to authorize cost-of-living increases in such benefits and in State supplementary payments, to prevent reductions in such benefits because of social security benefit increases, to provide reimbursement to States for home relief payments to disabled applicants prior to determination of their disability, to permit payment of such benefits directly to drug addicts and alcoholics (without a third party payee) in certain cases, and to restore to recipients of such benefits their right to participate in the food stamp and surplus commodities programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENHOLM:

H.R. 17646. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to authorize the transmission, without cost to the sender, of letter mail to the President or Vice President of the United States, to Federal executive departments and agencies, or to Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES:

H.J. Res. 1177. Joint resolution to extend the expiration date of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Ms. COLLINS of Illinois:

H. Res. 1510. Resolution expressing concern for the safety and freedom of Valentyn Moroz and Leonid Plyushch; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

[*Omitted from the Record of Dec. 13, 1974*]

592. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Italian-American Labor Council, Inc., New York, N.Y., relative to the energy crisis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

[*Submitted Dec. 16, 1974*]

593. Also, petition of Dr. Roy S. Wilson, Atlantic, Iowa, and others, relative to congressional pay increases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 17409

By Mr. CONYERS:

Page 29, line 14; page 30, line 24; page 31, lines 7, 21, and 24; page 34, lines 14 and 23; page 36, lines 9 and 12; strike out "Act" each time it appears and insert "chapter" in lieu thereof.

Page 29, line 23; and page 35, line 12; strike out "the Act" each time it appears and insert "this chapter" in lieu thereof.

Page 31, line 25, strike out "request" and insert "requests" in lieu thereof, and on page 32, line 1, strike out "allowance" and insert "allowances" in lieu thereof.

Page 37, line 12, strike out "of which sum up to $25,000 shall" and insert "to" in lieu thereof.

Page 37, line 14, strike out "each Federal judicial district" and insert "Federal judicial districts" in lieu thereof.

Page 38, line 12, strike out "title" and insert "chapter" in lieu thereof.

Page 39, line 15, strike out "indictment" and insert "arraignment" in lieu thereof.

Page 34, line 1, strike out "3168" and insert "3170" in lieu thereof.

Page 35, line 13, strike out "3169" and insert "3171" in lieu thereof.

Page 37, line 6, strike out "criminal justice advisory".

Page 36, line 8, strike out "criminal justice advisory".

Page 29, line 17, strike out "criminal justice advisory".

Page 32, begining on line 17 and ending on line 18, strike out "rule 46(g) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure" and insert "the provisions of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure relating to the supervision of detention pending trial" in lieu thereof.

Page 37, beginning on line 14 and ending on line 15, strike out "and to the Superior Court of the District of Columbia,".

Page 38, line 5, insert "Federal" immediately before "criminal offense".

Page 38, beginning on line 3 and ending on line 4, strike out "or judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia,".

Page 48, line 9, insert "Federal" immediately before "criminal offense".

Page 31, strike out lines 18 through 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

gathering and monitoring information and statistics, by which the district court, the United States attorney, the Federal public defender, if any, and private attorneys experienced in the defense of criminal cases, have expedited or intend to expedite the trial or other disposition of criminal cases, consistent with the time limits

Page 31, immediately after line 13, insert the following new subsection:

"(f) Plans adopted pursuant to this section shall, upon adoption, and recommendations of the district planning group shall, upon completion, become public documents.

Page 31, beginning on line 11 and ending on line 12, strike out "twelve-calendar month period" and insert in lieu thereof "and subsequent twelve-calendar month periods".

Page 32, line 21, strike out the period immediately after "classifications" and insert "; and" in lieu thereof.

Page 32, immediately after line 21, insert the following new paragraph:

"(8) the incidence of, and reasons for each thirty-day extension under section 3161 (b) with respect to an indictment in that district.

Page 32, line 18, strike out "and".

Page 9, line 15, reinsert the comma immediately after "calendar".

H.R. 17409

By Mr. CONYERS:

Page 45, line 20, insert "and with the apsert "GS-16" in lieu thereof.

Page 45, line 20, insert "and with the approval of the Attorney General" immediately after "Courts".

Page 47, strike out line 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) As used in sections 3146-3150 of this chapter—

"(1) The term 'judicial officer' means, unless otherwise indicated, any person or court authorized pursuant to section 3041 of this title, or the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, to bail or otherwise release a person before trial or sentencing or pending appeal in a court of the United States, and any judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; and

"(2) The term 'offense' means any criminal offense, other than an offense triable by court-martial, military commission, provost court, or other military tribunal, which is in violation of an Act of Congress and is triable in any court established by Act of Congress.

"(b) As used in sections 3152-3155 of this chapter—

Page 48, line 15, strike out "Sec. 302." and insert "Sec. 202." in lieu thereof.

Page 48, line 18, strike out "Sec. 303." and insert "Sec. 203." in lieu thereof.

Page 49, line 3, strike out "Sec. 304." and insert "Sec. 204." in lieu thereof.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COLUMBUS RESIDENT VISITS RHODESIA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 years, Americans have witnessed an almost unprecedented propaganda barrage against Rhodesia. This smear campaign has attempted to brand Rhodesia as an oppressive police state, stamping out the freedom of an unhappy population. So offensive are its policies, critics would have us believe, that Rhodesia is unworthy of U.N. membership and should be treated as an outcast among nations.

I cannot agree with all the actions of the Rhodesian Government. I would like to point out, however, that there is another side to this question than is generally presented in the media.

An American visitor may be surprised to discover that, despite all the adverse reports, Rhodesia is a peaceful, prosperous, and progressive nation. This view is given by Stelio M. Stelson, a resident of Columbus who has been touring Rhodesia. To help set the record straight on Rhodesia, following is a letter by Mr. Stelson that appeared in the November 23 edition of the Dispatch:

VISITOR TO RHODESIA DISCLAIMS ACCOUNTS OF POLICE TYRANNY

TO THE EDITOR: I am writing from Salisbury, the capital city of Rhodesia.

Americans are being told constantly by much of the printed media, television and, of course, the U.S. State Department that Rhodesia is a most unhappy country with terrible tension between blacks and whites.

Rhodesians, they are told, groan under a police state tyranny.

What rubbish! What lies!

I find Salisbury a clean and beautiful city. Blacks and whites go about their business without any sign of tension. The few policemen I have seen perform their duties unarmed. The opposition can say what it has to say without fear.

As far as the white opposition goes, it did not get any members elected to the Rhodesian Parliament but that was the choice of the white voters. There are black voters who elect black members of Parliament (there are 16 in a House of 66).

Salisbury is a pleasant place, and it's safe. One can walk about the city day and night. Of course, as any Rhodesian will tell, there is a certain amount of crime as in every city and town, but it's nothing to worry about or to cause fear.

For some reasons I cannot understand, lies are being told about Rhodesia which has done nothing to upset any other country. There is a certain amount of segregation. The whites and blacks live in separate areas; government schools and hospitals are segregated.

If Rhodesians want it that way, why not?

However, the big hotels cater for all races.

There is no law about this. It is entirely up to the managements to decide what is in their best business interests.

Since 1966 the United States has joined with the United Nations (U.N.) in imposing economic sanctions with the intention of destroying Rhodesia. There is no other word for this criminal aggression against an inoffensive small country.

However, these sanctions have failed. In 1965 there were 656,000 blacks in paid employment, excluding those employed by other blacks in the rural areas. Today there are 909,000 in paid employment.

In 1965 agricultural output by whites was $140.3 million and by blacks $34 million. In 1973 the whites produced $247.3 million and the blacks $64.1 million.

Mineral output in 1965 was $63.9 million and in 1973 $135.9 million.

This will show Americans and, hopefully, the U.S. State Department, how ineffective sanctions have been.

I should also relate that the Rhodesian currency has not been devalued and the rate of inflation in Rhodesia is much less than in the U.S.

This is a happy, peaceful country in spite of terrorist actions in a small northeast area. It's a prosperous country, yet the administration in the U.S. is trying to destroy it.

Rhodesia, of course, is staunchly anti-Communist and anti-Socialist and the economy is based on private enterprise.

Can those be the reasons we Americans are trying to pull down its capable and incorruptible government and replace it with an untried, inexperienced, black one that would probably lead to the military dictatorship or one-party tyranny found in most of the black-ruled African states?

STELIO M. STELSON,
Columbus resident.

MRS. JENALEE D. NIVENS—THE BEST IN THE HOUSE

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest things about ending 30 years and 7 months of service in this distinguished body is the farewell that must be said to old and trusted friends. I would like to refer today, Mr. Speaker, to an old and highly respected friend who is not a Member of this body but who has served it well and faithfully—I refer to my administrative assistant of many years, Mrs. Jenalee D. Nivens.

Mrs. Nivens joined my staff on March 15, 1957, working under my late administrative assistant, the great Mr. George B. Buchheister. On George's sudden passing in April 1961, she took over the top position on my staff and has remained there ever since. As the office workload and staff expanded over the years she never once faltered in her ability not only to cope with but to become better and better at what she was doing. I am sure that many of my colleagues know the worth of a good administrative assistant; I for one know it and add that I was extremely fortunate in not only having a good one, but a great one. Since June 6, 1944, I have had only two, both great, the best on Capitol Hill.

Faithful is a word we sometimes throw around somewhat lightly here but when I think of Mrs. Nivens the word really takes on added emphasis. I think of the long hours, the weekends worked, the sudden trips to my district in Brooklyn, the missed vacations and the countless arduous, and many times unnoticed, tasks that she has performed without question. I think, too, of loyalty when I think of Mrs. Nivens and how she has never once wavered. I think of how many times over the years she has protected me, and my office, from enemies, and, thank God, sometimes even from some friends. Throughout all these years, and the many tough days that we shared, she stood strong and yet at the same time remained very much a warm, personable woman; a woman with whom I am proud to have been associated and a woman who I am proud to call a highly respected friend. Words cannot express my true feelings in this instance, Mr. Speaker, so just let me conclude by saying to Mrs. Nevins from the bottom of my heart, thank you—for everything.

HON. LESLIE ARENDS

HON. TENNYSON GUYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, only once in a half century does a man like LES ARENDS come upon the political horizon. Unassuming, quiet of nature, profound in wisdom, sparkling in humor, commanding in sincerity, dependable in crises, loyal in allegiance, and sterling in character—here is a man who would be at home with Will Rogers or Pope Paul.

We new Members of Congress, who came to know LES, first by reputation, and next by personal privilege—soon knew we were in the company of a man who stands on that very narrow rim of Alpine leadership.

Standing on that lonely ledge of minority circumstance, LES always towered above the battle. His quiet but persuasive voice rallied his team with excitement and vitality. If we lost, he always found time to say thinks. If we won, he was the first to pat us on the back. He was often our only avenue of communications between the White House and the Congress.

LES ARENDS made life exciting and interesting. He was never bored, and could find as much enthusiasm over the price of soybeans as successfully sustaining a Presidential veto.

But more importantly, LES ARENDS is one of a dying breed—a real gentleman. He always did the common things uncommonly well. Farmer, golfer, legislator, leader, community worker, family man, and much more—LES ARENDS has the esteem of his colleagues, the love of his countrymen, and the respect for people in high and low places. His niche will never be filled and his remembrance will always be a treasure to those who knew him and admired him. We wish him well.

LABELING OF OLEOMARGARINE

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this bill for the purpose of bringing the food margarine into more uniformity with the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as respects two labeling requirements. When the old Federal taxes were repealed, special requirements were inserted into the act requiring colored margarine to be labeled "Margarine" or "Oleomargarine" in letters as large as any others on the label or, on an inner wrapper, in 20-point letters. These requirements are section 407(b) (3-A) and (4), respectively.

They are necessary, as a quarter century of experience has shown. Margarine labeling should be covered as all other foods are covered under the act, by the misbranding section 403. Since these unique requirements were set up, margarine has become a food in almost universal use; it is the major table spread. No special problems attend its sale. It should be brought under the same provisions of law that apply to other foods in the interests of uniformity, lower packaging costs, and simpler enforcement, and with no loss of consumer protection.

New packaging and labeling laws we have enacted cover margarine the same as other foods. New labeling regulations issued by the Food and Drug Administration and issued or proposed by the Department of Agriculture make no special clauses for margarine.

Section 407 itself merely reflects the obsolete idea that margarine had to be specially restricted or limited in its sale. Whatever relevance that concept had 25 years ago, it has none now.

My bill would bring margarine into uniformity with the act in two respects: First, applying the regular provisions of section 403 to the word "Margarine" or "Oleomargarine" on the label, instead of the rigid present requirement. Section 403 requires such a name to be truthful, conspicuous, and understandable—subsections a, b, c, f, and g. Within these requirements allows some flexibility in size of type.

There is no reason why margarine should not have the limited flexibility permitted under section 403. Conspicuousness is the real objective, and this requirement is in the act. A consideration is the fact that so much information is required to be on margarine package—which at its largest is only 5 by 5 inches and for smaller units is much less: list of ingredients, nutrition data, net weight—ounces and pounds—and name and address of manufacturer or distributor. Many margarines also include polyunsaturates and cholesterol information. Smaller units have to cram all this language into one small panel.

Second, removing the 20-point minimum type size requirements for inner wrappers, in cases where the margarine so wrapped is not intended to be sold as a separate subunit and where the full information is on the outer label enclosing the wrapped subunit. This is in line with the Food and Drug Administration's distinction between inner units sold as intrinsic components of an outer labeled package and units intended for sale as packages per se. Margarine inner units or one-quarter-pound "sticks" are not packaged to be sold separately and always are packaged within a label giving all the required information required under the law.

These two small amendments will establish a more rational, uniform basis of labeling margarine, and to that extent aid consumer identification of what is being purchased.

