paul. Its inevitable long-run result is to undermine the incentives of both Peter and Paul to work or to save.

What is overlooked in all these government interventions is the miracle of the market—the amazing way in which free enterprise maximizes the incentives to production, to work, innovation, efficiency, saving, and investment, and graduates both its penalties and rewards with such accuracy as to tend to bring about the production of the tens of thousands of wanted goods and services in the proportions in which they are most demanded by consumers. Only free

private enterprise, in fact, can solve what economists call this problem of economic calculation.

#### THE PROBLEM OF CALCULATION

Socialism is incapable of solving the problem. The bureaucratic managers of nationalized industries may be conscientious, God-fearing men; but as they have no fear of suffering personal losses through error or inefficiency, and no hope of gain personal profits through cost-cutting or daring innovation, they are bound, at least, to become safe routiniers, and to tolerate a torpid inefficiency.

But this is the smallest part of the problem. For a complete socialism would be without the guide of the market, without the guide of money prices or of costs in terms of money. The bureaucratic managers of the socialist economy would not know which items they were producing at a social profit and which at a social loss. Nor would they know how much to try to produce of each item or service, or how to make sure that the production of tens of thousands of different commodities was synchronized or coordinated. They could, of course (as they sometimes have), assign arbitrary prices to raw materials and to the various finished items. But they would still not know how much or whether the bookkeeping profits or losses shown reflected real profits or losses. In short, they would be unable to solve the problem of economic calculation. They would be working in the dark.

The directors of a socialist economy would have to fix wages arbitrarily, and if these did not draw the right number of competent workers into making the various things the directors wanted produced, and in the quantities they wanted them to be produced, they would have to use coercion, forcibly assign workers to particular jobs, and direct the economy from the center, in a military kind of organization. The militarization and regimentation of work is what, in fact, Cuba, Russia, and Red China have resorted to.

#### RIISING EXPECTATION

We come finally to the fifth reason that I offered at the beginning for the chronic hostility to free enterprise. This is the tendency to compare actual state of affairs, and its inevitable defects, with some hypothetical ideal; to compare whatever is with some imagined paradise that might be. In spite of the prodigious and accelerative advances that a dominantly private enterprise economy has made in the last two centuries, and even in the last two decades, these advances can always be shown to have fallen short of some imaginable state of affairs that might be even better.

It may be true, for example, that money wages in the United States have increased fivefold, and even after all allowance has been made for rising living costs, that real wages have more than doubled in the last generation. But why haven't they tripled? It may be true that the number of the "poor", by the Federal bureaucrats' yardstick, fell from 20 percent of the population in 1962 (when the estimate was first made) to 13 percent in 1970. But why should there be any poor people left at all? It may be true that the employees of the corporations already get seven-eighths of the entire sum available for distribution between them and the stockholders. But why don't the workers get the whole of it? And so on and so on.

The very success of the system has encouraged constantly rising expectations and demands—expectations and demands that keep racing ahead of what even the best imaginable system could achieve.

The struggle to secure what we now know as capitalism—i.e., unhampered markets and private ownership of the means of production—was long and arduous. It has proved

an inestimable boon to mankind. Yet if this system is to be saved from willful destruction, the task of the incredibly few who seem to understand how and why it works is endless. They cannot afford to rest their case on any defense of free enterprise, or any exposure of socialism or other false remedies, that they or their predecessors may have made in the past. There have been some magnificent defenses over the past two centuries, from Adam Smith to Bastiat, and from Boehm-Bawerk to Mises and Hayek. But they are not enough. Every day capitalism faces some new accusation, or one that parades as new.

#### ETERNAL VIGILANCE—TRUTH NEEDS REPEATING

In brief, ignorance, shortsightedness, envy, impatience, good intentions, and a utopian idealism combine to engender an endless barrage of charges against "the system"—which means against free enterprise. And so the return fire, if free enterprise is to be preserved, must also be endless.

I find I have only been applying to one particular field and exhortation that Goethe once applied to all fields of knowledge. In 1828 he wrote in a letter to Eckermann:

"The truth must be repeated again and again, because error is constantly being preached round about us. And not only by isolated individuals, but by the majority. In the newspapers and encyclopedias, in the schools and universities, everywhere error is dominant, securely and comfortably enshrined in public opinion which is on its side."

Yet above all in political and economic thought today, the need to keep repeating the truth has assumed an unprecedented urgency. What is under constant and mounting attack is capitalism—which means free enterprise—which means economic freedom—which means, in fact, the whole of human freedom. For as Alexander Hamilton warned: "Power over a man's subsistence is power over his will."

What is threatened, in fact, is no less than our present civilization itself; for it is capitalism that has made possible the enormous advances not only in providing the necessities and amenities of life, but in science, technology, and knowledge of all kinds, upon which that civilization rests.

All those who understand this have the duty to explain and defend the system. And to do so, if necessary, over and over again.

This duty does not fall exclusively on professional economists. It falls on each of us who realizes the untold benefits of free enterprise and the present threat of its destruction to expound his convictions within the sphere of his own influence, as well as to support others who are expounding like convictions. Each of us is as free to practice what he preaches as to preach what he practices. The opportunity is as great as the challenge.

### THE CONFIRMATION OF NELSON ROCKEFELLER

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, next week we are expecting to vote on the confirmation of Nelson Rockefeller as Vice President of the United States. I and several of my colleagues have grave reservations as to the suitability of Mr. Rockefeller for this high office. My opposition to Rockefeller is based on his record as Governor of New York and his general philosophy of government.

At the request of several other members and myself the Republican Steering Committee prepared a paper on the Rockefeller record and his views on government. I would like to commend the fine job done by the steering committee on this paper and the research work they do on behalf of conservative Republican Congressmen.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will take some of these points seriously as they prepare to vote on this nomination. Therefore, I would like at this time, to read this paper into the Record.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that the Republican Steering Committee as an organization does not take positions on issues and this research is not to be interpreted as a view held by all members of Republican Steering Committee.

#### SEVEN REASONS WHY MANY CONSERVATIVES OPPOSE THE CONFIRMATION OF NELSON ROCKEFELLER AS VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

##### INTRODUCTION

The American Presidency—the engine of our government—is now in a unique position. For the first time in our history we have a President who was not elected by the people. For the first time in over 150 years we have a President who was not chosen as a candidate for either President or Vice President at the national convention of one of the major political parties.

Former President Nixon did have the wisdom of choosing as his Vice President under the 25th Amendment a man who at least was elected to the leadership of his party's Representatives in the Congress and who did and does enjoy the confidence of the great majority of our people. If the Republican party controlled the House of Representatives, Mr. Ford would have been the Speaker of the House and therefore would have become President if the 25th Amendment had not been ratified. In the case of President Ford therefore we do not have too great a departure from tradition.

The nomination of Nelson Rockefeller to the Vice Presidency, however, is necessarily the source of much more concern. The former governor of New York was an active candidate for the nomination of his party for the Presidency three times and three times he was decisively defeated for that nomination by the elected delegates of Republican voters. In all his many years of active politics, Rockefeller has been identified with one wing—a minority wing—of his party. He is regarded as a liberal Republican and has never had the confidence of the majority wing of the Republican Party, the conservative wing.

A large number of Republicans, perhaps a majority, as well as many independents and Democrats do not have confidence in Nelson Rockefeller and do not believe that he should now receive at the hands of one man the national office that he could never win at the hands of the people . . . despite many expensively-financed attempts.

These conservative Republicans oppose Rockefeller's confirmation for at least seven major reasons.

##### I. LACK OF POPULAR SUPPORT

In the latest Harris poll, taken in November only 39% of the American people approve of Rockefeller's nomination. 43% are opposed and 18% are not sure. The drop in Rockefeller's public standing since the beginning of the Congressional hearings is apparently due to public concern over two major issues.

According to that Harris poll, 47% of the American people believe there would be a conflict of interest if he were confirmed as Vice President because of his family's finan-

cial holdings and investments, 34% disagree with this view and 19% are not sure; 54% in the Harris poll do not believe that it was all right for him to give \$2 million as gifts and loans to people he appointed to high office. 28% believe it was all right and 18% are unsure.

In the unique situation in which we now find ourselves (having a non-elected President who replaced a man forced to resign from the Vice Presidency and then who went on to succeed another man who was also forced to resign from the Presidency) it is vital, if public confidence in our political institutions is to be restored, that our newly appointed Vice President be a man (or woman) who has the full and unquestioned support of the great majority of the American people. If Nelson Rockefeller at this time had the confidence of only 55% of the people it would be an undesirable situation; the fact that he apparently has the support of barely 40% of the people makes his position untenable.