MRS. MARGARET YOUNG CITED FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the South Side Chamber of Commerce annually choses a resident of the area to be the recipient of its Community Service Award. This year, it selected a gracious lady who has distinguished herself in unselfish dedication toward improving and enriching the lives of her friends and neighbors.

In the words of the chamber's selection committee:

> No one, man or woman, is more deserving of this special recognition than Mrs. Margaret Young.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally acquainted with this remarkable woman and I can truthfully say the chamber has chosen well.

Mrs. Young has long been an advocate of programs to help people, particularly in the areas which involve the elderly or improved housing. She is credited with being almost single-handedly responsible for the success of a free nutrition program for the elderly and she has pleaded her case for a revolving loan fund to spur housing rehabilitation before the highest officials of the city of Pittsburgh.

As president of the South Side Community Council, Mrs. Young has been a familiar figure at public meetings of all kinds. She does not hesitate to express the opinions of the majority of her neighbors on programs or projects which affect their community.

In addition to her council work, Mrs. Young also serves as first vice president of the Brashear Association and is president of the Number Seven Police-Citizens Council. She has been active in politics, serving as a member of the Election Board in her district 21 years, including 10 as judge of elections. During the 1950's, she also served as chairman of the 17th Ward Surplus Food Board and was a member of former Mayor David L. Lawrence's Cleaner City Committee.

Mrs. Young is a lifelong resident of the South Side. Her late husband, Norman, was an Allegheny County police officer, and the couple had two children: Mrs. Virginia Patter and Robert, also a county police officer. In addition, there are four grandchildren in the family.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Congress, I extend our official congratulations to Mrs. Young, a woman who has enriched the lives of all who know her. She is a wonderful person and richly deserving of the honor accorded her.

PIPELINE TRANSIT TAX

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUES OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week, I introduced legislation which would in essence direct the President to impose a pipeline transit tax or duty on Canadian oil transported across American territory through American pipelines.

On December 3, 1969, Mr. J. J. Greene, Canadian Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, restated his country's desire to have an open market in the United States for Canadian oil and assured our Government that the United States could always depend on Canada as an oil supplier.

Mr. Trudeau's government since then has adopted a beggar-thy-neighbor policy toward the United States. They have imposed an excise tax on all Canadian oil coming into this country which has made the cost of Canadian oil higher than any other oil imported from any other country in the world.This tax has forced U.S. consumers in our northern tier States to subsidize Canadian consumers in the eastern provinces. Also as a direct result, our northern tier refiners who had relied for years on Canadian oil have been placed in an extremely difficult competitive position.

Now the Canadian Government states they want to phase out all Canadian oil exports to this country. When this announcement was made by Prime Minister Trudeau, the only response from our State Department was that they were disappointed but they could understand.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the State Department can understand, but I certainly cannot. I realize that Canada has the same problems with energy that every country does, but I think this unilateral action on their part is a slap in the face to the American public.

For years the Canadians were in a very lucrative position of having a ready market for their oil in this country. At the same time, they were able to use these profits to purchase cheap imported crude from Venezuela, so actually we were subsidizing their own imports. During this same period of time, the Canadians were enjoying free access to transport their Canadian oil through American-owned pipelines on American soil.

The Canadian Government justifies the imposition of this excise tax by saying that it is needed to offset the additional costs of their imported oil. They also say that the possibility of them becoming exclusively dependent on imported oil in the near future is certain. There is no doubt that Canada's domestic oil supply is diminishing, but I would simply like to state that the internal problems of Canada have not been conclusive to stimulate their own oil exploration policies. I am not trying to influence Canadian internal policies, but when it has a direct effect on the well-being of the United States, I am greatly concerned.

Another dilemma of this excise tax has been the action by the Venezuelan Government in using the price received by Canadian crude in the United States as a benchmark for its own export price to Canada. The result is a closed circle in which Canadian price increases generate Venezuelan price increases, which, in turn, generate Canadian increases. The United States is caught in the middle of a cost squeeze over which we have no control.

It is not my desire that a pipeline tax ever be adopted by this country, but apparently our State Department does not want to face up to the Canadian Government. My purpose in introducing this legislation was not to urge retaliation against Canada, but to point out that the United States is not altogether without recourse in its dealings with Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing this bill again in January, and I welcome any Member of the House as a cosponsor. I feel it is mandatory that our own State Department know there are some in Congress who are greatly concerned and are ready to fight fire with fire.

FAREWELL TO "FISHBAIT"

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, after 42 years of distinguished service for the House—including a quarter century as Doorkeeper—William M. "Fishbait" Miller is retiring at the conclusion of the 93d Congress.

Fishbait has been a part of the ebb and flow of history through the House as the escort and announcer of Presidents and other leaders who have addressed and appeared at joint sessions of the Congress. His stentorian voice will echo down the corridors of time as future generations see and hear film and television reports of his introduction of famous visitors to the House.

Fishbait recalls 1 week, for example, when he introduced Gen. Douglas MacArthur and President Harry S. Truman.

Fishbait has devoted his adult life to service to the Members of the Congress—

his dedication to the Members has been remarkable. He is a consummate politician and has made many friends during his years of service which dates back to 1933—the year Franklin Roosevelt became President—when William M. Miller became an official messenger to the Postmaster of the House.

Fishbait remarked recently:

I have lived a good life, a full life. I have enjoyed every minute of it and as I leave I have no regrets and no axes to grind.

I am going home happy and catch fish and enjoy the good life in retirement.

Fishbait Miller deserves many years of relaxation and contentment away from the pressures and demands of the "pressure cooker" that is Washington.

Certainly I want to join many friends of Fishbait in wishing him the very best of good luck, good health, and much happiness as he returns to his beloved Mississippi homeland.

AMBASSADOR HENRY J. TASCA

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to one of our great career Foreign Service officers who has given our country a remarkable example of self-sacrifice and devotion to his country. I speak of Henry J. Tasca who has been serving with great distinction and ability as American Ambassador in Athens, Greece.

I have intimately known and admired Ambassador Tasca for a number of years during which he served under a number of Presidents of both parties with high dedication and loyalty.

I have always been impressed with Henry Tasca's broad understanding of world affairs and I have marveled at his grasp of the economic, social and political issues related to each country in which he was serving our Government. Part of this unusual comprehension of the problems we and other governments face derives from his exceptional academic background: Temple University, B. Sc.; University of Pennsylvania, MBA and Ph. D.; Temple University, LL.D., research fellow, Brookings Institute, London School of Economics, and much more.

A great deal of Henry's success comes from the magnificent experience he obtained in his highly successful service in Paris, in Korea and the embassy posts in Rome, Bonn, Rabat, and most recently in Athens.

The people of this Nation should be eternally grateful to Ambassador Tasca for the fearless and competent manner in which he preserved our American interests during the past several years of political crises in Greece. In this connection, I recall that a high ranking minister of the present Caramanlis government in Athens told Newsweek magazine that history will record that Henry Tasca played a major role in the return of democracy to Greece. And yet I must also recall that during this period of time he also fully protected all of our top security interests in Greece.

Ambassador Tasca frequently stood alone in his recommendations to Washington; frequently his analyses of the volitant political situation was not always what his detractors in this House and the other body and the press wanted to hear. But during all these crises Henry Tasca stood firm on his convictions in supporting our national interests in Greece. Often he was misquoted and more often criticized by a seemingly hostile press, but he did his job with utmost vigor and commonsense. Just how good this commonsense was has been proven over and over again with the recent developments in Greece. The restoration of democracy and the recent elections prove the statesmanship of Ambassador Tasca's effectiveness as our President's representative in that country.

In a letter to him from President Gerald R. Ford, he was paid the highest tribute for the dedicated manner in which he served as Ambassador to Greece for a long 5 years.

Surely Ambassador Tasca richly deserves a hero's medal when he stood out against Greek and American critics alike. His courageous anti-left wing stand was exactly what the Greek people wanted as can be attested by the sound defeat of an actress named Melina Mercouri on the anti-American Andreas Papandreous ticket which got only 13 percent of the votes. The people of the port city of Piraeus demonstrated quite forcefully that they do not at all want her, not only on Sunday, but on every other day of the week. Another anti-American critic was a composer named Mikis Theodorakis, a Communist friend of Melina. He too was a loser. His Communist party got only 8 percent when democracy returned to Greece.

Ambassador Tasca had to contend with some congressional hostility on the part of a few members who paid very brief visits to Greece, possessed with only a superficial and meager understanding of our foreign relations and had the effrontery to criticize him.

As one who is about to soon depart these sacred halls, I do fervently hope that Members of Congress, both bodies, who visit our embassies in capitals abroad and are not fully competent to discuss our foreign relations would not reiterate positions taken by the left wing and pro-Communist media.

The growing list of martyred American diplomats, the last of whom was Rodger P. Davies, our Ambassador in Cyprus, an outstanding career Foreign Service officer, should make all of us think very seriously before putting the finger on our diplomats, particularly from the career service, as responsible for carrying out policies which certain Members of Congress and the media may not like.

Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to be honored recently at a reception at the Department of State in recognition of my retirement after almost 31 years of service, most of which having years to do with Foreign Service personnel and operations. I was pleased that the President, our Speaker, and the Chief Justice of the United States attended. I took occasion on that evening before the assemblage to pay tribute to Ambassador Henry Tasca and to insist that we need more Foreign Service officers with his dedication and proven ability.

As I depart this body I want to wish Ambassador Tasca all the future success and happiness possible and express the hope that our paths may cross soon again and often.

A MANDATE FOR REPUBLICANS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in a recent editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon News. The editorial emphasizes that the past election was a mandate for Republicans, too—a mandate to get the "party back on a clearly defined track if it is to regain its position as the rallying point for moderate Americans." Essential in this process is the need for the party "to clarify and restate its principles."

I agree wholeheartedly with these views. A major reason for the poor showing of Republicans at the polls was the failure of the party to stand for basic principles.

Republicans have historically stood for restraints on Federal spending. Yet a Republican administration proposed some of the largest budget deficits ever seen on Capitol Hill. Republicans have historically stood for free enterprise. Yet a Republican administration initiated wage and price controls. Republicans have historically stood for a strong national defense. Yet a Republican administration allowed our Nation to lose military superiority. Law and order, clean government, anticommunism—the issues go on and on.

Is it any wonder that the electorate voted against Republican candidates? Republican leaders abandoned the principles that had attracted millions of voters and that had thrust them into control of the Presidency.

If Republicans are to regain their lost support, the party must return to its historically sound principles. Otherwise the Republican Party is heading toward national oblivion.

Following is the text of the editorial from the Mount Vernon News:

THE REPUBLICANS ALSO HAVE A MANDATE

The Republicans took a bath, as the saying goes, in the last election. For the sake of the future of the Grand Old Party we would rather think that this shock at the polls will have the sobering and invigorating effect of a cold shower on a basically sound body.

The fortunes of the Republican Party at this point cannot be separated from the fortunes of the two-party system that is essential to the functioning of our nation's political mechanism. How the Republicans react to their off-year defeat could well determine the fate of third party movements stirring within both parties as 1976 approaches.

The Gallup Poll reported last June that 38 percent of American voters considered themselves "conservatives" and only 26 percent would call themselves "liberals." This is the highest percentage of people classifying themselves as conservatives since 1936. At the very same time polls also were reporting that 40 percent of the people identified themselves as Democrats and only 24 percent as Republicans. This contradiction gives a clear indication of just how fragile labels can be in politics.

Clearly neither party has been succeeding very well in offering voters a "home" based on their political philosophies, as a healthy two-party system requires.

The Democrats are interpreting their showing in the election as a mandate to assume a more active role in dealing with the problem uppermost in the public mind—our sick economy. This is no mean challenge to a party whose congressional record is poor; a party which must reconcile leaders ranging across the philosophical spectrum from Alabama's Gov. George C. Wallace to South Dakota's Sen. George McGovern. It will not be roses all the way for the Democrats in the next two years.

The Republicans can interpret their poor showing as a mandate, too. The voters have as much as told Republican leaders that they must get their party back on a clearly defined track if it is to regain its position as the rallying point for moderate Americans.

The GOP has been wounded by Watergate, but certainly not fatally. Fair-minded citizens recognize that the scandal which spread into the White House from the Committee to Re-Elect the President in 1972 was a failing of individuals, not of a great political party. The important thing is for the GOP to regain its ideological perspective, to broaden its base and thus provide a strong and practical appeal to the "silent majority" that, in other years, has been the party's great strength.

Finally, the Republican Party needs to clarify and restate its principles, which are altogether sound ones. It needs to capitalize on its strengths, which are considerable.

If it does all these things the GOP will quickly be reassured that its foundations are firm—quite firm enough to support a strong and effective party for millions of Americans who, in spite of a loud cry of protest at the polls, are still looking for a place to feel at home.

H. R. GROSS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, H. R. GROSS of Iowa, has been one of the most respected and useful Members who have served in the Congress during more than 2½ decades. His contribution to legislation has been invaluable.

It is unfortunate for the country that a man of H. R.'s caliber finds it necessary to retire. But he can look back upon his record with understandable pride and satisfaction. Always alert and courageous, he has never faltered in his devotion to the cause of good Government.

Like most of his colleagues, I regard H. R. GROSS as a personal friend. Serving with him has been a rewarding experience. The entire Nation will be the loser because of his retirement. I extend to him and his family my very best wishes.

NEW WING FROM NASA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, NASA continues to make contributions not only in space application but also in aeronautics. One of its most recent achievements is the development of a new wing, promising increased performance and reduction of fuel consumption. NASA and its forerunner, the NACA, have worked with our aircraft industries over the years to improve the technology essential for the competitive commercial aircraft. In a recent article by Laura Mason, staff reporter, of the Daily Press in Newport News, Va., she describes the activity of Langley Research Center in the development of this new wing, because this is such an apt example of NASA's contribution to aircraft technology. I am including this article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and the general public.

NASA DESIGNING NEW WING TO IMPROVE LIFT, SAVE FUEL AND INCREASE SAFETY

(By Laura Mason)

A new wing (airfoil) developed by NASA's Langley Research Center scientists will make small, light aircraft 75 per cent safer, will provide up to 30 per cent increase in maximum life over conventional wings and will enable twin-engine planes to cruise at normal speeds with at least a 10 per cent reduction in fuel consumption.

Joseph W. Stickle, assistant chief of the Flight Research Division at LRC, explained the project was begun in the fall of 1972 with preliminary designs for modifying the supercritical wing designed by Dr. Richard T. Whitcomb, also of Langley Research Center. Dr. Whitcomb's wing was designed for use on commercial jet transports. It was re-designed for optimum use on light aircraft.

The new low-speed airfoil, called the GAW-1 (General Aviation Whitcomb-1) was basically re-designed by a computer. (A comparable wind-tunnel program to build, test, and evaluate 17 model changes would consume 6 months or more and many man-hours.) The computer results were validated in wind-tunnel tests at Langley and at Wichita State University. The program has been designated ATLIT (Advanced Technology Light Twin).

ATLIT is the program management responsibility of the University of Kansas under a $800,000 grant from NASA.

The new wing was built by Robertson Aircraft Company who performed the design study. Piper Aircraft Company in Lakeland, Fla., is fabricating and mounting the wing on the twin-engine craft. The plane will be transported to LRC in September where the test flights will be made.

Upon its arrival at LRC some forty different pieces of instrumentation will be fitted into the craft in order to document characterizations of the airfoil, such as pilot input and effects, climbing capabilities and control of the aircraft, among others.

According to Harold L. Crane, NASA project engineer for the program, the safety factor comes in because the new wing increases the rate at which the small aircraft can climb from 200 feet per minute to approximately 350 feet per minute, thus lessening the chance of an accident during the critical take-off period. According to aviation studies, operations near the airport account for over half of all general aviation accidents. Crane said it would take a couple of months to install the equipment needed for documentation and that test flights would begin at the first of the year.

Not only will the ascent speed be increased, Crane explained, but the cruise speed for the aircraft will be increased approximately seven knots (10 miles per hour) without addition of power.

Two Langley pilots, Philip W. Brown and Robert S. Champine, will test the twin-engine Piper. Tests have been scheduled on an average of two per week and will extend over a four month period beginning January, 1975.

Bruce J. Holmes, project engineer from the University of Kansas where the program was conceived, explained that the grant not only covered development of the aircraft but also financed an extensive educational program at the University which is still being carried on. The program has resulted in a number of degrees being earned through work on the airfoil program. At least ten students have already been awarded either M.S. degrees or doctorates in General Aviation as a result. Holmes is serving a 15-month internship at LRC which will count as credit hours leading to a doctorate in General Aviation.

In addition to the University of Kansas, three other educational institutions are involved in the development of the airfoil. Work is presently underway at North Carolina State, Wichita State University and even Princeton University.

In addition to testing the new airfoil, the plane will also be testing two other unique and newly developed features. A new propeller design based on the revolutionary supercritical wing will be tested along with exclusive use of spoilers for roll control instead of conventional ailerons. (Spoilers are hinged surfaces that extend above a wing to slow a plane usually during landings.)

HUMAN RIGHTS IN SPAIN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, many Members have demonstrated a continuing interest in issues concerning human rights. A case relating to a violation of these rights was recently called to my attention by a resident of Minnesota whose daughter is living and working near Barcelona, Spain.

The case concerns Lydia Falcon O'Neill, an author and lawyer who was recently arrested and imprisoned with seven other prominent intellectuals and charged with being a "link" between the Communist party and ETA, the Basque nationalist group. The arrest was prompted by the September 13 bombing of a Madrid restaurant in which 12 people died and another 50 to 70 were injured. The bombing was attributed to ETA. The group is also blamed for the assassination of Premier Adm. Luis Carrero Blanco last December. ETA policy is to accept responsibility for acts of ETA terrorism. In the Madrid restaurant case they have disclaimed any involvement.

Through correspondence with the Spanish Ambassador to the United States and the U.S. Ambassador to Spain, I have learned that Ms. O'Neill had been critically ill previous to her arrest and subsequent to it was held without medical attention for 25 days. Later she was transferred to the prison hospital where her condition improved. It is not now known if she has been placed in a regular prison cell.

Following is an article about the case that appeared in the New York Times, November 25, 1974. Also included is a letter from Horatio Rivero—U.S. Ambassador to Spain:

TORTURE IN SPAIN

(By Barbara Probst Solomon)

Spain is in a chaotic state of political decomposition. The Franco family has been discretely removing furniture and other valuables from the Pardo Palace to family property in Torrelodones. The Franco estate in Móstoles has also been quietly sold. Clearly, the family is preparing for mobility.

From left to ultra-right, the power play for political control is in full swing. The more liberal members of the opposition are hoping that legal political associations will be allowed. The Communist party, which has steadily worked toward an image of respectability, is also trying to negotiate an eventual legal place in a future government.

It is against the background of these confused political events that the current right-wing backlash must be understood. It has led to the bizarre arrest of the famous Madrid playwright Alfonso Sastre and his wife the psychiatrist Genoveva Forest. It is the most important political case since the Burgos trials; it is the most brutal arrest since the Spain of the nineteen-forties and will undoubtedly be considered an equivalent of the Sacco-Vanzetti trial.

On Sept. 13 a bomb exploded in a Madrid cafeteria generally frequented by Madrid policemen. Twelve people were killed. The Basque nationalist group known as E.T.A., which was responsible for the assassination of the Premier, Adm. Luis Carrero Blanco, last December, was immediately blamed. E.T.A. policy is to claim responsibility for all acts of E.T.A. terrorism; this time E.T.A. disclaimed involvement.

The fact that at the time of the bombing no policemen were in a cafe habitually frequented by the police was immediately picked up by the Barcelona newspaper Vanguardia as giving a somewhat "odd cast" to the affair. Spanish newspapers suspected ultra-right-wing involvement.

On Sept. 16, Genoveva Forest and seven other prominent intellectuals were arrested. They were charged with being a "link" between the Communist party and the E.T.A. and with having aided the E.T.A. in the cafeteria bombing.

According to the police, the homes of these prominent Madrid and Barcelona intellectuals were used as E.T.A. hiding places. Genoveva Forest was accused of having coauthored "Operation Ogre," a clandestine E.T.A. best-seller that gives a documented E.T.A. account of the Carrero Blanco assassination.

I have read the book. Clearly, it is written in the unique Basque argot, which a non-Basque, Madrid psychiatrist such as Dr. Forest simply would have had no access to. Dr. Forest is of Catalan origin.

Those familiar with the Spanish political scene and aware of the animosity of the conservative Communists and trade unionists toward E.T.A. terrorist tactics consider linkage between the two groups lacking in credibility. Clearly, it is an attempt by extremists in the police to discredit the opposition.

What has most shocked the Spanish and European intellectual community has been the torture used against prominent intellectuals. In an article in Le Monde, corroborated by information received from Amnesty International, the following events have been reported:

Dr. Forrest was held incommunicado for 26 days. She was continuously beaten and kicked in all parts of her body. She was told she would be thrown out of a window and that the world would be told that she had committed suicide. When she vomited, she was forced to swallow "the mess"; when forced to urinate, she was mocked by twelve policemen.

According to a letter smuggled to her lawyer, Dr. Forest wrote that the severest form of torture for her was psychological and involved her daughter. She was told, untruthfully, that her 12-year-old daughter was being interrogated in prison concerning her parents' activities and that her husband was dead.

Mr. Sastre had of his own volition handed himself over to the Madrid police in an effort to save the lives of his wife and the other prisoners. He is now in Carabanchel prison awaiting trial: According to Spanish law, a husband is legally responsible for crimes committed by his wife.

The other prisoners are as follows: Lidia Falcón O'Neill, a Barcelona labor lawyer and feminist; her husband, the writer Eliseo Bayo Poblador; Antonio Durán Velasco, a labor leader; Maria Paz Ballesteros, a television actress; her husband, the producer Vicente Sains de la Pena; Maria del Carmen Nadal, a teacher; her husband, an airline pilot, Bernrdo Vadell Carreras. All have been tortured.

Apparently the continued use of torture these last two months on Genoveva Forest has been successful. She has been charged with the murder of Admiral Carrero Blanco.

MADRID, *October 29, 1974*.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: The American Consul General in Barcelona, Mr. William H. Lehfedt, has referred to us your letter of October 14 and asked if we could obtain additional information concerning the situation and health of Mrs. Lydia Falcon O'Neill, lawyer and author arrested and imprisoned in the wake of the September 13 bombing of a Madrid restaurant which cost the lives of 12 persons and injuries to an additional fifty.

From conversations with two different lawyers familiar with both her case and that of her husband, Eliseo Bayo, we understand that both of them still remain in prison in Madrid at this time. Mrs. Falcon is expected to be charged with terrorism and, if indicted, would consequently be tried before a military tribunal (as will her husband). It is not known when the court-martial will be held nor whether Mrs. Falcon will be held in jail until the trial, although there is a strong possibility of the latter. Her husband reportedly may have a better chance of being given provisional liberty pending the court-martial than Mrs. Falcon.

Both lawyers agreed that Mrs. Falcon was suffering some form of chronic illness at the time of her arrest. One lawyer claimed she has diabetes and the other that she has a chronic liver ailment and probable hepatitis. Both are agreed that she was held some 25 days incommunicado in prison after her arrest during which time her ailment apparently got worse. She was then transferred to the prison hospital where her condition substantially improved under regular and adequate medical care, and reportedly by now she may have left the prison hospital and been placed in a regular cell block with other prisoners.

This is all the information which we have at present. Should you desire more detailed and precise information, we understand her defense attorney is a Barcelona lawyer named Frederico Valenciano Tejerino, whose address is Ausias March 19, Distrito 10, Barcelona (his phone number in Barcelona is 226-3144).

Sincerely,

HORACIO RIVERO,
Ambassador.

FACING CHINESE REALITIES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, what is happening on the mainland of China? A number of different answers are being presented. But one point most all observers agree on—the present leadership of Communist China is close to death. What will come after is anyone's guess.

It is highly important that U.S. policy keep this observation in mind. As my good friend William Rusher has written:

Of China's future, only one thing is sure: Neither Mr. Mao nor Mr. Chou will be around to influence it. By committing the United States to them, Mr. Ford and Mr. Kissinger will only make it likelier that the same can be said of us.

It is time for sober analysis and not for dreams of what might have been. Certain facts stand out. One is the continuing existence of the Republic of China on Taiwan—one of the economic and military powers of Asia. It is foolish to ignore this reality.

At this point I include in the RECORD William Rusher's sound analysis, "Caution Toward China," from the New York Times of Sunday, December 8, 1974:

CAUTION TOWARD CHINA

(By William A. Rusher)

The announcement that President Ford will visit China next year, with its implication that diplomatic recognition will follow, simply underlines the growing uneasiness in Washington about our policy of détente with the People's Republic of China.

That policy has been a sickly child from the start, and for almost a year Red China's supporters in this country have been urging quick diplomatic recognition on the rather panicky ground that this step is necessary to keep not merely the policy but our friends in Peking from collapsing.

The State Department has remained considerably calmer than that, but these latest developments suggest that pressures for therapeutic concessions to Red China are getting pretty high.

The opposite view—and it certainly seems to have its fair share of adherents—is that this is supremely not the moment for the United States to commit itself still further to a particular regime in Peking, or to any given solution for the future of China.

After all, none of the really towering figures on the political scene in Peking, or for that matter in Taipei, will ever see 75 again. Chou En-lai is 76, and has been hospitalized for five months with heart trouble. Mao Tse-tung at 81 and Chiang Kai-shek at 86 are fading from the scene.

Within a matter of years at most, and perhaps even sooner, the deaths of some or all of these men must catapult China into a new and quite possibly prolonged period of political uncertainty, with an almost infinite variety of possible outcomes.

Why should the United States open this unpredictable phase by announcing its formal diplomatic recognition of the gerontocracy in Peking?

Put aside all arguments based on the worth of America's pledged word of Taiwan—and admit that any promise by the People's Republic not to use force against Taiwan would be at least equally open to (shall we say?) re-evaluation. Consider only the facts, which tend to outlive both Presidents and Premiers:

Fact 1: Nationalist China is very much a going enterprise, not just economically but even militarily. In the Dec. 6 National Review, Brian Crozier reports that, according to expert estimates, the Red Chinese Air Force and Navy could at best land three divisions of assault troops in Taiwan—a force with which the Nationalist defenders could cope, even without American aid.

Fact 2: Soviet intentions with respect to China are cloaked in mystery. But Leonid I. Brezhnev sharply rejected Peking's recent tentative overture, ships of the Soviet Far Eastern Fleet sail regularly through the Strait of Formosa, and the border between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic is 4,000 miles long. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Moscow plans to take a lively interest in future political developments in China.

Fact 3: The Chinese Communist Government has been wracked by dissension for nearly two decades, and the dissension appears to be approaching some new climax. The nominal President of the People's Republic was toppled and disgraced less than ten years ago, Mao's constitutionally designated "heir" was liquidated as late as 1971, and Chou En-lai has come under indirect attack by shadowy forces in the last six months.

Fact 4: The entire history of China bears witness to the difficulty of ruling that whole vast land effectively from a single capital. Warlordism—the tendency of regional military commanders to develop into autonomous political entities—is one of the signal characteristics of the long Chinese record, and it would be folly to assume that we have seen the last of it.

Is this, then, the time for the United States to be binding itself irrevocably to the fading leaders, shifting policies and unidentified successors of the present Chinese Communist regime?

Of China's future, only one thing is sure: Neither Mr. Mao nor Mr. Chou will be around to influence it. By committing the United States to them, Mr. Ford and Mr. Kissinger will only make it likelier that the same can be said of us.