According to another poll conducted by the American Conservative Union, Rockefeller's support among people who regard themselves as conservative is practically nonexistent. Only 11% of the 3000 ACU members polled said they favored the nomination. Since conservatives make up the largest part of what is still the major conservative party in this country, it seems difficult to justify the nomination of a man who totally lacks support in the majority wing of his own party.

#### II. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Although wealth (no more than poverty) should exclude no one from political office, Nelson Rockefeller is one of the very few Americans whose financial interest are so widespread that there is no conceivable way that conflicts of interests can be avoided. If, for instance, Rockefeller derived his wealth from one major source, such as automobile manufacturing, everyone would know this fact and any political judgments he made as Vice President or President which affected automobile manufacturing would be fully and fairly criticized by the press and public. Obviously, he would have to lean over backwards to avoid the appearance of favoring the Rockefeller Motor Corporation and that problem would then solve itself. The Rockefeller family holdings are so vast and so diversified, however, that there is practically no major part of our economy where Nelson Rockefeller does not have a financial interest.

The Rockefeller interests, directly and indirectly control between 8 and 10 million shares of Exxon, have a "substantial presence" in Mobil Oil, own all the preferred stock of Eastern Airlines, and hold at least 700,000 shares of the Chase Manhattan Bank which has branches in most countries of the world. In addition the Chase Bank through its own trust department, holds the largest single blocks of shares in United Airlines, Northwest Airlines, and Atlantic Richfield Oil, plus sizeable chunks of AT&T, IBM, Sperry Rand, Motorola, IIT, and so on.

As Senator Jesse Helms recently put it, "There is no way in which he can perform the duties of Vice President, or President, without laying himself open to the charge that his actions are tainted by the outlook or interests of the Rockefeller family dynasty. If the people had an opportunity to judge him in an election, the people could decide whether such a consideration should be decisive. But there is no way that he can take office under the 25th Amendment without that event appearing to confirm the hypothesis that the Rockefeller interests control the Nation, including the Congress. It is not fair to Mr. Rockefeller to put him in such an untenable position."

#### III. GIFTS TO PUBLIC OFFICIALS

In his testimony before the Senate Rules Committee, Rockefeller admitted that he gave

gifts totaling some \$2 million to 18 public officials over a period of several years. Several of the public servants were employed by the State of New York at the time. There is a New York state law which prohibits gifts of more than \$25 in value to state employees for the purpose of "influencing them in the performance of their professional duties."

Again, although there is no specific evidence that these very substantial gifts were intended to be bribes to insure the performance of particular acts that these officials otherwise would not have performed, there is no doubt that this pattern of philanthropic behaviour has caused uneasiness in the minds of many people. 54% of the people polled by Harris, as we have seen, disapproved of this conduct.

Rockefeller has shown in this behavior a basically cavalier attitude toward the law of his own state. Because he doubtless believed that he had no improper intentions he took it upon himself to ignore a very clear law against giving gifts of any appreciable value to state public servants.

In effect, while Governor, he decided by himself to pay certain favored state officials higher salaries than the people of New York wished them to be paid. It is a well-established principle in all democracies that the legislature, the people's representatives, must control the purse-strings of government. By unilaterally changing the official salary scale, at the very minimum, he usurped an important power of another branch of government.

Rockefeller himself has essentially admitted that this policy was wrong since he has promised he will not give valuable gifts (with the exception of ordinary Christmas presents, etc.) to any federal employee if he is confirmed as Vice President.

As Senator Jesse Helms has recently remarked on the floor of the Senate, "It is now plain that Mr. Rockefeller conducted a governorship in which the restraints of law and custom were subordinated to his personal style of governing. It is for New Yorkers to decide whether his policies were wise; it is for the rest of us to decide whether his style ought to be transferred to the Federal executive offices."

#### IV. EXCEPTIONALLY HIGH TAXES AND RISING DEBT IN NEW YORK STATE

Aside from matters of conflicting financial interests and possible personal financial impropriety, the Congress should carefully consider Rockefeller's public record as Governor of New York before voting on his confirmation.

It is not only logical but necessary to evaluate that record before passing judgment on his fitness for the Vice Presidency or Presidency. Many people believe it would be a profound mistake to elevate a man who has so over-taxed his own state as to cause it to lose businesses and jobs at an alarming rate. Obviously, if he could pursue such a high tax policy in New York he could well try to impose yet higher levies on the Nation as a whole should he become President.

The record here is very clear. In his years as Governor of New York Rockefeller increased the cost of state government by an almost unbelievable 400%.

From 1959 through Fiscal 1974, New York State's budget went up from Democratic Governor Harriman's relatively frugal \$1.9 billion to nearly \$9 billion. Under Rockefeller's money-devouring administration, state taxes were imposed or increased at least every other year: in 1959, 1963, 1965, 1966, 1968, 1969, 1971 and 1972. During his time in office, the maximum rates on the state income tax more than doubled, from 7 percent to 15 percent. Over the same period, the state gasoline tax went up from 4 to 8 cents a gallon, the cigarette tax from 3 to 15 cents per pack. A 4 percent state sales tax was imposed. In 15 years, the taxload of hard-

pressed New Yorkers early quintupled. According to the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., taxpayers in New York State are today the most overburdened in the U.S.

The bonded indebtedness of New York also increased 600% under Rockefeller. It is ironical that Rockefeller would have driven the state even deeper in debt were it not for the restraining influence of the State Comptroller, Arthur Levitt, a Democrat. Levitt has said, "Rockefeller and his staff fashioned devices whereby debt was imposed on the people without their vote. This was done despite the fact that the state constitution forbids the assumption of debt or guarantee of debt without the vote of the people."

The question naturally arises, will Rockefeller as Vice President or President be as cavalier with the laws and Constitution of the United States as he was with the Constitution of New York?

Levitt, in an interview with the American Conservative Union (Battleline, August 1974, p. 3), went on to comment that he disagreed strongly with Rockefeller's passion for building more and more buildings and thus pushing the state more and more into debt. "My feeling was," he said, "that with the rising inflation that began to be evident in 1966, 1967 and 1968 that it was improvident to embark upon huge spending programs beyond the capacity of our taxpayers to pay, expenditures involving huge borrowings, incurring debt that would extend many, many years into the future." Rockefeller maintained that since costs were increasing every year, it was wise to build now and thus escape higher costs in the future.

Of course, as Levitt has said, "This is the very essence, the very language and philosophy of inflation. My argument with him," Levitt went on to say, "was that although this might be appropriate for the private sector, even though I'd question its morality, for government to do this is a betrayal of the people."

Rockefeller's policy of tax and tax, spend and spend and elect and elect was popular with certain powerful vested interest groups which benefited (or thought they benefited) from inflation and debt. The construction unions, in particular, have long been pillars of Rockefeller's empire in New York State. For 15 years he ruled New York by forging an alliance of certain sectors of big business and big labor at the expense of the average taxpayer.

President Ford has said that our number one domestic problem is inflation, now running at about 12% a year. It is reported that, if Rockefeller is confirmed, the President will assign him the task of presiding over the administration's war on inflation. In view of Rockefeller's almost incredible record as a champion inflationist in New York, this would be tantamount to appointing the village arsonist fire chief.

#### V. LESS AND LESS JOBS AND MORE AND MORE WELFARE

As a direct result of Rockefeller's financially improvident policies in his home state, New York State lost 400,000 jobs during the years of his governorship. New York's share of the nation's manufacturing declined significantly during those years (from 11.2% to 9.2%). Many national companies moved to other parts of the country; thousands of businesses have fled across the Hudson to New Jersey since the cost of doing business in New York has become prohibitive for many industries.

At the same time the welfare rolls have grown larger each year until, in New York City alone, one out of every six persons is now a welfare client.

#### VI. WORLD FEDERALISM

Congressman John Ashbrook has recently pointed out that Rockefeller has long been an advocate of world federalism and that it

would be less than desirable to have as a President of the United States a man who believes in submerging the sovereignty of the American nation under some form of world government. "I find it somewhat ironic," Rep. Ashbrook has said, "that—as our country is preparing for its 200th birthday celebration—a man would be nominated as Vice President who believes the nation state is an anachronism and who espouses the principles of international federalism."

VII. TAXPAYER-GUARANTEED LOANS TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Rockefeller has also long been a proponent of trade with Communist nations, preferably subsidized by loans to Communist governments guaranteed by American taxpayers. Of all the questionable purposes for which our tax dollars are spent, surely one of the least excusable is to finance the shipping of U.S. technology and industrial plants to the Soviet Union—and this is a policy Rockefeller has favored for years.