STALEMATE IN THE WAR ON CANCER

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the December 1 issue of "Science and Government Report," an independent bulletin of science policy, contains an article which deserves to be read by those of us in Congress who have oversight responsibilities for Federal programs.

The article, entitled "The 'War on Cancer': Official Fictions and Harsh Facts," suggests that much of the recent optimism associated with our national effort to cure cancer is not borne out by statistical examination. As the author of the article, Daniel S. Greenberg, editor and publisher of "Science and Government Report," points out:

After 25 years and several billion dollars expended on research for cures, survival rates for the most common types of cancer—those accounting for some 80 percent of all cases—are virtually unchanged.

Because I believe my colleagues will be especially interested in this article and its implications, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point.

THE "WAR ON CANCER": OFFICIAL FICTIONS AND HARSH FACTS

The official "communiques" from the so-called War on Cancer, like those of bygone days in Vietnam, convey an impression of slow, but steady, progress in a difficult struggle, beyond which shines light at the end of the tunnel.

Thus, just as General Westmoreland could proclaim on the eve of the Tet offensive, "I have never been more encouraged in my four years in Vietnam," the American Cancer Society (ACS) tells the public in a pamphlet titled, *The Hopeful Side of Cancer*, "Too few know that cancer is curable." The accompanying message from ACS, reminiscent of Vietnam optimism prior to the deluge, is that perseverance and more of the same efforts have been paying off and will continue to do so.

To cast doubt on these medical claims is not to wish they weren't so, nor to imply that one has a better formula for success. But the grisly fact is that the public is getting a snowjob about progress in cancer research and treatment, and a direct consequence of that deception is increased power for the cancer "establishment" to go on with more of the same. When the reports are favorable, there is little cause for pressure for a re-examination of the basic strategy.

Following a recent excursion through the statistical centers of the War on Cancer, SGR must regrettably report a fundamental but rarely discussed finding, namely, that after 25 years and several billion dollars expended on research for cures, survival rates for the most common types of cancer—those accounting for some 80 percent of all cases—are virtually unchanged; here and there a bit of improvement has occurred, but in some instances, the survival rates may even have worsened. As for the types that comprise the remainnig 20 percent of all cancers, there has been some improvement in certain categories, but overall, these figures, too, are relatively unchanged.

Consider, for example, lung cancer, which, accounting for approximately 10 percent of all cancers, is one of the most prevalent forms of the disease. As reported in statistics that the National Cancer Institute periodically publishes under the infelicitous title of *End Results in Cancer*, the 5-year survival rate in 1940–49 was a grim four percent, which means that five years after diagnosis anytime during that period, only that slight percentage of the patients remained alive. In the period 1950–59, however, the five-year survival rate doubled, to eight percent. It remained there through 1960–64, and then rose by only one percentage point during 1965–69, which later date, for five-year survival calculations, extends to 1973.

Putting these numbers in layman's terms, they mean that of those who are diagnosed in 1950 as having lung cancer, eight out of 100 were alive in 1954; of those who were diagnosed in 1969, the number surviving in 1973 was nine out of 100. The increase merits gratitude, but it scarcely supports the ACS's assertion that "Cancer is one of the most curable of the major diseases in this country."

Another of the most common cancers, that of the colon, accounts for eight percent of the total incidence of the disease. According to NCI's statistics, the 1940–49 survival rate was 32 percent. In 1950–59, it rose to 44 percent, which is exactly where it remains to this date.

In the case of cancer of the colon, as well as some others, the survival figures do worse than mock the official line that progress, though slow, is continual. Statistical quirks may be the cause, but the one-year survival rate for cancer of the colon has actually declined, according to figures soon to be published by NCI. In 1965–69, the one-year rate was 68 percent; in 1970–71, it had dropped to 65 percent. Several factors could account for this change, but not infrequently, one finds well-credentialed cancer researchers speculating that newly devised "treatments" many actually be adding to the toll.

In their presentations to Congress, NCI officials have recently expressed encouragement about treatments for leukemia and cancer of the cervix, and of late there has been much in the news about progress in treating breast cancer. Progress there has been, but again, regrettably, the official statistics do not support the optimistic claims.

Thus, the ACS states, "Only 10 years ago, anyone who spoke about curing leukemia was considered a charlatan. Today, the cure for leukemia is a realistic goal."

SURVIVAL RATES

However, the survival rates for leukemia, though apparently improving as a result of new chemotherapies, remain tragically low, according to NCI's tabulations. For the three categories that come under the heading of acute leukemia, the five-year survival rate in 1950–59 was one percent; for 1965–69, it had risen to three percent. In the same periods, the survival rate for chronic leukemia rose from 23 to 29 percent. Statisticians caution, however, that since the incidence of leukemia is relatively low (3.5 percent of all cancers) and diagnosis often so difficult, the margin for error is considerable. "I wouldn't be surprised if they're 'curing' a lot of leukemia that never existed," one statistician said.

The ACS also expresses optimism about uterine cancer, stating that "The death rate from this form of cancer in women has dropped over 50 percent in 30 years," adding that "Much of the credit for this dramatic decline is due to the Pap test, one of the most significant advances in early detection techniques." The official statistics, however, show that ACS's hopeful report is both true and misleading. For cancer of the cervix uteri, which accounts for 5.8 percent of all cancers, the five-year survival rate in 1940–49 was 47 percent. By 1950–59, the survival figure had risen to 59 percent. By 1965–69, however, five-year survival had *declined* to 56 percent.

For cancer of the corpus uteri, which accounts for 3.5 percent of all cancers, the 1940–49 five-year survival figure was 61 percent. This rose to 71 percent in 1950–59; 73 percent in 1960–64, and 74 percent in 1965–69. Again, only thankfulness can be expressed for any improvement in survival rates, but what the figures show is that very little change has actually occurred since the 1950–59 period.

BREAST CANCER

Female breast cancer, which accounts for 11.8 percent of all cancers, has long been the object of a public awareness campaign that presumably has resulted in some increased measure of early detection, which is an important element of effective treatment. Nevertheless, the changes in survival rates over the past 25 years have been surprisingly slight. In 1940–49, the five-year survival rate was 53 percent, when averaged out among cases detected at various stages of development. The rate improved to 60 percent during 1950–59, but despite the emphasis on early detection, and the much-heralded development of combined therapies involving surgery, radiation, and drugs, the most recent 5-year survival rate has risen to only 64 percent.

The oft-repeated and authoritative statement that Mrs. Rockefeller's chances of survival are 90 percent is indeed welcome news. But considering that she was the beneficiary of early detection and the most capable care, it is also worth noting that the three-year survival rate for her type of localized breast cancer was 89 percent in 1950–59, and has stood at 91 percent since then.

Going down the grim list of other major cancers, the five-year survival rate for cancer of the stomach has stood at 12 percent since *1950. For cancer* of the rectum, it has remained at 40 percent over the same period. For cancer of the pancreas, the survival rate has stood at one percent since 1950–59. For cancer of the esophagus, survival has apparently declined, from a rate of four, down to three percent over the past 25 years.

OFFICIAL OPTIMISM

If these are NCI's own figures, what then accounts for the routinely official optimism, such as that expressed by NCI Director Frank J. Rauscher, Jr., who wrote last January in *U.S. Medicine*, "The 5-year survival rate for cancer patients in the 1930s was about 1 in 5. Today, the figure is 1 in 3," the implication being that progress, though slow, is steady.

The answer is that the need to maintain public support for the war on cancer has inspired a bit of statistical sleight of hand. Rauscher is correct—survival rates have risen from about 1 in 5 in the 1930s to 1 in 3 today. However, virtually all of this improvement was achieved prior to 1955, which, ironically, was when federal spending for cancer research began to accelerate to its present level of $600 million a year. The cause of the improved survival rates prior to 1955 is not wholly understood, but one plausible explanation is that the postwar introduction of antibiotics and blood transfusions helped cut the toll from cancer surgery. It wasn't that more patients were surviving *cancer;* rather, they were surviving cancer *operations* that previously killed them. The result was a big statistical jump in the baseline for survival. But since 1955, when the toll from surgery became negligible, there has been little if any change in survival rates for the most common cancers.

Looked at another way, this analysis means that today's patient, who is supposedly the beneficiary of two decades of ever-expanding cancer research, has approximately the same chance for survival as a patient whose case was diagnosed before any of that research took place.

LEADING RESEARCH CENTERS

The argument is, of course, raised that pioneering techniques at major cancer centers—which are few in number—are proving more effective than the traditional techniques, which are the stock in trade of lesser institutions. The task ahead, it is argued, is to implement the National Cancer Act's provision for enlarging the number of first-rate centers. But even here, one encounters skepticism among the statisticians. The research-oriented institutions can pick and choose their patients, one of the most renowned students of the numbers told SGR. "Clinical researchers don't like to treat dying patients, and poor risks can be sent elsewhere to die." Success rates at leading centers were described as difficult to obtain and highly ambiguous.

Is there perhaps some statistical peculiarity that can explain away the appearance of so little progress? SGR took up the question with one of the most eminent experts in the field, one who, curiously enough, is publicly on record as saying significant progress is being achieved. Privately however, he said the following:

"Actually, there has been little improvement since 1945." Whereupon, he explained changes that have taken place over the years in collecting data, problems of analysis, and the difficulty of drawing interpretations from the sampling of cases that are transformed into national statistics.

The sorrowful tale that SGR presents here would have no purpose if informed opinion widely held that the strategy underlying the national cancer program is fundamentally sound and, though results are slow in coming, no other way exists to achieve them.

However, travels through the cancer "establishment" reveal that such is not the case, though, shades of early Vietnam days, there is great reluctance to go public with dissent beyond the usual quibbles about the program's emphasis on "targeted" research.

Rather, a fair number of respectable persons at major research institutions are now saying that the emphasis on cure is misguided because cure is so elusive. Since this is so, they contend, resources should be shifted to prevention, for which a gusher of recent promising leads is being responded to with a paucity of money. Though the sums have, in fact, been increasing a bit in response to recent findings, such as the possibility of carcinogenic substances in water supplies, they remain small.

"UNCONVENTIONAL RESEARCH"

The dissenters point out that the generals in the war on cancer come from the ranks of surgery, biochemistry, radiology, and virology, and that their training and inclination is to carry on which what they have been doing ever since they began their careers.

It is interesting to note, for example, that after a decade of unsuccessfully searching for viruses in human cancers, NCI continues to support the quest at a cost of $57 million a year. Meanwhile, though there is voluminous and mounting evidence that nutrition plays a major role in the onset of cancer, NCI's spending on that line of inquiry is around $3 million. A partial explanation is that nutrition is a low-prestige field, and easily evokes the image of high school cafeteria dieticians, whereas virology wins Nobel prizes.

THE PAULING EPISODE

The purpose here is not to question the motives or humanity of those who manage our vast national effort to cure cancer. Rather, it is to point out that great wars, whether military or medical, are necessarily conducted by large and complex bureaucracies. These embark on their missions with high hopes, accompanied by a tendency to see light at the end of large tunnels, and, perhaps most important of all, a quickness to consider dissenters as fainthearted, misguided, or even worse.

Consider, for example, what happened recently when Linus Pauling suggested to NCI that a small portion of its research funds be allocated for "unconventional research."

NCI Director Rauscher responded with a letter that, in part, stated: "In the sense that every grant and contract awarded by the Institute is based on an individual idea, we are pursuing such a policy now."

It sounds like what they told Billy Mitchell when he suggested that the airplane could be a serious weapon.

NATIONAL HEALTH FEDERATION: THE QUESTIONABLE VITAMIN LOBBY

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Members have received thousands of form letters which have been circulated by Clinton R. Miller, lobbyist for the National Health Federation. These letters urge support for the industry-oriented Proxmire-Hosmer bill (H.R. 10093) and oppose the consumer-oriented Kyros bill (H.R. 16317). Mr. Miller and the National Health Federation have been misrepresenting, distorting, and emotionalizing the vitamin issue in order to try to pass a bill backed by certain irresponsible members of the health foods industry.

Mr. Miller and the National Health Federation have been passing themselves off as "consumer representatives", even though they support an industry-oriented bill, which is opposed by genuine consumer groups such as the American Association of Retired Persons, the National Retired Teachers Association, and the Nader-backed Health Research Group of Public Citizens.

For further information on the vitamin legislation, Members and their staffs should refer to other information which my colleague, Mr. KYROS and I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 16, 1974, pages 36007–36008; Tuesday, December 10, 1974, pages 38786–38787; and Friday, December 13, 1974, pages 39893.

Why is the National Health Federation and Mr. Clinton Miller taking an industry-oriented position on vitamin legislation? Members should read the attached memorandum from the Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Public Affairs to the Acting Commissioner of Food and Drugs of the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, regarding the criminal and other legal actions taken against individuals associated with the National Health Federation, which Clinton Miller represents.

The memorandum follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
May 15, 1973.

To: Acting Commissioner of Food and Drugs.
From: Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Public Affairs; Director, Office of Legislative Services.
Subject: Report on the National Health Federation—Information Memorandum.

This memorandum updates a previous memorandum issued October 21, 1963, and is intended to provide you with background on the activities of the National Health Federation. Currently, this organization is promoting a mass write-to-Congress campaign against the recently issued special dietary food regulations, and urging support for H.R. 643, a bill which would virtually destroy all FDA control over the health claims made for special dietary foods. The Agency is receiving numerous Congressional and public inquiries as a result of this campaign.

The National Health Federation was founded in 1955 by Fred J. Hart, shortly after he consented to a Federal court injunction prohibiting him from making further shipments of 13 electrical devices which had been widely distributed for the diagnosis and treatment of disease. Mr. Hart had for many years been president of the Electronic Medical Foundation, previously known as the College of Electronic Medicine. The "College" was established by the late Dr. Albert Abrams, inventor of a "blood spot" system of diagnosis known as "Radionics."

Following the injunction, the Food and Drug Administration investigated reports that Hart was continuing to distribute the devices. He was prosecuted for criminal contempt of the injunction and on July 27, 1962, he was fined $500 by the U.S. District Court at San Francisco. At that time the court was informed that the Electronic Medical Foundation had been discontinued on June 16, 1962, leaving Mr. Hart free to devote his efforts to the National Health Federation.

The major stated purpose of the Federation is to promote "freedom of choice" in health matters. The record shows that what this frequently means is freedom to promote medical remedies and devices which violate the law. From its inception, the Federation has been a front for promoters of unproved remedies and eccentric theories. It has consistently supported discredited medical treatments such as the outlawed Hoxsey cure for cancer and other equally worthless treatments. Currently they are promoting Laetrile.

RESULTS OF COURT ACTIONS

Court records show that a number of the founders, officers, directors and active members of the National Health Federation have been involved in court actions under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Among those prosecuted, fined and/or imprisoned have been the following:

Fred J. Hart, founder and now Chairman of the Board. Mr. Hart was enjoined with the Electronic Medical Foundation on March 15, 1954, from distributing 13 electrical devices charged as misbranded with false claims for the diagnosis and treatment of hundreds of diseases and conditions. In 1961 he was prosecuted for violating the injunction, entered a plea of "no contest" and was fined $500 on July 27, 1962, by the U.S. District Court at San Francisco.

V. Earl Irons, Chairman of the Board of Governors (1963). Mr. Irons was then a food supplement distributor who served a one-year prison sentence in 1957 for misbranding Vit-Ra-Tox, a vitamin mixture sold by house-to-house agents. His conviction by the Federal District Court at Boston was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals on April 24, 1957.

Royal Lee, deceased Director, member of the Board of Governors and one of the founders of the Federation, was a non-practicing dentist at Milwaukee who was twice convicted for violating the Federal food and drug law. On April 23, 1962, he was given a one-year suspended prison sentence and put on probation for three years by the Federal District Court at Milwaukee. His firm, Vitamin Products Company, was fined $7,000. A court order prohibited them from continuing to ship 115 special dietary products misbranded by false claims for the treatment of more than 500 diseases and conditions.

Roy F. Paxton, Director (term ending 1963) was twice convicted as the promoter of "Millrue," a worthless cancer remedy. Mr. Paxton was convicted the second time in February 1963 by the Federal District Court at Springfield, Illinois. He was fined $2,500 and served a three-year prison sentence. The corporation, Millpax, Inc., was fined $1,000.

Andrew G. Rosenberger, listed as "Nutrition Chairman" and a featured speaker at NHF national conventions. Mr. Rosenberger representing the firm "Nature Food Centers," at Cambridge, Massachusetts, was convicted of misbranding dietary food products. On June 19, 1962, Andrew Rosenberger and his brother Henry, were each fined $5,000 and the corporation was fined $10,000 by the Federal District Court at Boston. Each of the Rosenbergers received a six-month suspended prison sentence and was put on probation for two years. The sentences were upheld by the Court of Appeals.

The Washington representative of the Federation continues to be Clinton R. Miller, Vice President. Before coming to Washington, Mr. Miller was the proprietor of the Clinton Wheat Shop at Bountiful, Utah. One of his products, Dried Swiss Whey, was seized on charges that it was misbranded as a treatment for intestinal disorders.

The aims and purposes of the National Health Federation are shown by its monthly publication, *National Health Federation Bulletin*, a pocket-size magazine published at San Francisco with Fred J. Hart listed as "Managing Editor."

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

On April 9, 1971, Kurt W. Donsbach, currently Vice President of NHF, pleaded guilty to practicing medicine without a license on charges brought by the State of California. According to the State records, the case culminated a five-month investigation by the Fraud Section of the State Bureau of Food and Drug Inspections.

Undercover agents of the California State Bureau of Food and Drug Inspections made repeated visits to Donsbach's "Nature's Way Health Food Store" in Garden Grove, California. They reported business "very good," usually with about 15 persons waiting to see "the doctor." Donsbach represented himself as a chiropractor, a naturopath, and a "Bachelor of Therapeutic Science." Investigation disclosed he is not licensed as a chiropractor in California, and the State does not recognize the other credentials. His driver's license identified him as an M.D.

The case résumé states that the California agents found that Donsbach was receiving "patients" in his "consulting room" and prescribing organic vitamins, minerals, etc. for disorders ranging from spastic colons to menopause and from serious heart ailments to breast cancer.

A woman agent was told by Donsbach on several occasions that her "breast cancer" could be controlled if she followed his advice and adhered to a strict diet with vitamins, minerals, and a herbal tea called "chapparral."

Another woman agent was told that her "emphysema" and "heart condition" would be helped 100 percent by following a regimen of vitamins, minerals, and herbs.

A man agent was instructed to take cabbage tablets daily to cure "stomach ulcer."

The cost of Donsbach's treatment to the woman agent with "breast cancer" would have been approximately $60 per month. With this as a yardstick for ten patients daily, and a five-day week, the California authorities estimated a gross income to Donsbach of around $2 million a year.

Donsbach was fined $750 plus $2,000 costs of investigation, and placed on probation for two years. Additionally, he consented to stop all "nutritional consultation" in the State of California.

Aside from his "health food" store, Kurt W. Donsbach is president of Westpro Labs, Inc., of Garden Grove, California. The firm's stationery indicates it deals in proteins, vitamins, stock formula, private labeling, custom formulation, contract development, market research, and unusual cosmetics.

The NHF continues to advocate and defend ill-founded and unsupported theories and practices, even for the treatment of serious disease conditions such as those described above, under the guise of the "right to freedom of choice" in health matters. The NHF contends that only those products and procedures with are intrinsically injurious should be legally restricted. This philosophy, of course, exposes innocent members of the public to worthless products, false hopes, and a return to the long discarded philosophy—"let the buyer beware!"

Such a philosophy fails to recognize the danger of reliance on unproven or ineffective agents in the treatment of serious disease which can be just as dangerous to the patient as the use of intrinsically injurious substances. One example of this NHF position is the continued advocacy in their association journal of the "right" of persons to obtain cancer remedies which are illegal in the United States because their merits, even for research purposes, have not been established.

NHF maintains that there is a right to sell food and other articles for their presumed health benefits, whether or not there is any scientific evidence to support the claims to promote them. A good example will be found in the November 1972 *National Health Federation Bulletin*. This issue contains an article entitled "How to Survive in a Poisoned World," by Paavo O. Airola, an Arizona naturopath. The article exaggerates the effects of air and water pollution and then prescribes approximately a dozen "health foods" and vitamins and minerals as effective antidotes. Scientifically, the material is nonsense. This type of literature also provides unethical or misguided dealers in such products with sales promotion material which exploits widespread fears and misconceptions.

Currently, NHF is carrying on a lobbying campaign in Congress against FDA's regulations which update obsolete (1941) rules on the labeling of special dietary foods. Under the laws as passed by Congress in 1938, the label for a food for special dietary uses must include "such information concerning its vitamins, minerals, and other dietary properties" as the regulation prescribes as "necessary in order to fully inform purchasers as to its value for such uses." The law also authorizes FDA to establish standards of quality and identity for food, including food supplements. The NHF's expressed philosophy is wholly contrary to the intent of Congress in enacting these laws. Further, their exaggerated views concerning the value of most vitamins and minerals and many other substances are not supported by recognized nutrition and medical authorities both inside and outside Government.

Directly related to the National Health Federation campaign against the FDA's dietary food regulations is a massive campaign for legislation which would exempt "health food," vitamins, minerals, etc., from being proven safe and effective by their sponsors when they are offered for the treatment of diseases. Present law offers full consumer protection by requiring that articles intended to treat disease conditions must be proven safe and effective *before* they can be placed on the market. Legislation being advocated by NHF would substantially weaken this protection which has been part of our law since 1938. The NHF bill (H.R. 643) would bring about this rollback in consumer protection by permitting the marketing of articles used in treating disease conditions without any assurance that they are safe and effective. The burden would be shifted to the Government to detect and remove dangerous products *after* they have been marketed (i.e., locking the barn door after the horse is stolen). In the meantime, of course, the public is exposed to such dangerous untested and ineffective products. Thus, a loophole would be opened for a return of the infamous "patent medicine" style of promotion, with "food supplements" taking the role of the "snake oil" remedies of bygone times; good for everything.

The NHF sponsored legislation would also reverse requirements of present law regarding proof of safety of food additives. In addition, present law deems a food to be adulterated if it contains a substance which "may be" injurious to health; yet the NHF bill would permit protective action only when a product is intrinsically injurious to health. Here again, this legislation would inappropriately shift the burden to the Government rather than the manufacturer who should bear this responsibility when he undertakes to market a product. We believe most consumers would not want to lose this protection against *potential* hazards.

According to the U.S Postal Service, paid subscriptions to the NHF Bulletin (sworn statement filed August 18, 1972) totaled 18,173. Membership, however, is estimated to be about 10,000.

We, of course, are concerned about the effects of this campaign on the uninformed consumer. We will continue to monitor the inquiries received. The Department's formal bill report on this legislation has issued and, at least, members of Congress now have more detailed information on the impact of this bill.

JOHN T. WALDEN,
GERALD F. MEYER.

Emory W. Thurston, NHF director, was convicted and sentenced July 24, 1973, for prescribing and selling the unapproved new drug Laetrile to an agent of the Bureau of Food and Drug, California State Department of Health, who represented to Thurston that she had uterine cancer.

The affidavit of the agent is attached. (Not reproduced.)

The defendant was fined $500 and assessed $125 (Peace Officer Training Assessment). The fine was suspended and the defendant placed on probation for 24 months on condition that he not sell or promote the sale of Laetrile for cancer, and not engage in the practice of medicine without a license.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD MOVES AGAINST SEX DISCRIMINATION

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, in following Federal legislation the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has issued regulations banning discrimination against women in applying for mortgage loans. In an article in today's Washington Post details of the new regulations are discussed.

In breaking down the barriers of sex discrimination the Board will make it easier for both married and single women who apply for mortgage loans. Up until now savings and loan associations have frequently refused to count a woman's income as part of a married couple's total salary intake. And in the case of single women it has even been more difficult in getting a loan—by forcing them to have a cosigner or guarantor—while this does not hold true for single men.

This "bill of rights" for women represents a breakthrough in the area of sex bias. The following is the article written by Claudia Levy of the Washington Post which I want to share with my colleagues:

MORTGAGE SEX BIAS REGULATED

(By Claudia Levy)

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, implementing recent federal legislation banning sex discrimination in lending, has issued regulations that it says amount to a "bill of rights" for women applying for mortgage loans.

The regulations, which apply to savings and loan associations under the board's jurisdiction—the country's major source of mortgage loans—"spell out in plain language what the board views as discriminatory practices," an announcement noted. They require every federally chartered lender, as well as those making "federally related" real estate loans backed by the Veterans Administration or Federal Housing Administration, to evaluate loan applicants for their credit-worthiness "without reference to presumed characteristics of a group," the board said.

The combined incomes of both husband and wife, for instance, must be considered "without prejudice," the board said. Women, particularly those of child-bearing age, frequently have complained that lenders refused to count their salaries when evaluating a family's financial resources. Lenders were said to often use the excuse that women tend to stop working when they have children.

But in its new regulations, to be published Tuesday in the Federal Register, the FHLBB says it officially frowns on the practice of making a couple spell out its birth control practices or ability to have children as a prerequisite to counting the wife's income.

The board said criteria for evaluating married applicants must be based on a "realistic appraisal of the past, present and expected continuance of both incomes when the couple applies for a loan together."

In addition, the board said, requiring a single woman with steady employment or other income to obtain a co-signer or guarantor for a mortgage loan—when single men are not—is sex discrimination.

Complaints of alleged violations may be referred to the board's office of housing and urban affairs, as well as to the assistant secretary of equal opportunity at the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

TRIBUTE TO THE TEACHING PROFESSION IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA—THEN AND NOW BY COL. BARNEY OLDFIELD, USAF, RETIRED, A CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF LITTON INDUSTRIES, INC.

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, for many years we have been treated to a strong diet of our country's and our individual State's shortcomings in meeting requirements, past, present, and future, so it was with considerable pleasure that I contemplated the remarks of Col. Barney Oldfield, USAF, retired, a corporate director of Litton Industries, Inc., in Beverly Hills, Calif.—as delivered recently before the convention of the Nebraska State Education Association in Kearney, Nebr.

What he says is a great tribute to the teaching profession in our State, and he has some credentials from which to speak as he has had a much varied career as a newspaperman, radio commentator, script writer, magazine and book author, Army and Air Force officer in two wars, and a businessman. These things have caused him to undertake all kinds of assignments in some 67 countries to date, and with more to come, undoubtedly.

While he may live in California now—as he has done twice in his life, first when he was with Warner Brothers Studio, and now with Litton—he was born and educated in Nebraska, grade school, country school, small town high school, and the University of Nebraska. I do not know whether at any of his graduations the speakers may have said he would go far, but whether they did or not, geographically he surely did.

This is what he said:

MY PETS ARE TEACHERS

Members of the Nebraska State Teachers Association and friends:

Many thanks for inviting me to come back to Nebraska on this occasion. It's always a delight for me, as everything that was to be for me began in this state in a country school, in a small town high school, and in this state's great university. How different life would have been for me, I often think, had it not been for that institution we call school, and those people who make it go—teachers. Your Nebraska and my Nebraska may lie in the very same geographic area as always, but the changes it has known since I was a day-to-day part of it and it was the only world I knew, have been great, indeed. Even the fact of going to work at this hour of 9:30 a.m., that's a big switch! When I was growing up on Nebraska farms, anyone who wasn't up and doing by 5 in the morning, and was not an equally late stayer in the fields was asking for the village banker to come and take it all.