CONCLUSION

As Congresswoman Marjorie Holt has put it, "It's a safe bet that a large majority of Republicans are unhappy with the choice of Nelson Rockefeller for the vice presidency. The party rejected his presidential ambitions in three past national conventions. I am unhappy with the choice, not only because it ignores the will of most Republican voters, but also because it fails to reflect the conservative mandate expressed by the American voters in the 1972 elections. President Ford is working so hard for consensus politics that he is risking an early alienation of conservative voters."

Congressman Steve Symms focused on the misgivings of many conservatives when he recently summed up his reasons for opposing Nelson Rockefeller's nomination. "Nelson Rockefeller," he said, "represents—in the mind's eye of most Americans—big government, big business, big labor, high taxes, the centralization of power and abrogation of liberty, which were all part of the Great Society, New Deal, paternalistic government approach which was soundly rejected at the polls in 1968 and 1972."

THE DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM FOR THE ECONOMY IS A RECIPE FOR SHORTAGES AND A RETURN TO CONTROLS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House unwisely reacted to the shortage of investment capital in this country by passing a \$2 billion emergency public employment bill which can only be paid for through higher taxes or increased inflation.

It was said in debate that this was an important feature of the eight-point program for our faltering economy, formulated at the Democrat's Kansas City convention.

I would like to point out to my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, who still believe in free enterprise, that the last part of the eight-point program is across-the-board wage and price controls. Have we not learned our lesson from the beef freeze?

As the Wall Street Journal correctly summed it up, all this is rather pitiful. It seems the Democratic Party can do no

better than return to the New Deal prescriptions which not only did nothing to end the depression, but which, when followed by Britain, drove the economy of that Nation into nationalization of over 60 percent of the industry.

What is even more pitiful is the support the Democrats are getting from Republicans who should know better, and who at one time helped our party stand for free market economics and the incentive system of private enterprise.

As we add more workers to the public payroll have we forgotten that one out of every six Americans in the labor force today works for the Government and as the debts and deficits pile up, the growth of the public sector further erodes the capital necessary to truly stimulate our economy and provide more jobs and better wages for American workers.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following editorials:

THE DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM

The eight-point economic program adopted by the Democratic Party at its Kansas City convention invites at least one word of commendation. It has forced us to realize how imaginative and effective, by comparison, is President Ford's WIN button as a means of dealing with the nation's economic problems.

We assume that those who drafted the program intended for it to be taken seriously as a blueprint for national policy, by the economically literate as well as economically illiterate. But we can find very little that anyone could take seriously, other than out of a sense of horror that a national party in 1974 would merely resurrect the discredited panaceas of the 1930s. The program could only have been conceived by a committee of party hacks sitting around trying to imagine what Franklin Roosevelt, John Maynard Keynes and Henry Wallace might have proposed.

They recommend a public-service job program in which the unemployed worker does not even have to look for a job in the private sector before becoming eligible for a government rake or shovel. "To assist faltering businesses," they would revive the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to channel credit subsidies to the worthy. The Federal Reserve and other federal lending agencies are invited to allocate credit away from "speculative ventures" to "productive enterprises." Taxes for lower middle income people will be lowered by closing "tax loopholes." Two birds are slain with one stone by ending "those tax incentives that encourage multinational corporations to export American jobs and capital."

To fight inflation, the Democrats reach back to World War II, with a few creative twists. "We support an across-the-board system of economic controls, including prices, wages, executive compensation, profits and rents. Provision should be made for wage catch-up and price rollbacks." And to insure that the controls are administered equitably, authority should not be given to the Republican President, but to a special council managed by Congress, which would vest it with "whatever monitoring and enforcement procedures are necessary." Gasoline should be rationed.

All this is rather pitiful. The Democratic Party, which once prided itself on being a magnet for the nation's intellectual elite, can do no better than return to the fetal position of the Roosevelt coalition. All that's missing is a Blue Eagle and a plan to pack the Supreme Court with appointees of the Democratic Study Group.

But why should any parts of this program work now, when they did not work when FDR tried them? After eight years of Roose-

veltian experiments with CCCs and RFCs, the U.S. economy was in no better shape than when the mess was inherited from Herbert Hoover. Nor did wage and price controls work much better in wartime, when administered by 300,000 bureaucrats, than they did when President Nixon tried them in peacetime. The program the Democrats now propose could not even be contemplated without also sealing off the U.S. economy from global trade. Otherwise all internal investment would grind to a halt, with capital fleeing abroad and with inventories exported at artificial prices.

The prescriptions of Kansas City are precisely the ones the British have followed in driving their economy into the ground. Sixty percent of all Britain's economic activity is managed in one way or another through the government, and the private sector continues to function only out of habit. There is no incentive to produce when what is produced is taxed away. If there is hope in the U.K., it is because the Labor Party has lately shown some small signs of turning away from the caricatured Keynesianism that has dominated British thinking—moving away from "incomes policies" and relenting on government taxation of the private sector.

The only other good thing about the Democratic package is that at the moment there is little chance the economy will be burdened with much of it. Congressional Democrats and organized labor went along with it at the convention only to preserve the appearance of party unity. "We aren't quite ready for all this yet," said George Mahon, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. If the day ever comes when they are ready for all this, there will not be much left of the U.S. economy.

ANALYZING SOVIET POLICY TOWARD THE WEST

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, with the recent announcement by President Ford on arms agreements with the Soviet Union, I think that it is important to understand Soviet policy toward Western Europe. The Soviet view of the two power blocs in Europe—their own and that of the United States and its allies—is an important consideration for American policymakers.

As Gerhard Wettig has written:

Soviet representatives have always stubbornly insisted, especially during negotiations, that the reality which is to serve as a point of departure can only lie within the framework of Soviet ideas. . . . Soviet design, on the basis of Soviet power, decides what can become reality. It is up to the Atlantic and neutral States to bring into play their own design on the basis of their own power in order to determine the shaping of political reality, and not leave the decision on the structure of East-West relations to the U.S.S.R. alone.

In regard to this view, which I think is correct, it is also important to remember the composition of what Wettig refers to as "the framework of Soviet ideas." Gerhard Niemeyer has explicated what this means. Dr. Niemeyer has stated:

Communists regard the present not as a status quo to be preserved, but as a period of transition in the revolutionary struggle

for a Socialist future. . . . The Communists are oriented toward a future which in no way resembles that of present-day democratic politics. . . . Their orientation toward the future causes the Communists to think not in terms of desirable solutions for present-day living, but rather in terms of an endless accumulation of power for the Party.

It is a serious mistake for any Western policymaker to neglect these fundamental insights into the nature of Soviet policy toward the West.

Too often free societies view the Soviet or Communist Chinese systems as simply other governments and societies with some type of goals as their own. This is both false and dangerous. False because the Soviets as explained before have a completely different outlook toward existence than do free countries. And dangerous because the misreading of Soviet intentions lead to Western policies which do not meet the Communist threat.

At this point I include in the RECORD an article from Osteuropa entitled "Soviet Policy Toward Western Europe":

SOVIET POLICY TOWARDS WESTERN EUROPE  
(By Gerhard Wettig)

The Soviet attitude to cultural exchange is inextricably linked with Soviet ideas about how countries belonging to the two power blocs in Europe are to coexist. The two levels of international coexistence and social struggle are strictly separated in both definition and practice. But closer examination reveals that one and the same policy operates on both levels and that the two sectors are only differentiated for reasons of convenience. Two separate methods of procedure have been adopted. They are based on the desire to avoid risks and the endeavour to maintain opportunities and, in the final reckoning, revolve around the same objectives.

Both theoretical statements about the sort of relations between "socialism" and "capitalism" and the Soviet Union's practical proposals at the European Security Conference reveal Moscow's desire to fix definite rules of procedure for the relationship between the two power blocs. Soviet propaganda stamps the defamatory cold war tag on all rival concepts which would lead to other rules of procedure in East-West relations. This invective is also directed against ideas of understanding, reconciliation or rapprochement between the two camps. The Soviet side also makes use of the argument that any type of reciprocal relations which appears undesirable to the USSR is at variance with "reality". Soviet representatives have always stubbornly insisted, especially during negotiations, that the reality which is to serve as a point of departure can only lie within the framework of Soviet ideas. The logic behind this standpoint is that Soviet design, on the basis of Soviet power, decides what can become reality. It is up to the Atlantic and neutral States to bring into play their own design on the basis of their own power in order to determine the shaping of political reality and not leave the decision on the structure of East-West relations to the USSR alone.