Before coming here, considering the kind of audience this would be, I looked in my dictionary for the word teacher. I knew what it meant in a general way, but I wanted to see what kind of word company it was keeping. That shook me up a little. My dictionary gave teach, teacher, teaching, and teaching hospital a total of only 16 lines. But it gave the word tea three times as many. It gave tea credit for being a drink, for having caused wars, for having affected the history of the Orient, for coming in bags, and for being the basis of ceremony. Yet for me, who can take tea or leave it, it is the teaching profession which throws open the golden door for every man and woman on earth.

At odds with the sparseness of credit given you by my dictionary, let me break the word up into the letters which compose it, and this will lead to the reasons why I feel as I do.

First, there is the letter T. I'd like to let that stand for Technology. This is how we lace up chemical, mechanical and physical sciences as they are applied to industrial processes. Technology begins with teachers, borrowing on the wisdom of the ages and adding new thinking. It calls for the addition of the important ingredient we call imagination. The start may be with one of your classroom daydreamers or youthful wondering minds, and if this can somehow be led into a tieup with strange but complementing combinations, it can well lead to us knowing more, doing better things, helping more people. To know is crucial; not to know or being afraid of knowing points the most lethal weapon of all right at your head. In 1959, I was writing and producing a radio series which would be called Face to the Future. To provide its foundations, I asked fifty scientists, engineers, theologians, teachers, far-out thinkers, leaders asking each to list his idea of the 13 most important factors bearing on our progress to the year 2,000 A.D. The thirteen most frequently mentioned then became the subjects of the 13 episodes. One of these was communication, in the largest sense of that word. It was my feeling that in the talk then about the oncoming synchronous satellites, we really were on the threshold of its realization. The synchronous satellite is one which, placed in orbit 22,000 miles above the earth at the Equator, will stay in a fixed relationship to a spot on earth. I was looking for a scientist or engineer of dimension beyond the sizable accomplishment of putting it there. My proposal was that if three were so placed in a triangulation pattern off the earth's surface so any one of them could "see" the other two, and if these satellites were equipped as TV and radio relays, were we not close to the oldest dream of Man that he be able to communicate with every other Man on earth? And would not the country which achieved this first—exposure of the whole of the earth's surface to broadcast and telecast—make of its culture, its doings, its language that of every other man?

When the series played on more than 900 stations in 1960, this particular segment was often described as the most far out, beyond comprehension really. Just eight years later, a black teenager named George Foreman won his Olympic Gold Medal in Mexico City and this fight was viewed all over the world by 500,000,000 people by satellite relay. He waved his little American flag in the ring because he was happy, but it was a gesture which touched the hearts of many people. Two months later, the same George Foreman was mystified when he received a special invitation from President Johnson to come to a state dinner at the White House being given for the Emir of Kuwait, the leader of that oil-rich Persian Gulf nation. George went, and found himself seated at the same small table with The President, The Emir, and their wives. The Emir asked George if he had wondered about his invitation a little bit, and George said he hadn't really understood it. The Emir told him: "I saw you win your Gold Medal in Mexico on my TV set in my hotel suite in Beirut, Lebanon, and I was so pleased to see you as a young man who loved his country. When they asked who I would like to meet when I was coming to America for this visit, I said I hoped I would get to see you." So, what was too far out for anybody to reach in 1960—this particular communications dimension—was proven not to be of the next century, but the reality of just eight years later! It was advancing technology which brought it about.

The next letter is E, and I would assign that to Experience. One of the hardest jobs in teaching is to stay ahead, they tell me—particularly if you are faced with bright youngsters in a classroom. One of my revered teacher acquaintances is a Catholic Nun named Sister Mary Aquinas. In the '30s immediately following Lindbergh's much heralded exploit of flying non-stop from New York to Paris, the pupils she had in her science classes were asking her all kinds of questions about flying. She felt she had to have the experience of doing so to properly perform her role as a teacher. Much to the consternation of her Mother Superior and other churchly figures, she went out to a nearby grass field where there were some rickety planes and some men who called themselves pilots. Working with them, she learned to be a mechanic, then took flying lessons, eventually soloed, and altogether had about 68 solo hours of flying time. She became the first nun to become a licensed pilot, and was the first and genuine "flying Nun." She was such a rousing teaching success, she was lifted out of her small school in Wisconsin, taken to Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., and she taught hundreds of Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps pilots meteorology and navigation as World War II got under way. Later, I nominated her and she was awarded the Air Force Association of Honor for this wartime service. At a reception that evening, she cornered the 4-star Air Force General I then worked for and told him she had two un-answered prayers. One was to go to heaven when she died, and the other was to fly an Air Force jet. She was only 64 years old when she told him that, but he was game if she was. When Sister Mary landed, she told us when she had been up there at 40,000 feet, and perhaps as close to her God as she had ever been, she looked at that jet control panel and it came home to her more forcibly then than it ever had before that none of what had just occurred could have happened to her except for scientists and engineers who had earlier in their lives passed through classes such as hers. Experience is not only the great learning aid of those being taught, it does things for the teacher, too.

We move on now to the letter A, and I would assign that to Application. I have always felt that the greatest loss in the abortive Apollo 13 mission to the moon was not the crippling of the ship by having its panels blown from the spacecraft, but the denial to the world's classrooms of the conversations from Mission Control in Houston to the astronauts in their great mortal danger. Being there on the ground in Houston, I have since thought that hearing it all would be the greatest stimulus to the serious study of mathematics I had ever known. Math was never a favorite place to play for me, but had I had that Mission Control spinoff to have influenced me in my time, the story could have been different for even a dullard such as myself. The situation, you may remember, was one of three brave men enroute to the Moon, the spacecraft crippled, they were unable to land, and the trick was to maneuver them safely back—all this going on while the spacecraft was moving in excess of 17,000 miles per hour. For some time it appeared they might miss the earth entirely. The dramatics of the instant mathematical calculations for course correction of the spacecraft which were being fed to the astronauts more than 200,000 miles way were unbelievable, done so calmly, which is one of the hallmarks of competent men. For more than 48 hours, the tension was so overwhelming that none of the hundreds of reporters and cameramen and commentators covering the shot ever left his chair for long, or could bring himself to take the earphones from his head. Mathematics was no longer multiplication tables, Xes *and* Yes, theorems, schoolroom problems, a drudge, it as turning into a matter of life and death, and right before all of us. The real bridge between disaster for three astronauts and safety had been built through those long hours by mathematics.

The next letter up for consideration will be C. I give that to Curiosity. This eagerness to know goes in many directions, shows in many ways. It can be as easily worn by the gossip who settles for half, as by the most responsible newsman who wants to present all that is pertinent. It is the starting point for trying something new, as it is a trail retracer to determine why something is the way it is and has always been so. Properly nurtured, curiosity can be world-changing; let go to weeds, it can serve no constructive purpose. The biggest word to the curious is why. It brought about one of the most startling and vengeful coincidences in history in the person of a young Jewish scientist named Heinrich Hertz, who proved certain theories about pulsations in electromagnetic waves, and he ushered the microwave into understandable and serving proportions taking it from the unknown and mysterious into harness as a servant of Mankind from the Cosmos to the kitchen. The microwave oven which is now serving so well in so many homes is just one of the newer applications of his proved up knowledge. But Hertz was driven by his curiosity, and in 1888, he nailed it down. The coincidence was that while this was listed as the most important event in physics in the 19th Century, that 1888 was also the very year Adolf Hitler was born. Although Hertz, a German himself, would only live to be 37 and not see Hitler's rise to power where he would scheme to destroy millions of the Jewish people, he had given the world the key to Hitler's vulnerability. An Englishman named Sir Robert Watson-Watt took the Hertz findings and developed radar, which was used so successfully to defeat the German Luftwaffe in the Battle of Britain. This saved the British Isles as a launching area for the forces which would liberate Europe and bring the end of Hitler himself. No man ever reached more dramatically beyond the grave to avenge his people than did Hertz, and it was all based on a probing curiosity about the theories of others. I have never seen curiosity and a vacantly-staring face go together, as nothing so animates a face as a well-developed and healthy curiosity. If you as teachers see it there, give it a flower garden's special care.

The H is for Horizons. These are too often accepted as being as far as one can see in any direction, but it wrongly assumes the viewer will always be in a fixed position, rooted as is a tree. Movement changes it all, and by taking new positions, horizons can be altered a little or a great deal. Between high school and college I drove stakes for Ringling Brothers, Barnum and Bailey Circus, and later on laid rails for the Burlington Railroad. I found the people who worked in both these environments very different from the ones I had grown up with. Where I was going out after the world literally, many of them for various unhappy reasons took these strange ways of hiding from it. The life was mobile, the scenes changed and while I was all eyes and looking about, theirs were down and they were not too communicative. There were times when I had to make serious judgments, and there was none to advise me. As one finds out about others in such circumstances, he also discovers a lot about himself, and when there are prospects of a lot of living ahead of you, it's comforting to know where your strengths are. Being sheltered too long may give one an aura of being protected, but it's also hazardous. so doctoring one's horizons should be encouraged at the earliest possible moment. I don't know how well acquainted you are with the old tented circus, but it had to arrive in a new town each morning on several trains, have its wagons and animals offloaded, and some pasture or meadow had to be changed into a vast tent-city by noon then there were two performances, after which it all had to be torn down and be back on the trains by midnight or shortly thereafter for the run to the next stand. The distance from the circus lot to the trains could be as much as three miles or more, and the way was always marked with a series of flickering flares so that teamsters would not get lost. One particular evening, a cold rain was drizzling down on us as I rode along behind a six horse hitch on the stake and pole wagon of the cook tent, our canvas-topped restaurant was always the first to come down and be loaded out at night. At one point there was a traffic halt, and as this old teamster and I sat there waiting for the way to clear, the water was running off my hat, some down my neck, some in drops before my eyes. It was right uncomfortable, and by this time I was a little homesick, if you want to know the truth—not being quite 19 then. Glancing in at some of the houses along the street, there was one there with a big, wide window. It had been cool enough that night for the family to have a little flash-fire in the fireplace to take the evening chill off. Through that window I could see a woman sewing, her husband reading the newspaper, and their two kids prone on the floor playing with blocks. It was too much. With envy in my voice, I said to my companion: "Hey, there's a guy who's really got it made!" The teamster, having been with the circus for 17 years, looked over the scene with great disdain. "That hick," he said scornfully, "he's probably so dumb he can't even throw a half hitch." Well, as I said, you have to make judgments when you are on your own, and it was easy for me to disagree with that teamster's sense of values. Horizons need never be fixed and can always be flexible. If one seeks no greater proficiencies than how to make a half hitch, he becomes rooted as a tree.

The next letter is E, and I give that to Example. I'd like to tell you how my geometry teacher once saved my neck in a way not even she would have dreamed of, when I was faced with a tough technical presentation. The idea was to write about it in a fashion which would say it all simply, and say it for the easy understanding of mass or general readerhip. The situation was this: After World War II, the speeds of aircraft in military use increased greatly with the arrival of jets. These planes moved so fast, the pilot found himself riding along exceeding the velocity of a pistol bullet. In the slower pace of other wars, the aerial combat tactic *was to come* in on the tail of an adversary, line him up in the gunsights, and let him have it. This was known as hitting him in his tailfeathers, and that they did. But what was to happen if they flew faster than bullets were able to travel? Obviously it would be better if the hits could be brought about broadside, so a new tactic was introduced which called for the use of fast rockets which would go after their targets on what was called a collision course. This was much the same thing as having two automobiles coming into a street intersection at right angles to each other, and running into each other. But it was far from simple to be precise about this when both planes and rockets were exceeding the speed of sound. Since men's nervous systems were in no way fast enough to compute, to calculate, to shoot and to hit, all kinds of electronics and radar had to be added. It was some toughie to write about, and have a feature story result which could go via some national syndicate to a public readership on a grand scale. We were in Yuma, Arizona for this test in mid-summer. Quite suddenly, an idea struck me and for some strange reason I could see one of the early pages of that old geometry book which I had loathed so much in high school. It was summer vacation time, but because I was afraid old memories were not infallible, I called the Principal of Yuma's high school and asked him if by any chance one of his geometry teachers might be in town. He said that one of them was—she was about 60, and didn't bother to go anywhere for the summer hiatus, and just stayed home. I called her and told her who I was, that I had a question. As I remembered my old geometry book, I told her, somewhere about page 7 or 10, there was a theorem that I recalled went like this: Two straight lines can intersect at but one point. There was a moment's silence on the other end. Finally, she said: "Do you know what a thrill this is? Somewhere in Heaven this morning, there has to be an old geometry teacher who is jumping about in ecstasy, saying to herself that one of the ones she taught did remember after all!" I used that old theorem for the lead on that story about collision course, as the intersection of plane and rocket at a single point was all it would take. The story ran nationwide.

The last of the letters in TEACHER is R, and I ask you to think of it as standing for Recognition. I've been told that through grades and early high school, it's hard for most young people to believe their elders think they're worth the trouble, will ever amount to anything, will ever really be anybody. Recognition is the simple act of encouragement, by even looking hard sometimes to find something an individual has done which is worthy of a pat on the head, a word of praise, the act of rendering an appreciative gesture for the quality of work done. One of the greatest costs levied on society today is that so much effort above and beyond the mere average is denied our lives because so few in any career field who rise to positions of consequence find the time for pauses to set stimulative processes in motion and gain all the extra rewards which can be aroused by them. One of my long ago history books, whose author is dimmed out by time, carried a statement attributed to Napoleon which read: "Give me some bits of metal and bright ribbons, and I will conquer the word." He was speaking of awards and decorations for service, for bravery, for gallantry in action, and although he didn't conquer quite all of it, he was enough of an earth-shaker that we study still the techniques which he used and which were the essence of his leadership. Perhaps it was this side of his leadership qualities—the fact that he understood the men he led and how they would react, and how hard they would labor for his favor—which had the most to do with his success. I bring up recognition before you all, because somehow this ability or willingness or desire to applaud others for good workmanship is not there often enough for those who leave the classrooms to carry it out into their own lives and put the magic of its incentive into the others.

You as teachers have probably loosed a great many on a future course which would startle you, if you knew some of the destinations. My hope is that those you did it with will remember where it really began and will let you know. Then you can recollect Mark Twain who said: "It is noble to be smart, but even nobler to tell someone else how to be smart—and it's much less trouble."

My first teacher is still alive, but quite frail now. When they asked me to come back to my home town once to do the commencement address, she made a trip of 600 miles each way to be there that night—all the way from Wyoming. I told the audience I was glad she was there, as on my very first day of school, coming back from you-know-where, I had to go "psst, psst" at the door and have her come out to join me. I needed help in getting my pants buttoned. I told her I was very glad she was there, as I just might need her again. No one enjoyed that special remembrance between us more than she did. While I can never say I was ever a teacher's pet, I can say that some of my favorite pets have been teachers. Bless you all.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE PLO

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues here in the House. I found this article, which appeared in the Charlotte County, Fla., Daily Herald News, a most candid response to the recent appearance of Yasir Arafat before the United Nations in New York. I urge each of you to read it and seriously consider its contents. Ofttimes, unfortunately, when dealing with international diplomacy the hard truth gets brushed aside—or even buried.

The article follows:

UN DISGRACE

It is very clear that the United States has become the whipping boy in the Mideast.

The reception given to terrorist Yasir Arafat by the United Nations was the cork in the bottle. This country should withdraw its representation and financial support from an international organization which makes a mockery of diplomacy.

It just so happens that an Arab, Foreign Minister Abdelaziz Bouteflika, was presiding over the UN General Assembly when Arafat made his appearance. Contrary to all custom, Bouteflika ordered the courtesies normally accorded only to chiefs of state or prime ministers extended to Arafat. The UN chief of protocol escorted him to a chair on the rostrum.

This man is a terrorist; he and his henchmen are responsible for the deaths of people in various parts of the world in senseless bombings and killings and kidnappings.

Has this country been reduced to the degree of taking part in such a tragic charade? It would appear so.

It should not be so. Our money is paying, largely, for Arafat's appearance—and for his further troubling the scene involving potential warfare between Israel and the Arab world.

Our money is, largely keeping the United Nations alive.

Not a dime of the taxpayers' money should be devoted to maintaining a platform on which the ilk of Arafat can appear and address the world community.

Our objection stems, not from his goals, but from his means of attempting to achieve them.

If the small nations of the world are to continue to use the UN as a podium, from which, on a one-vote-per-country basis, to beat the United States over the head and body, we think it's time to withdraw, gracefully but firmly, and to tell the UN to find another home.

The Arafat performance was disgraceful.—BILL NEEDHAM.

H.R. 10337

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday December 16, 1974

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, on December 10, 1974, the House concurred in the amendments of the Senate to H.R. 10337, providing for the settlement of a dispute between the Navajo and Hopi Tribes to certain lands within the State of Arizona.

The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the House had extensive hearings on the bill and it passed the House on May 29, 1974. House Report No. 93–909 accompanied the bill.

The extensive debate was held in the House on the legislation on March 18 and May 29 of this year and I will not go into too much detail on the provisions of the House-passed bill. However, I do feel that a more detailed explanation should be on the record with respect to the major amendments of the Senate with which the House concurred.

The first tract of land in dispute is approximately 2 million acres within the 1882 Executive order reservation in which the Federal courts have determined the two tribes have a joint, undivided, and equal interest. The House-passed bill provided that the district court would partition this area between the two tribes under certain guidelines established in the bill.

With respect to the settlement of this dispute, the Senate amendments provide that a mediator shall be appointed by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to mediate negotiation sessions between the two tribes in an attempt to arrive at an agreed-upon settlement of the issue during an 180-day negotiating period after enactment.

If the tribes fail to reach agreement during this period, the mediator will then serve as a master to the Federal district court which will partition the lands pursuant to the recommendations of the mediator and under general guidelines established in the bill which are very similar to the guidelines of the House-passed bill.

The second major difference is the treatment of the lands in dispute in the so-called 1934 Navajo Reservation, known as the Moencopi Area. The House provision calls for a congressional partition of the lands with approximately 250,000 acres of this reservation being partitioned to the Hopi Tribe. The Senate provision provides that the dispute to the Moencopi Area shall be litigated by the two tribes in the district court in a suit separate from that relating to the 1882 joint use area. Litigation expenses of the tribes are authorized to be borne by the United States.

The House bill makes provisions for the Secretary to implement the partition of any land in the 1882 area and the Moencopi Area by providing for the removal of members of one tribe from lands partitioned to the other tribe. The authority to do so is conferred and authority and funds are established to facilitate the removal of such persons, purchase of improvments by the United States, and relocation of such persons.

The Senate amended the bill in this regard to provide for the establishment of a Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission to direct and implement this relocation. The Senate bill also conferred necessary authority on the Commission to carry out its responsibilities and authorized appropriations for such purpose.

Finally, the Senate increased the appropriations to carry out the total purposes of the legislation from approximately $29 million in the House bill to approximately $49 million.

Mr. Speaker, we feel that this legislation, with the Senate amendment, will finally bring to a conclusion the long-standing, vexing problem which has plagued these two tribes and permit them to proceed with the extremely important task of improving the condition of their members.

MERCHANTVILLE STUDENTS PERFORM

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today the Merchantville, N.J., Elementary School Band and Choir presented two performances on Capitol Hill.

This group of some 150 youngsters, in grades 3 through 8, gave fine performances both in song and through their band.

I want to take this opportunity to welcome them here today, and to share with my colleagues my pride in them. These children, in visiting their Nation's Capital, have participated in a great experience. Their eagerness, their openness, typical of most youngsters their age, is refreshing and a true inspiration.

I know you will share with me my best wishes for all of these fine students and for their music teacher, Mr. Joseph DiMenna, and their superintendent of schools and principal, Mr. Ernest H. Bardow, Jr.

TRIBUTE BY PRESIDENT FORD AND STATE DEPARTMENT TO REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. ROONEY OF NEW YORK UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, November 26 just past, the State Department gave a reception on the eighth floor of their building in the beautiful Thomas Jefferson and John Quincy Adams Rooms for our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY of New York. The occasion was highly unusual in that the heads of the three branches of our Government, the executive, the legislative and the judiciary were present: The President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Chief Justice of the United States. These gentlemen delivered highly complimentary remarks concerning the guest of honor and his retirement at the end of this Congress. During the course of the speaking program the former Ambassador and former Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Honorable Loy W. Henderson read a beautifully illuminated framed scroll of a resolution adopted by members of the Foreign Service, both retired and active assembled on Foreign Service Day, November 15, 1974, which he presented to the guest of honor. The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

CONGRESSMAN JOHN J. ROONEY

Whereas, Congressman John J. Rooney has served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives since 1945, a period of almost thirty years, and

Whereas, Congressman Rooney has served as Chairman of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce and the Judiciary Appropriations for almost twenty-four years, and

Whereas, Congressman Rooney, throughout his long and illustrious service in the Congress has contributed substantially to the well-being of the country and to the interests of the United States in foreign affairs, and

Whereas, Congressman Rooney has continuously sought to assist in promoting and enhancing the stature and performance of the Department of State and the Foreign Service, therefore, be it

Resolved, that we, members of the Foreign Service, both retired and active, assembled on this Foreign Service Day of November 15, 1974, express our high regard and respect for Congressman, Rooney's outstanding service to his country and the promotion of its interests overseas, and record our deep gratitude to Congressman Rooney for his continuing help and assistance to the Department of State and Foreign Service throughout his service in the Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
United States of America.

There was also a presentation of a seal of the Department of State, a gavel, and a gold plaque, all in a very nice frame.

The hosts for the evening were the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management, former Ambassador L. Dean Brown and Mrs. Brown. In addition to the Honorable Gerald R. Ford, President of the United States; the Honorable CARL ALBERT, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and the Honorable Warren E. Burger, Chief Justice of the United States, and Mrs. Burger, those in attendance were the Acting Secretary of State Robert E. Ingersoll and Mrs. Ingersoll; Assistant Secretary of State for Administration John M. Thomas and Mrs. Thomas; former Ambassador and former Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Loy W. Henderson; former Ambassador and former Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Idar Rimestad and Mrs. Rimestad; Ambassador Henry J. Tasca; former Ambassador Norman K. Winston; former Ambassador John Clifford Folger; former Assistant Secretary of State Frank G. Meyer and Mrs. Meyer; former Assistant Secretary of State Joseph F. Donelan, Jr., and Mrs. Donelan; Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Richard W. Murray and Mrs. Murray; Mr. William Roy Little and Mrs. Little; Mr. Lee Owens; Mr. Bruce T. Howe and Mrs. Howe; Mr. Clement E. Conger, Curator, State Department and White House; former Legal Adviser of the Department of State and presently dean of Georgetown University School of Law Adrian S. Fisher; Dr. Ernest N. Mannino and Mrs. Mannino; Mr. Michel Cieplinski; former Consul General Charles Manning and Mrs. Manning; former Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Raymond F. Farrell and Mrs. Farrell; Consultant to the Department of State Dr. Vincent P. Mazzola, M.D.; Commissioner of the Civil Aeronautics Board G. Joseph Minetti and Mrs. Minetti; Maritime Commissioner George H. Hearn and Mrs. Hearn; U.S. Customs Court Judge Paul P. Rao; Marshal of the U.S. Customs Court Dante A. Robilotti; Representative GEORGE H. MAHON and Mrs. Mahon; Representative WAYNE L. HAYS; Representative JAMES J. DELANEY; Representative JOHN M. SLACK and Mrs. Slack; Representative ELFORD A. CEDERBERG and Mrs. Cederberg; Representative MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota, and Mrs. Andrews; Representative WENDELL WYATT and Mrs. Wyatt; Representative THADDEUS J. DULSKI; Representative MARIO BIAGGI; former Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst; the Capitol Physician Rear Adm. Freeman H. Cary, M.D. and Mrs. Cary; Physician to the President Rear Adm. William M. Lukash, M.D.; Assistant Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives D. Thomas Iorio; Mr. Jay B. Howe and Mrs. Howe, Mr. Dempsey B. Mizelle and Mrs. Mizelle; Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Administration Leamon R. Hunt and Mrs. Hunt; Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Elmer S. Groo; Mr. Samuel F. Pryor of Pan American World Airways; former Assistant Secretary of Labor John W. Gibson and Mrs. Gibson; Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for

Security Victor H. Dikeos and Mrs. Dikeos; Director of Office of Foreign Buildings Orland C. Ralston and Mrs. Ralston; Mr. Ernest J. Colantonio and Mr. Lawrence S. Eagleburger, Executive Assistant to the Secretary of State.

Also Mr. Oscar Nielson and Mrs. Nielson, Mr. Charles D. Roche, Mr. Hugh Adamson and Mrs. Adamson, Mr. Ted Chariott, Mr. David Waters, Mr. David Dean and Mrs. Dean, Mr. George A. Willming and Mrs. Willming, Mr. Gerson H. "Lefty" Lush, Mr. William A. Buell, Jr., and Mrs. Buell, Mr. Harry A. Cahill and Mrs. Cahill, Mr. Francis J. Donnelly and Mrs. Donnelly, Mr. Kenneth Strawberry and Mrs. Strawberry, Mr. Eugene L. Krizek and Mrs. Krizek, Mr. John E. Reilly, Mr. Don C. Eller, Mr. Marvin Braverman and Mrs. Braverman, Mrs. Jenalee D. Nivens, Mrs. Thomas S. Miller, Miss Susan L. Shaw, Mr. Mark A. Eller and Mrs. Eller, Mr. Michael McShane, Mr. and Mrs. Marshall E. Sheets, Dr. Henry Busky and Mrs. Busky, Mr. Don Byrne, Executive Officer of the Drug Enforcement Administration Daniel P. Casey, Mr. John J. Rooney, Jr., and Mrs. Rooney and Mr. Michael G. Farrell and Mrs. Farrell, Mr. Fred Blumenthal and Mrs. Blumenthal, Mr. Leo J. Grills and Mrs. Grills.

Greetings on the occasion, contained in an album, were received from the Honorable Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State, who was in Peking; the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; former Secretary of State Dean Rusk; former Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration William J. Crockett and Mrs. Crockett; Ambassador to Argentina Robert C. Hill and Mrs. Hill; Ambassador to Vietnam Graham A. Martin and Mrs. Martin; Ambassador to Ireland John D. J. Moore and Mrs. Moore; Ambassador to Guatemala Francis E. Meloy, Jr.; Ambassador to Turkey and former Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration William B. Macomber, Jr., and Mrs. Macomber; Ambassador to France Kenneth Rush and Mrs. Rush; former Counselor of our Embassy in London Jack A. Herfurt and Mrs. Herfurt; Counselor of Embassy in Paris Peter J. Skoufis and Mrs. Skoufis; former Deputy Chief of Mission to France and presently President of the American Hospital in Paris Perry Culley; former Counselor of Embassy in Paris Robert Ryan and Mrs. Ryan; former Ambassador to Barbados Miss Eileen R. Donovan; USNATO Counselor John V. Abidian and Mrs. Abidian and former Consul General at Naples and Supervising Consul General for all Italy Homer S. Byington and Mrs. Byington.

EVENTS IN RHODESIA AND THE CHROME VOTE

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 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 U.S. importation of Rhodesian chrome against U.N. sanctions. Our vote on this measure, scheduled later this week, could not come at a more opportune time at which to make our position on this matter abundantly clear.