When the Soviet side wishes to fix specific rules of procedure for its relationship with the West, this is meant to result in the establishment of specific conditions applying to the increasing process of exchange between the two camps—for material cooperation and for the political struggle along with resulting contacts and communication. The conditions aimed for are naturally adapted to Moscow's requirements and wishes. Among these requirements and wishes is the declared aim that the Western class enemy should be gradually outstripped and vanquished. It is therefore a question of establishing within the

East-West relationship conditions granting the USSR and its camp a maximum of advantages and opportunities and a minimum of disadvantages and risks in the clash with countries possessing different systems. The States of Western Europe in particular are to be impeded as far as possible from asserting themselves politically against the Soviet side.

The nature of the conditions the Soviet Union would like to see established reveals the decisive problems. The Soviet concept of coexistence only permits a peaceful relationship between States while a militant relationship must prevail between societies. It is the declared assumption of Soviet political leaders that concentrating the clash on the social level will involve a maximum of disadvantages and risks for the Western side. Unlike the area over which the Soviet Union enjoys hegemony, the Western nations do not possess organisations on the social level which would combine and mobilise economic, cultural and ideological potential under the aspect of the East-West struggle on the social level or even guarantee a coordinated articulation of interests toward a third party. The pluralistic structure of State and society in the West offers a large number of targets for specific coordinated influence and divisive efforts on the East's part. From the Soviet viewpoint, this is a decisive factor of weakness which will be fully exploitable in a period of coexistence and detente.

#### STRENGTH FACTOR

But the West's pluralistic structure can also contain a factor of strength. As Moscow too clearly recognises, the manifold opportunities of economic and intellectual development in Western nations exert a powerful attraction on people everywhere, not least in Eastern Europe. Even where Western "seduction" is not effective, the Russians see the danger of the basic confrontation between East and West fading and of tendencies developing within their own camp for the other side's case to be considered. Western State and social systems could meet more understanding and tolerance, it is thought. Once the elimination of capitalism is no longer the aim of humanity, communism's international historic mission would be betrayed. At the same time, if this ideology's claim to represent universal liberty were to cease, there would be doubts about the justification for a strict system of Soviet domination which negates the opportunities of man's economic and spiritual development in order to carry through an ideology expressed in absolute terms.

Soviet leaders seek to neutralise the attractiveness of the Western pluralism of ideas and the Western pluralist model by all peaceful and violent means. Military intervention in Czechoslovakia after this country embarked upon a course of reform communism and the Police State's repression of the Soviet dissidents are striking examples. State security forces have the responsibility of deciding the battle on the social level within the Soviet sphere of dominion or, if possible, not allowing it to break out in the first place. Action by social organisations—such as the coordinated ideological campaigns by communist party apparatuses in the Warsaw Pact States—have no more than an auxiliary function. The social struggle is therefore a State matter wherever State power is controlled by the Soviet leadership and its stalwarts.

#### RUSSIAN CHANGE OF HEART

That was clearly revealed in connection with the European Security Conference when the non-communist States began to call for a somewhat freer exchange of persons, information and ideas between East and West. At first the Soviet Union was unwilling to discuss even the possibility of any social opening, that is to say a reduction of the protective barriers erected by the

State in the East. Eventually the Soviet Union expressed its readiness to accept an item on the agenda to this effect but has since insisted with unerring consistency that the Eastern European States should be granted unlimited control over every detail of the exchange procedure, which is to be closely restricted, painstakingly directed and robbed of all political effect from them very outset. State coercion is to inhibit all movement in Eastern European society. At the same time however Moscow claims the right to assert its political influence on Western society without restriction. The Western States are to renounce unilaterally the use of force in the social struggle. As repeatedly stressed on the Soviet side, these conditions should lead to political changes being possible only in Western societies. There should only be a question therefore of the West conforming unilaterally to "socialist models".

The Soviet concept of coexistence promises peace, that is the elimination of hostility and violence, in the sphere of international relations. Relations between States belonging to the Soviet sphere of influence are however excluded from the very outset by the pointer to the commandments of "socialist internationalism," in particular the Brezhnev Doctrine. Any member of the "socialist community" which does not act in complete agreement with the Soviet leadership in both foreign and domestic policy must expect sanctions on the part of the USSR and its allies which may culminate in the use of armed force. Occasional Soviet statements about the struggle against "peaceful counter-revolution" within the Warsaw Pact sphere justifying the risk of military conflict with NATO also indicate a reservation as regards the renunciation of force in East-West relations. Finally, the theory that the principle of peaceful coexistence does not apply to relations between colonialists and colonised, justifies when necessary Soviet support of parties in civil or colonial wars in the Western world. In specific circumstances, military force can therefore be a means by which the Soviet leadership weakens Western States or groups of States.

#### SUICIDAL VENTURE

As long as there is reciprocal second-strike capability, the military balance of power between the two major powers makes direct conflict between them and their allies a "suicidal venture", as a Soviet writer recently stated. An armed East-West conflict bringing States into confrontation with one another as consolidated units and therefore providing the basic conditions for the possible use of nuclear capacities is therefore to be avoided. But that does not mean that Soviet military power no longer has any function in international relations. "Not even in a period of detente are the socialist States willing to dispense with a sober appraisal of the balance of power." "A realistic approach to the question of the power balance" is seen as "necessary security for firm and lasting peaceful coexistence".

The USSR and its allies cannot of course "gullibly place their trust in their opponents in the class struggle", in other words the Western countries. The Soviet leadership therefore continues its programme of nuclear and conventional rearmament, especially in sectors where the Russians are superior and the West is reducing its capability. As a result of these endeavours, a "balance of power favourable to socialism" has now developed, it is stated in Moscow. This verdict is based primarily on the state of affairs in Europe. According to Soviet theories, the Western States are forced by their relative weakness to agree to the Soviet Union's ideas more than in the past.

The military superiority achieved is considered and employed as a factor of political strength. It can therefore be understood why

the Soviet leadership, even though it is not considering military employment of its forces in the foreseeable future, is continuing to increase its armaments and opposes the fixing of a balanced military relationship between East and West. At the strategic arms limitation talks (Salt) the Soviet side is trying to maintain and expand the quantitative lead it was granted as a result of its one-time qualitative inferiority, even though it has now caught up technologically. During talks on a mutual and balanced reduction of forces (MBFR) the Soviet negotiators are trying to make their Western partners agree to an arrangement which would increase the East's qualitative superiority in Europe. The official argument states that the balance of power favouring the East should not be reversed. From the Soviet view-point only increasing military superiority on the part of the East provides a guarantee that opposing forces will be kept in check and its own aims achieved by peaceful means.

#### SOVIET PROPOSAL

The Soviet proposal for multilateral renunciation of the use of threat of force between States of different systems indicates that military strength is not to be made politically effective by means of unqualified coercion. But military strength can also help influence international relations in different fashion. A power which possesses the ability to exert irresistible force in a specific sector and at the same time reveals its desire to push through its objectives against inferior countries will not generally need to make any express threat to emphasise its wishes. Those countries which need to fear possible armed conflict will probably consider it the lesser evil to step down in time and as a precaution eliminate any factor that could result in the outbreak of hostilities. This situation could arise in relations between the USSR and the States of Western Europe if the Eastern bloc was able to increase its qualitative military superiority in Europe or if it found itself in a position of power without a counterbalance due to possible estrangement between Western Europe and the United States. In this case it would be more than probable that Western European governments would see themselves forced to conform more and more to Moscow's wishes even though they might not be expressly faced by threats of force.

The Soviet side is evidently aiming at a development of this type. Even today Moscow's propaganda towards the West occasionally employs military superiority as an argument why European countries outside the Warsaw Pact should agree with Soviet ideas. The Western Europeans in particular are called upon to abandon the concept of deterrence and the preservation of military balance and cease the "confrontation" resulting from the existence of the Atlantic Pact. Western attempts to offer military opposition to the USSR in Europe are hopeless from the very outset in view of Soviet strength, propagandists claim. At the same time this policy leads to risks of instability and war which are untenable for Western Europe. As a way out of this situation it is suggested that the countries of Europe should found their security on the Soviet Union's renunciation of force and promise to preserve peace as the Soviet Union is the only power with sufficient military means to keep such promises. This concept of a hegemonial security guarantee for Europe would be furthered if a system of European liaison were to institutionalise political relations to the USSR for the continent's Western-oriented countries.

This is the way the Soviet leadership would like its proposals on "European security" to be considered. The USSR's foreign policy experts have long claimed that a system of collective security must be established in Europe. A network of Pan-European structures would therefore be superimposed on the alliances and partnerships currently existing

on the West and gradually take over the security and economic functions of these Western groupings. Nato, the Western European Union and the European Community would therefore lose the basis of their existence. At the same time Moscow looks upon the Warsaw Pact organisation as an instrument that will increase in importance as the process of detente progresses. The Pan-European agency for security and cooperation aimed for by the Soviet side at the current European Security Conference would determine and strengthen Western Europe's reorientation to an alliance with the USSR.

#### MISLEADING BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

A system of collective security is a basically dubious method of preserving peace. According to the basic idea behind this scheme, any member State attacked would always be able to rely on the support of other members. Accordingly, any victim of an act of aggression should have an overwhelming majority of the powers and superior power on its side. Therefore, the argument runs, the possible aggressor could not hope for success and would consequently be deterred from using force from the very outset. That is the theory. In practice, it is quite different, as the League of Nations experience revealed. Two basic assumptions are revealed to be misleading on closer examination. In a case of crisis, it is not clear to everyone who the aggressor is nor are States committed to support the country attacked willing to sacrifice their own interests. If a State has more ties with the aggressor than the country attacked, it will at most remain neutral.

Even those countries which advocate support in principle will first of all calculate the risks of action. As the roles of attacker and attacked are not always obvious, or at least exposed to propagandist distortion, a violation of commitments entered into can always be represented as conforming to the agreement by stressing the right facts.

Additional problems arise if the scheme of collective security in Europe is to guarantee peace between East and West. Among the European States the Soviet Union would possess military superiority and this state of affairs would still remain if the other powers combined. In these circumstances the Soviet Union would automatically assume the role of a protector and hegemonial power over all of Europe, it would not need to make allowances for other States in its actions and would at the same time become the decisive power in cases of dispute arising in other sectors. In the case of conflicts between Western and Eastern countries, it would have to be assumed the criterion used in defining the aggressor would be based on the Russians' ideological theory that "socialist States" cannot be guilty of causing the outbreak of armed hostilities in view of their social structure. The existence of the "socialist community" as an active alliance strictly regimented by the USSR (and based ideologically on what has become known as the Brezhnev doctrine) rules out varying action on the part of Warsaw Pact States in case of conflict from the very beginning. But a system of collective security in Europe would tend to weaken and eventually end the USA's security commitment.

#### AIM OF SOVIET COEXISTENCE

The envisaged security system would be an ideal means of achieving the gradual transition from "capitalism" to "socialism" that is an aim of Soviet coexistence. This would create a state of affairs on the European continent which would only allow the USSR and its allies to use military force in the pursuance of its aims. As a result, the Western nations of Europe would depend on Soviet goodwill and would therefore have to accept unreservedly Soviet conditions for the social struggle between East and West. The already existing one-sidedness of success prospects on both sides—the largely riskless chances of

intervention on the one side and hopeless defence risks on the other—could then be perfected and guaranteed.

One of the demands raised by the East in connection with the European Security Conference indicates the course that would be taken. Western governments, it is stated, should no longer use the excuse of Western freedom of opinion to shirk their responsibility for ensuring that the only influence emanating from their countries are in accordance with peace and morality. In other words, Western governments are expected to exercise censorship in their societies with the aim of preserving the States of the Soviet camp from the Western influences which are undesirable to the drafters of Soviet policy. In the event of Soviet hegemony over Western Europe it could be forecast without difficulty that Western governments would be requested to ensure that Eastern Europe was shielded against Western ideology and that pro-Soviet communist forces in Western societies should be guaranteed ideal operating conditions.

It is probably no coincidence that Soviet statements always contain reminders that "peaceful coexistence" and the rules of procedure governing this will have to be "imposed" on imperialism. Finally, the representatives of the Western system will be forced to accept the prospect of increasing suppression without being able to take countermeasures.

#### SOVIET POWER OPPORTUNITIES

The extent to which these Soviet ideas of "peaceful coexistence" materialise depend on the opportunities the state and the conduct of Western groupings offer the spread of Soviet power. The Soviet leadership is completely aware of this fact. It is always seeking to derive the maximum of advantage but is also willing to accept more balanced arrangements when the aim in sight has proved unattainable after long and stubborn efforts. Admittedly, the current crisis in the Atlantic alliance, Western European integration, Western self-assertion and democratic liberal awareness does not make Soviet modesty appear appropriate. Moscow therefore believes that there are good prospects for a programme of coexistence demanding from Western countries an unreserved social opening for enemy attacks, a far-reaching dismantling of instruments of military power and general confidence in the peaceful and harmless nature of Soviet policy, while prescribing for the Warsaw Pact countries strict measures to ward off Western influence, continuing consolidation of their military positions in Europe and a complete prevention of "misplaced confidence" in the West.

Current Soviet arguments skillfully take advantage of the West's weaknesses. Significantly, the theory of possible military inferiority on the Eastern side with which certain groups like to play down conceivable dangers from the East and encourage unilateral Western disarmament is not accepted. The existence of a large Soviet military force is not to be supplanted from the minds of the Western public in case the USSR's political proposals lose some of their weight. Instead, as Michail Voslenski recently wrote, Western deliberations must be based on the premise that Soviet military power is "not a threat to other countries but a factor in the preservation of peace". In other words, military superiority is not to be considered as alarming when it is in Soviet hands. Western Europe is to base its future security on this assurance. Michail Voslenski interprets signs of political disorientation in Western societies as proof that "this realisation" is beginning to be accepted in the West as well. It cannot be deemed possible, he adds rhetorically, that the Western Europeans were more worked up about bans on Sunday driving than the growing precariousness of the security situation, if there was such a thing. "What rational human being would consider

such a schizophrenic attitude of whole nations and States to be possible!" No—Western conduct could only be interpreted as evidence of "confidence in the peaceful intentions of the USSR". At the same time this is meant to display irrefutably the harmlessness of Soviet policy.

#### MILITANT NATURE OF RELATIONS

But Soviet commentators and politicians consider it quite certain that relations with the West will also have to be of a militant nature even if the conflict has to be restrained in certain aspects because of the risks existing and the USSR displays great interest in many of the West's economic and technological achievements.

During all practical cooperation resulting from Soviet needs, the Eastern camp's relationship with the West must therefore be determined by the awareness of an insurmountable antithesis and unrelenting militancy if "socialism" is not to give itself up. A large number of institutions deriving the justification for their existence from ideology are continually converting this ideological maxim into political action. Whenever Soviet interests demand measures of cooperation or a pragmatic renunciation of confrontation, these ideological tribunals have to subject this action to strict examination of the possible effects of this collaboration. The practical conditions and theoretical interpretation set out serve the aim of giving collaboration with representatives of the West the function of purely pragmatic conduct without any indication of partnership. The ideological and institutional structures of the Soviet camp aim at neutralising the politically psychological effect that could result from detente and cooperation between East and West so that the guiding light of militancy against the West can be upheld uncontested under conditions involving a renunciation of Cold War.

#### ELIMINATION OF WESTERN SYSTEM

The idea that the Western countries' system must be eliminated is an important determining factor in Moscow's long-term political considerations. This gives rise in particular to moral justification of a code of conduct which uninhibited pursues the East's own advantage and aims relentlessly at the elimination of other power blocs. As the East's own aims of dominion are coupled with its claim to ideological supremacy, the clash with the West appears as a bitter "struggle" or even "war", and never as "rivalry". In other words, the East is unwilling to recognize any rules which would grant the opponent a rise to advantages and opportunities and accordingly tend to restrict its own freedom of manoeuvre. It is more a question of refusing the other side as many advantages and opportunities as possible and at the same time warding off all risks and disadvantages which threaten one's own side. The more onesidedly the rules of battle favour one's own camp the better. An attitude of this type does not necessarily exclude the use of force. After all, it would appear to favour the opponent unjustifiably if the East were not to seize the certain chance resulting from the use of arms in a specific situation. Soviet adherence to a basically anti-Western attitude is therefore no basis for coexistence that would really be peaceful.

Coexistence between East and West is still burdened by political tension and the risk of the direct or indirect use of force. The factors inhibiting the use of military force result from the situation and not from a basic desire for peace. There is therefore only a guarantee of continued peace and detente if both sides continue to possess the political and military arsenals to convince the other side of the impracticability of uninhibited force as a means of resolving conflicts and if sufficiently balanced conditions of political confrontation within the societies arise so that the Soviet leadership no longer derives any advantage from its

militancy and in the longer term displays interest in an East-West relationship based on tolerance and understanding.

#### THE FEMALE EQUATION

### HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members the following excellent article which appeared in the November issue of the American Education magazine written by Kathryn G. Heath who is Assistant for Special Studies in the U.S. Office of Education:

#### THE FEMALE EQUATION (By Kathryn G. Heath)

Sixteen years before *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* by Mary Wollstonecraft was published in England, a Colonial woman on the other side of the Atlantic wrote a prophetic letter to a delegate to the Continental Congress in Philadelphia. The date was March 31, 1776—midway between the New Year's Day publication of Thomas Paine's *Common Sense* and the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

The author of the letter was Abigail Adams, wife of one future President and mother of another, who had learned to read and write without benefit of the formal schooling usually reserved for her peers of the opposite sex. Its recipient was her husband, whom she admonished:

"... in the new Code of Laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make I desire you would Remember the Ladies, and be more generous and favourable to them than your ancestors. . . . If particular care and attention is not paid to the Ladies we are determined to foment a Rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any Laws in which we have no voice or Representation.

A century later, however, and for almost a century after that, educational opportunities as well as laws remained considerably less than "generous and favourable" as far as "the Ladies" were concerned. Even so, there were some indications along the way that men might be forced one day to face the female equation.

An early sign arose in 1819 when Emma Willard issued *An Address to the Public; Particularly to the Members of the Legislature of New York Proposing a Plan for Improving Female Education*. A Magna Carta for the higher schooling of women, the plan called for public endowment of an institution that would offer systematized instruction having educational substance. The legislature proved apathetic but the citizens of the town of Troy came to her aid, and the Troy Female Seminary she founded in 1821 led to others. For example, Catharine Beecher, an early advocate of domestic science, opened a school in Hartford in 1822 and later the Western Female Institute in Cincinnati. An activist in what she termed "securing professional advantages of education for my sex equal to those bestowed on men," she sought to arouse the public to endow still other institutions for the liberal education of women.

In 1882, a different approach to the encouragement of female education began to unfold. Sarah Josepha Buell Hale, a writer who had been tutored by her Dartmouth brother, began to publish the new *Ladies Magazine*. Two years later Louis A. Godey started *The Lady's Book*, and in 1837—a landmark year as it developed—bought out his competitor and ensconced Mrs. Hale as literary editor. Her work quickly gained a national reputation for Godey. One of her

never-ending purposes and certainly her favorite reform effort was the education of females to become more than hearthside hostesses. Step by step through the years she campaigned for high schools for girls, promoted the idea of normal schools and colleges for women, even outrageously urged medical education for women at a time when such training was regarded as plainly inappropriate for "delicate souls." The conclusion of her editorial career of nearly a half a century marked the beginning of the upsurge in higher education opportunities for women throughout the land.

Far-reaching events other than the influence of *The Lady's Book* made 1837 a historic year for women. That was the year for realization of the dream and crystallization of the career of Mary Lyon, who wanted young women to have the chance to attend a seminary of superior academic quality at an inferior price. Against almost interminable discouragements, she raised funds through private philanthropy for a distinguished institution that offered its first instruction in 1837 and, in time, became Mount Holyoke College. That year also saw the inauguration of co-education at the college level, and three of the first four women for the four-year course received their B.A. degrees in 1841 from Oberlin Collegiate Institute.

Their matriculation proved, however, to be something less than a recognition of the principle of equality of educational opportunity for the two sexes, for they were barred from the study of Greek or Latin on the ground that the "rigors of these languages" were too great for the "female mind." Moreover, a gross disparity in timing was involved. The decision to establish the institution soon known as Harvard College was made in 1636, and the first class of "English and Indian youth"—meaning males—was admitted two years later. By contrast, 199 years were to pass before the first door was opened to baccalaureate degrees for women. And for that matter, it took another half century before Harvard's coordinate sister, Radcliffe College, offered instruction resulting in conferral (in 1894) of the first baccalaureate degree on a "Cliffie."

In any case, the early decades of the 19th century did at least see the first steps toward introducing women to organized secondary and postsecondary education, tentative though that introduction may have been. In addition, an alternative to privately financed education for women also had begun to emerge. A State law enacted in 1827 required towns of a certain size in Massachusetts to employ a master to offer "instruction of utility" to young lads, and towns of a larger size to broaden that instruction to include such subjects as Greek and Latin. To get their money's worth, these towns sometimes allowed girls to fill empty places in the classes. A more subtle but in the long run more significant development also occurred in Massachusetts in the form of laws enacted between 1827 and 1834 that required tax support for public schools and declared them free to pupils.

Ultimately this concept of universal tax-supported schooling was to give a dramatic new dimension to the principle of equality set forth in the Declaration of Independence, but that time was not at hand in 1840. Witness the Sixth Decennial Census conducted that year. At the instigation of Henry Barnard of Connecticut (later to be the first U.S. Commissioner of Education), statistics about schooling were included for the first time. Women, however, like blacks and Indians, were not considered in the enumeration of citizens over the age of 20 who could neither read nor write.

Similarly, women abolitionists were excluded from delegate participation in a World Anti-Slavery Convention held in London in 1841, even when they represented



antislavery groups composed entirely of females. For two of the women thus excluded, that action was the last straw. Said Elizabeth Cady Stanton to her friend Lucretia Mott. "When we return home, we must hold a convention and form a society to advance the rights of women." The result was the first women's rights conference the Nation had ever seen, convened in 1848 at Seneca Falls, New York.

And so it was that three quarters of a century after Abigail Adams made her prediction, the rebellion surfaced. The history of mankind, the delegates declared in their overriding "sentiment," is "a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her." Butressing this "sentiment" were 15 "facts" which they submitted "to a candid world." The one on education declared: "He had denied her the facilities for obtaining a thorough education, all colleges being closed to her." This statement was almost but not quite true. College doors already had opened to women, but by so small a crack that the 300 men and women at the Seneca Falls Conference evidently had not yet noticed it.

In any case the Abigail Adams rebellion had been launched, though numerous other developments proved to be necessary before it achieved substance or even significant recognition.

One such development occurred in 1862 while the Nation's Civil War was raging. President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act as the first of a series of Federal laws providing grants of land and other support for establishment and maintenance of what became known as the "Land-Grant" institutions of higher learning. None of these laws contained provisions specifically discriminating against females. Nevertheless, initial practice in the States often barred women from admission, and even after that situation began to be eased they were either excluded or else denied anything approaching equal access to programs in certain fields—forestry, law, and medicine, for example—on grounds that these were not "women's fields" or that women would not put into productive use the expensive training involved.

Still, the Land-Grant institutions did open up wider opportunities for women—not only in these institutions but in an array of private institutions of higher learning, including many women's colleges established primarily in the East. As Mary Woolley put it during her Mount Holyoke College presidency, the era of expansion from about 1875 until the first World War was marked "by an advance in the education of women such as the world has never seen." Moreover, with the incentive thus established to prepare more students for higher education, schools below collegiate level began to be created at an accelerated rate, and females were the incidental beneficiaries.

Meanwhile, the Civil War brought a fresh examination of Congressional power under the Constitution to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States." There ensued a new exploration of the scope of power at Federal level and of those areas—education was one—involving concerns and issues that transcend State lines. One consequence was a memorial to the Congress resulting in legislation enacted March 2, 1867, and establishing what was to become the U.S. Office of Education. It was created, according to language in the law, to "aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country."

Henry Barnard, the first Commissioner of Education, immediately developed a Plan of Publication calling for a series of studies of what he saw as some of the major educational issues confronting the Nation. One was entitled "Female Education, with an account of different seminaries for females in

this country and in Europe." The subtitle was a telling clue to women's contemporary educational and employment status. Seminaries were at a lower level than colleges, and those seminaries open to women did not offer training in such "men's fields" as the ministry, law, medicine, agriculture, and the mechanical arts.

Shortly thereafter (in June of 1867) the Commissioner issued a Circular Respecting Female Education, seeking current information from leaders in education at home and abroad. Though the leaders were men, Commissioner Barnard's initiative was of no small moment to the women's rights movement. This particular request inaugurated the Federal practice of routinely collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data on the educational status of girls and women. It also established the foothold for Federal action in the evolution that was to make the national Government a partner, albeit an often reluctant one, in the rebellion Abigail Adams had foreseen and the Seneca Falls Conference had launched.

One such development occurred in 1909 with the convening of the first in a series of White House Conferences on Children and Youth. Out of that initial meeting came, in 1912, the establishment of the Children's Bureau, whose work in getting States to outlaw child labor served to supplement an Office of Education drive to encourage compulsory school attendance throughout the land, with girls again being incidental beneficiaries in both cases. Seven years later the Secretary of War, impressed by the contributions of local women's groups in meeting the Nation's needs in 1917-18, authorized some special funds to stimulate attendance at a conference held in St. Louis in 1919 which resulted in the founding of The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs. Indignant over the prevalent attitude that the education of girls was less important than that of boys, the Federation mounted as one of its early programs a nationwide campaign, carried out through State and local clubs with the cooperation of leaders in education, to encourage girls to stay in school beyond the eighth grade.

The following year, 1920, brought some landmark advances in the drive for women's rights, again with action at the Federal level. June 5 marked the establishment of the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor, with responsibility for formulating standards and policies to promote the welfare of wage-earning women. Its early studies made official what women already knew: Regardless of how much education they had, they occupied the low rungs on the employment ladder. Then on August 26 came the addition to the Constitution of the 19th Amendment, enfranchising women nationwide—72 years after such action had been called for at the Seneca Falls Conference and 50 years after the antislavery 15th Amendment recognized the right to vote for "citizens of the United States" (a term that did not extend to females, as Susan B. Anthony demonstrated when she was arrested and convicted for trying to enter a polling booth in 1872).

Momentous though the 19th Amendment was, the celebration of that breakthrough was considerably dimmed by the fact that women as individuals still were excluded by the Supreme Court from coverage by the 14th Amendment, adopted in 1868 and prohibiting "persons" (interpreted as males) from being denied "due process of law" and "equal protection of the laws." A case in point was that of Myra Bradwell in 1872. Though she had duly been educated in law, an Illinois statute was used to deny her the right to practice. The United States Supreme Court upheld the State law and refused to apply the 14th Amendment in her case, though it did so in employment suits involving males, including alien men. It was, in fact, not until

1971, in *Reed v. Reed*, that the Court began to change its stance.

Winning the right to vote was nevertheless a major victory for women, but it was one of the last they were to claim at the national level until World War II. They continued, of course, to make progress on their own. Despite accumulating evidence that females were treated as second-class citizens by the schools and colleges, when war clouds broke over the horizon in 1939 the United States could claim the lion's share of the best educated women in the world. In the military and in civilian capacities ranging from Rosie the Riveter to entrepreneur, they won the Nation's respect. But not to the extent, as individual leaders and various women's groups insistently pointed out, that they were treated on an equitable basis with men. In education, for example, male faculty members received far higher salaries than their female counterparts, men overwhelmingly dominated the ranks of school administrators, countless women were snubbed by professional schools.

Winds of change finally began to blow with the establishment in 1961 of the President's Commission on the Status of Women and a followup drive by The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs to organize similar commissions at the State level, a move that ultimately resulted in formation of the Interstate Association of Commissions on the Status of Women. It was not until March of 1963, however, that the modern women's liberation movement was launched by the publication of *The Feminine Mystique*, a book that established Betty Friedan as the Thomas Paine of the rebellion Abigail Adams had called for nearly two centuries earlier.

This call to action was followed in October by American Women, the report of the President's Commission and the first effort to produce a composite picture of the status of women for purposes of national policymaking. The report called, for example, for a drastic revision of the structure of education so as to provide for "practicable and accessible opportunities, developed with regard for the needs of women, to complete elementary and secondary school and to continue education beyond high school . . ." Less than a month later President Kennedy established an Interdepartmental Committee and a Citizen's Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and not by coincidence Congress shortly thereafter authorized the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and for continuing education in the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Such advances were accompanied, however, by a noteworthy setback involving the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As women leaders were quick to point out, though this controversial legislation was strong in prohibiting discrimination in public education on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin, it was silent on sex discrimination. Thus, they said, educational institutions could and did continue to discriminate against girls and women in admissions, the right to take particular courses, and opportunities for scholarships and fellowships. Moreover, women performing educational duties in educational institutions were exempted from coverage under the equal employment opportunity provisions of the law, thus affirming such existing practices as lower pay for women than for men, fewer opportunities for promotion, and poorer fringe benefits. These injuries were in turn compounded, the women felt, when the related Executive Order 11246—issued the next year—ignored sex discrimination under thousands of Federal contracts with schools and colleges and under federally assisted construction contracts.

Number 11246 was destined to become one of the more noted of the Executive Orders that are issued from time to time, for it attracted the particular attention of the various new activist groups that were coming

into being. One of these was the National Organization for Women, more familiarly known as NOW. Founded in October of 1966, NOW was the first of what soon became an array of vigorous organizations established to fight for women's rights, and its members promptly selected Executive Order 11246 as a primary target. Lobbying their case with the Department of Justice, the Civil Service Commission, the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and the White House itself, they were able just 12 months later to point with considerable satisfaction to Executive Order 11375, which amended its predecessor by adding a prohibition of discrimination by sex.

That was no small victory, for the revised Order was the first (and for a time the only) Federal mandate bearing on the situation. Although some observers initially may have seen this administrative fiat as little more than a palliative to some irate females, its potential was to be made clear by another of the new activist groups—the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL). Organized in November of 1968, WEAL jolted academe 14 months later by starting to file specific and class action charges against hundreds of institutions of higher learning in virtually every section of the Nation, accusing them of discrimination by sex and relying on the amended Order. In the following year, and again relying on the revised Order as its authority, came another sweeping attack, this time by the newly established Professional Women's Caucus, organized to cut across the professions and thus assure a spectrum of expertise in activities aimed at opening up educational and professional opportunities for girls and women. Charges by the Caucus were directed at all law schools having Federal contracts. In total, more than 2,500 accredited institutions of higher learning found themselves under class action charges.

Thus did the drive for women's rights gain momentum, leading to a number of additional advances at the Federal level. In mid-1970 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Civil Rights notified its regional directors that "investigations of sex discrimination must be a part of all compliance review, and . . . all affirmative action plans in the future must address themselves to overcoming matters of sex discrimination."

Meanwhile, encouraged by Republican Congresswomen, President Nixon in 1969 had appointed a Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities. Out of the recommendations contained in its subsequent report—*A Matter of Simple Justice*—came such developments as the appointment of the first woman counselor to the President and the establishment of an Office of Women's Programs in the White House; extension of the jurisdiction of the Commission on Civil Rights to include sex discrimination; additions to equal pay provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to cover executive, administrative, and professional employees, including teachers; and establishment of a Women's Program Staff in the Office of Education. Also sparked by the report were establishment of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Women's Rights and Responsibilities and appointment of a task force in the Office of Education to examine and advise on the impact on women of programs administered by the Department as a whole and the Office of Education in particular.

By application of such administrative pressure, the women's rights movement was achieving change, but the pace was frustratingly glacial. It was time, the women's groups and their supporters determined, to renew their efforts along that most characteristically American route to redress of grievances—through legislation. Thus as the Nation entered its bicentennial decade, a concentrated drive was launched to achieve through new legislation the equity that the inertia of custom and tradition denied.

Among the landmark Federal legislation enacted thereafter was an amendment to

the Public Health Service Act adopted in November of 1971 which forced some 1,400 schools and training centers in medical and other health fields to open their doors as wide to women as to men—as a condition for further Federal financial assistance. Beyond its more visible impact, this legislative breakthrough brought home what was quickly recognized as a guiding principle. As Carnegie Corporation President Alan Pifer put it, "Without the threat of coercion it seems unlikely higher education would have budged an inch on this issue. Certainly it had every chance to do so and failed."

Then an organized lobbying blitzkrieg in the 92nd Congress by women's groups and their supporters proved successful—after 49 years of struggle—in winning endorsement by both houses of the Congress of a joint resolution proposing an Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution. "Equality of rights under the law," it declares, "shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." Final action on the resolution calling for the amendment, which now is in the hands of the States for the necessary 38 ratifications, came on March 22, 1972.

Two days later the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 broadened the purview of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to include persons (a word that now at last includes women) employed by States and their political subdivisions and those employed in educational activities in private as well as public educational institutions.

Three months after that came the Education Amendments of 1972, a far-reaching act that included a legal blockbuster on behalf of girls and women. With specified exceptions, it declared, "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Since the great majority of schools and colleges do in fact receive such assistance, and want to continue doing so, the recently proposed Federal regulations for carrying out this act charts a level of change not far from revolutionary.

From these major legislative advances—and from other legislative action that is filling in the gaps, from an array of court decisions and consent decrees, and from the vigorous campaign to win ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment—come the signs that the female equation will one day be brought into balance. That day may not be just around the corner. Nevertheless, as the Nation prepares to celebrate its 200th anniversary, it is reasonable to expect that the rebellion which Abigail Adams sought to foment in 1776—like the one her husband then was engaged in—will be crowned with success.

#### REBATES ON AIR FREIGHT

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the amendment bans solicitation or acceptance of rebates by shippers of airfreight. At this time the giving thereof is illegal. But foreign-flag carriers with fair regularity offer financial incentives, rebates, and so forth, to American shippers.

Other statutes relating to other carriers on land and water now prohibit this practice, but CAB has no power to halt this practice, soliciting and accepting rebates by American suppliers.

The amendment I offer conforms the law relating to air carriers and air ship-

pers to the law now in effect as to other modes of transportation.

In effect, the amendment would add the provisions of H.R. 17047, introduced earlier by me, to the legislation before us.

Pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the RECORD a letter from the Civil Aeronautics Board in support of the provisions of H.R. 17047 and so the provisions of the amendment, which explains the need for, and the working of the amendment. The letter follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,

Washington, D.C., December 13, 1974.

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,

Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for the Board's views on H.R. 17047, a bill "To amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit the solicitation or acceptance of rebates by shippers of property in air transportation, and for other purposes."

Section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. 1373(b)) prohibits air carriers and foreign air carriers from granting rebates, and carriers engaging in such practices are subject to criminal penalties under section 902(d) of the Act (49 U.S.C. 1472(d)).

H.R. 17047 would amend section 403(b) so as to prohibit shippers of property in air transportation and certain other specified persons from soliciting or accepting rebates. Persons violating the prohibitions would be subject to the section 902(d) penalties.

Rebating is a serious problem for a number of reasons. One is that it enables some shippers to obtain advantages that others do not enjoy. Another is that rebating can have material and detrimental effects on the financial health of the carriers, and ultimately on the air transportation system. The Congress itself has recognized the serious difficulties that rebating can cause by forbidding the carriers to engage in the practice and by imposing criminal penalties on them for violations.

Shippers of property by rail, motor and water carriers are made subject to penalties by various provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1) and the Elkins Act (49 U.S.C. 41(3)) for soliciting or accepting rebates. In addition, shippers by ocean carriers are subject to penalties under the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. 815) for engaging in similar practices. The Board understands that inclusion of these statutory prohibitions has operated as a deterrent against shippers seeking rebates.

In view of the foregoing, the Board supports the enactment of H.R. 17047.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. TIMM,  
Chairman.

FARM BUREAU PRESIDENT WARNS AGAINST NEW GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY, BLASTS OSHA

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 13, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I was very impressed with a recent speech by William Kuhfuss, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. In an address to the National Association of Independent Insurers, Kuhfuss warned that the creation of new Government bureaucracies such as the Consumer Protection Agency could result in new highs in the cost of living. Kuhfuss stated:

Every new government agency swells the already bloated federal payrolls, puts a new burden on the taxpayer, and adds to the cost of doing business. These increased business costs are passed on to the consumer in higher prices.

Kuhfuss also had strong criticism for one bureaucracy that is already in existence—the Occupational Safety and Health Administration—OSHA. He pointed out that some OSHA regulations demonstrate a lack of practical knowledge of farming operations. Although OSHA regulations waste many hours, they achieve little in safety. Kuhfuss went on to say:

Farmer, who constitute only 4.4 percent of the U.S. population, have had an almost impossible job in challenging some of OSHA's unrealistic regulations which have handicapped agricultural producers in meeting record food needs. Farmers and ranchers have taken many hours from their production jobs to appear at OSHA public hearings. Proposed regulations on some mandatory safety requirements on farm machinery, for example, reveal considerable lack of knowledge of the practical applications involved in farm operations. Of equal importance is the waste of time, manpower, and resources in relation to the achievement of increased safety.

I agree wholeheartedly with Kuhfuss' sentiments. I had doubts about OSHA when it was first proposed and I voted against its final passage in the House.

My doubts have certainly been confirmed. Farmers and businessmen are being forced to comply with more and more OSHA regulations—regulations that are difficult and costly to meet.

It is time that Congress moved to cut bureaucratic redtape. Rather than creating additional Government bureaucracies, Congress should thoroughly review the ones that are already in existence.

Following is an article on Kuhfuss' speech from the November 25 edition of the Farm Bureau News:

**KUHFUSS WARNS—LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS FOR NEW CONGRESS COULD CAUSE NEW HIGHS IN LIVING COSTS**

The cost of living could climb to new highs under federal legislation scheduled to be introduced in the 1975 session of Congress, a national farm leader warns.

The warning came from William J. Kuhfuss, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in an address to the 29th annual meeting of the National Association of Independent Insurers.

"Consumers should be alert to legislation which would establish a new super government bureaucracy to be imposed on top of

all existing federal agencies, intervening in all regulatory activities of each agency, saddling business with new red tape, and adding to the cost of their operations," Kuhfuss said.

"Every new government agency swells the already bloated federal payrolls, puts a new burden on the taxpayer, and adds to the cost of doing business. These increased business costs are passed on to the consumer in higher prices."

Kuhfuss said that the legislation set for introduction in the 1975 Congress calls for the establishment of a Consumer Protection Agency. Such a bill was killed September 19 in the Senate with Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina leading the opposition. Senator Ervin's retirement places Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut as chairman of the Senate's Government Operations Committee. Senator Ribicoff was the author of the original Consumer Protection Agency bill.

"Some might think that Farm Bureau is not interested in consumer legislation because farmers are not thought of as consumers. This is a common misunderstanding. Modern farm families are not only consumers of food, housing, clothing, and other goods and services necessary for family living, but they are also major consumers of industrial products used in farm production. Farmers buy one-fourth of all the trucks produced in America, 10 percent of the U.S. petroleum output, and five percent of the nation's steel products.

"Farm Bureau believes that government standards of quality, safety, health, and labeling have an important role in protecting consumers and we already have a wide range of more than 45 federal regulatory agencies operating in this and other areas of public concern.

"Such a list, to name a few, would include the Food and Drug Administration, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Power Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Federal Communications Commission, and many others. To keep up with all federal regulations and proposals, the government issues a Federal Register almost daily that sometimes runs to 100 pages and requires a team of lawyers to interpret.

"If these agencies are not doing a job for consumers, as some proponents of the Consumer Agency legislation contend, it is hardly likely that creation of another 'super agency' will be of much practical value except to provide more government jobs and more income for lawyers.

"It is difficult to estimate how much proliferation of new regulatory agencies—such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration—has slowed the U.S. economy, both industrial and agricultural,

and has added to the cost of everything from cars to food. The top example of the inconvenience and increased cost imposed on the driving public was the ignition interlock safety belts on cars. Congress exhibited good common sense in revoking this regulation because of the united and militant resistance to 'Big Brother' dictation. But how many other orders arbitrarily imposed on consumers can gain sufficient support to achieve revocation?

"Farmers, who constitute only 4.4 percent of the U.S. population, have had an almost impossible job in challenging some of OSHA's unrealistic regulations which have handicapped agricultural producers in meeting record food needs. Farmers and ranchers have taken many hours from their production jobs to appear at OSHA public hearings. Proposed regulations on some mandatory safety requirements on farm machinery, for example, reveal considerable lack of knowledge of the practical applications involved in farm operations. Of equal importance is the waste of time, manpower, and resources in relation to the achievement of increased safety.

"Agricultural producers know from experience the tremendous cost of government bureaucracy. For some 40 years, farmers and ranchers were subject to the self-defeating controls of a federal farm program that put a ceiling on market prices and opportunities and cost taxpayers billions of dollars. Today, agricultural producers are relatively free of such controls only to discover new problems created by federal regulatory agencies," Kuhfuss said.

The farm leader said he favored the proposed study by the Administration of the inflationary effects of the federal regulatory agency operations such as Interstate Commerce Commission regulations on transportation.

"There is merit in such a study and I would hope it is started as soon as possible. At the same time I would hope that the new Congress will cooperate in cutting government spending and balancing the budget," Kuhfuss said.

On no-fault insurance legislation, Kuhfuss reported that Farm Bureau favors the continuation of state, as opposed to federal, regulation of the automobile insurance industry.

"In AFBF's statement this past July before the House Interior Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, it was made clear that Farm Bureau does not oppose the concept of no-fault," Kuhfuss said.

Discussing the availability of adequate crop insurance to farmers and ranchers, Kuhfuss said that the Farm Bureau has recommended that the federal crop insurance be converted to a reinsurance program.

"Our policy states that such a program be sound actuarially, and premiums should be adequate to include reasonable charges for administrative expense.

## SENATE—Monday, December 16, 1974

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, as we undertake the tasks of a new week, we beseech Thee to support us in all wise endeavors for this Nation. Give us the courage to

change the things that can be changed, the serenity to accept the things that cannot be changed and the wisdom to know the difference.

While we toil through Advent days, may we be star-led to the ancient stable and the manger where truth became incarnate. May we follow the example of the wise men of old and hear again the timeless refrain: "The government shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor,

the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 14, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.