The Journal of Commerce has run an article on what is happening in Rhodesia and the ramifications and implications of our vote this week. The article follows:

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

(By Peter T. Leach)

The agreement announced Wednesday in Salisbury ending the black African nationalists' guerrilla 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 Administration, 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 per cent 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 sanctions, 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.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOUTH KOREA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the subject of human rights in South Korea has been a matter of considerable concern to many Members for several months.

Recently, I had an exchange of letters with Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Arthur W. Hummel, Jr. on human rights.

It seems to be the view of the Department of State that despite what may be temporary suspension of certain individual rights in Korea, the basic trend in Korea is toward a greater democratization and toward the development of freer institutions.

While it is less clear to many of us in Congress which way Korea will go in the coming months and years—toward even greater authoritarian and dictatorial rule or toward a freer society—it is clear that levels of U.S. aid to this country where we have spent so much in terms of human and financial resources will be determined in no small part by the way the Korean Government acts to resolve some of the internal political and social problems which have led to recent allegations, some substantiated, of human rights violations in South Korea.

I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention some exchanges and correspondence I have had with the Department of State on the situation in South Korea.

There follows a series of questions submitted to Deputy Assistant Secretary Hummel last summer, answers received this fall, and two exchanges of letters based on those answers:

HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOUTH KOREA

Question 1. Mr. Hamilton: President Park has argued that the recently tightened internal security measures are necessary because his opposition is Communist-led and because there are increased signs of North Korean hostility from the South. What are these signs, and how is the threat measured? How large, realistically, is the threat?

Mr. HUMMEL. Beginning late in 1973 there have been a series of North Korean provocations which has increased tension on the Korean Peninsula. These include an unprecedented claim by North Korea to control the waters surrounding islands off the west coast which were placed under United Nations Command control by the Armistice Agreement. At the time they made the claims, the North Koreans threatened to deny access to these islands. On February 15 the North Koreans sank one ROK fishing boat and captured another in international waters off the west coast. A Maritime Police boat was sunk by North Korean Patrol craft off the east coast June 28. All survivors of these incidents are still held in North Korea. Since then attempts to land agents have been reported off the south coast of the ROK and on July 19 ROK craft captured a North Korea agent boat off the west coast after a prolonged gun battle.

These events have considerably worsened the atmosphere and increased the potential for trouble in an area that has already known conflict and repeated hostilities. For these reasons we take that threat seriously.

Question 2. Mr. Hamilton: With a population more than twice the size of North Korea's, a larger army, and massive U.S. assistance, shouldn't the South be able to defend itself without restricting the civil liberties of its citizens?

Mr. HUMMEL. By and large, all Koreans in the South recognize that the north is provocative, and represents a threat to their security. Certain of them have expressed a concern regarding the extent to which their liberties have been restricted by their government in order to safeguard their security. The judgment of the measures necessary for national security was one made by the Korean Government and I don't think it would be proper for me to comment further.

Question 3. Mr. Hamilton: What precisely is the U.S. doing to express its displeasure with Park's actions? What else can we do?

Mr. HUMMEL. We do not approve of actions in Seoul or elsewhere that deprive people of their human rights. We have expressed ourselves clearly on this matter both in Seoul and Washington and there is no doubt that the Korean Government knows our position. Our Ambassador in Seoul has been active in representations on this matter and will continue to be, so long as the situation requires an expression of our concern. We believe our actions have been effective, and that diplomatic representations offer greater promise of alleviating the situation than heavy-handed threat or ultimatums.

Question 4. Mr. Hamilton: It has been said that President Thieu would fall if we withdrew aid from South Vietnam. Would Park fall if we withdrew from South Korea?

Mr. HUMMEL. I always find it difficult to answer that sort of question because, to begin with, it is based on a fallacy regarding our aid and support. We help countries and governments in the broad sense, because of our security interests, and because by so doing we contribute to economic well-being, the development of democratic institutions, and in turn world peace. Our aid is not provided as support *per se* to a given political leader. Specifically, as concerns Korea, our assistance has succeeded in achieving our objectives. To withdraw that support would cause great uneasiness in Korea, and contribute to instability on the peninsula.

Question 5. Mr. Hamilton: When will the "emergency measures" be lifted? Do we have reason to believe that they ever will be? If the measures are justified because of the Northern threat, how has the South survived for the past 20 years of Northern threat without "emergency measures"? Is the threat from the North greater now than it has been for the past 20 years?

Mr. HUMMEL. The ROKG has not informed us when the measures will be lifted although there are reports that indicate they may soon be partially lifted. In any case there is every reason to believe that these measures are not permanent. Since the decision to promulgate these measures was one taken unilaterally by the ROKG, I would rather not comment on their justification. I would say, however, that over the past 20 years, South Korea has had to cope with North Korea's aggressive intentions, and that she has felt the need for certain limitations of human rights which other countries in a more favorable geographic position have been able to enjoy fully. As concerns North Korea's military capacity, I would consider it greater now than at any time in the past 20 years. However, ROK capability has also increased and the basic confrontation remains much as it has in recent years.

Question 6. Mr. Hamilton: Could you compare the present level of civil liberties in North and South Korea?

Mr. HUMMEL. North Korea is a tightly closed society which allows virtually no reporting to the outside world. From what we know, however, her citizens live in a highly controlled and regimented society. State authority is supreme, and we have never heard of student dissidence, political opposition, or press criticism. Whatever may be the current status of human rights in South Korea, there is absolutely no doubt that civil liberties are practically non-existent in the north. While South Koreans have been critical of conditions in the south, none that I know of would prefer to live in the north.

Question 7. Mr. Hamilton: What is the role of religion in the movement to oppose Park?

Mr. HUMMEL. Christian leadership, both Catholic and Protestant, plays a significant role in the opposition to President Park's government. This is so because they believe that Christian doctrine is based on a fundamental adherence to human values, and on the rights of man, which they believe the present government has curtailed. The government on the other hand states, with some justification, that no one is denied the right to worship, and that there is no religious persecution in Korea. The Christian religion in Korea has about 4 million followers out of a population of some 30 million.

The oriental religions in Korea, mainly Buddhism, have not been deeply involved in this problem.

Question 8. Mr. Hamilton: For FY '75, the Administration has requested an increase in grant military assistance from $112,300, to $161,500, and an increase from $25,000 to $52,000 in military credit sales over FY '74. How can these increases be justified at a time when the Korean Government is restricting the civil liberties of its citizens? What would be the impact of a cut in grant military assstance to roughly $100 million, or slightly below last year's level?

Mr. HUMMEL. As part of the program to modernize the ROK Armed Forces, the Administration last year requested some $238 million. Korea finally wound up with $78 million, a figure we consider far below requirements. Following the shortfall of last year a $100 million level of grant military assistance would further delay our objective of modernizing the ROK Armed Forces, we believe this program, which we undertook in 1971, is in our own security interest of avoiding a war on the Korean peninsula. Secretary Kissinger made clear in testimony before the Senate, that our security interests require military assistance to Korea, even though we do not approve of certain of her policies.

Question 9. Mr. Hamilton: The Korean Constitution guarantees freedom of speech. Yet the government has made criticism of the regime punishable by death, and claims that "there are exceptional cases where political ideology or belief of an individual person constitutes either a crime of a condition for heavier punshment." Does the Constitution permit emergency measures to suspend civil rights?

Mr. HUMMEL. The answer to that question is yes. Actually, the present Constitution does not unconditionally guarantee freedom of speech. For example, Article 18 states that "No citizen shall be subject to restriction of freedom of speech and press, or freedom of assembly and association, except as provided by law." Article 53, however, states in part that "when the President deems it necessary, he shall have the power to take emergency measures which temporarily suspend the freedom and rights of the people as defined in the present Constitution. . . ."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1974.

Hon. ARTHUR W. HUMMEL, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMMEL: I recently received a copy of the answers you provided to the additional questions I submitted following your testimony before two Foreign Affairs subcommittees, July 30, 1974, on the subject of human rights in South Korea.

In one reply, you stated that with our aid and support to various states, "we contribute to economic well-being, the development of democratic institutions and in turn world peace." You go on to state that in South Korea "our assistance has succeeded in achieving our objectives." I would like you to explain this response. In particular, I would like to know precisely how our military and economic aid to South Korea is contributing to the development of democratic institutions as you say it is.

I would hope that you will be able to give me a thorough and frank answer to this matter in your reply. Only in that way can we help to close the increasing gap between what is often said to Congress and what appears to be the facts on the ground overseas.

I trust that you will be able to reply to this inquiry before Congress reconvenes after the elections.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C. November 12, 1974.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: Your letter of October 10 provides me a further opportunity to answer questions that remain in your mind about our attitudes toward security, aid, and human rights in the Republic of Korea. As I indicated in my testimony on July 30, we believe our policy has contributed toward security and, in many respects, toward economic, social and political progress in South Korea. At the same time, we admit that Korea's political institutions are imperfect and in particular we have expressed our concern about her policy.

You specifically noted a statement in one of my replies to your questions that we have contributed to "economic well-being, the development of democratic institutions and in turn world peace" and my further statement that in South Korea "our assistance has succeeded in achieving our objectives." Of course, I had also stated that our aid is not provided as support *per se* to a given political leader. Your question is entirely understandable, however.

As I see it, one has to look at our policy in long-range terms, in depth and with historical perspective. The Korean War, particularly the unprovoked attack from the North but also the aggressive posture of the North Korean regime over the years—certainly indicated that development and modernization—political, social and economic—in the South could take place only if it were secure from attack. This has been the rationale for our military assistance, and that is why we have frequently described it as building a shield behind which the country could develop.

We also supplied for many years grant economic aid as well which was directed at building a viable economy and laying a basis for a more profound social and political modernization and democratization. The physical process of building up the economy has been remarkably successful, as you know; in fact so much so that we have ceased grant aid, and our economic assistance today consists largely of PL 480 sales arrangements. Through economic development came a marked rise in the standard of living. Major highway systems provide better communication; more rural youth are afforded college education; mass media provides for a better informed citizenry. Surely you will agree that these contribute to the development of democratic institutions.

With the support of our aid programs, new generations of younger Koreans have not only been trained technically but have absorbed democratic values that are now being expressed. Much of the dissent at authoritarian practices in Korea reflects the fact that there has developed in Korea a basic desire for stronger representative institutions, able to endure beyond the reach of executive powers. Indeed, in all the comment about the status of democratic institutions in Korea, I find it curious there is not more mention of the vitality of open criticisms in the press, and in the schools. Fragile as these institutions may be, they are becoming more vigorous and are striving for improvement.

The intercourse at the economic, social and nation-building levels started by aid programs actually continues today without large amounts of current economic aid but it performs the same modernizing functions. Military aid is still necessary to provide the security through which this long term modernization process can continue. We are convinced that democratization will develop on the political level, and that authoritarian excesses will be curtailed in this process. We do not think that cutting off military aid will help; in fact, we think it will do more harm than good. To use an old adage, we should not throw away the baby with the bath water.

If there is any way in which I can be of further help, please let me know.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR W. HUMMEL, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for East Asia and Pacific.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., November 19, 1974.

Hon. ARTHUR W. HUMMEL, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia and Pacific, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMMEL: Thank you for your letter of November 12, 1974, in reply to my letter of October 10 concerning the subject of human rights in South Korea.

Two statements in your letter prompt further questions which I would like you to answer. At one point you state, "I find it curious there is not more mention of the vitality of open criticisms in the press, and in the schools." Is open criticism permitted within Korean society? On what basis do you conclude there is open criticism allowed in the press and educational institutions?

You also state that "we are convinced that democratization will develop on the political level, and that authoritarian excesses will be curtailed in this process." How are our policies promoting this democratization to which you refer? Why are you convinced that these developments will occur? And what evidence leads you to that conclusion?

I would appreciate your clarifying these statements.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., December 9, 1974.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: Your letter of November 19 raises questions about statements in my November 12 letter on the subject of human rights in Korea. You ask if open criticism is permitted within Korean society and on what basis I conclude open criticism is allowed in the press and educational institutions.

Certainly the main trend in Korea has been toward suppression of criticism. The emergency measures imposed for most of this year explicitly prohibited criticism of the present Constitution and by implication, of the present Government. Nevertheless two of the major emergency measures have been rescinded leading to a major increase in active criticism within Korea of Korean Government policies and in the reporting of such activity. There have been a series of protests and prayer meetings by Christian groups which continue. The major opposition political party has publicly adopted a demand for revision of the present Constitution. And on November 27 leading critics of the Government formed a National Council for the Protection of Democracy dedicated to bringing about Constitutional reform.

Although this situation may change rapidly once again, arbitrary censorship in Korea is rarely more than temporarily effective.

You also ask how our policies are promoting democratization and why I believe it will continue to develop. I should have emphasized in my previous letter that I was attempting to apply a longer perspective to recent developments and to note the important role of physical and economic security in fostering democratic development. I am not so naive as to believe democratic practices spring forth in all areas once a self-reliant defense posture is secured or a certain level of GNP is reached. However, I believe that our long association and extensive programs in Korea have given the Koreans a platform on which democratic institutions may be built and a strong positive image of what we stand for on human rights as well as in other areas.

Whatever criticism Koreans may have of their own government, the recent welcome given President Ford by the Korean people was warm and spontaneous. It is one evidence that the visit and the relationship it symbolized are seen as benefiting the nation as a whole and not simply a particular government.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR W. HUMMEL, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for East Asia and Pacific.

THE ROLE OF AMERICAN LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES IN MEETING THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on November 21, 1974, C. Peter Magrath, president of the University of Minnesota, spoke to the Minnesota Agri-Growth Council on "The Role of American Land-Grant Universities in Meeting the World Food Crisis."

Before discussing the contribution U.S. land-grant schools can make to solving the major world food problem facing us, President Magrath made three points. First, if a major U.S. commitment is made to help solve the world food crisis, all segments of our society must make an equitable contribution to the realization of this commitment. The second point was to recognize that this Nation has already made a major contribution to the feeding of the hungry of the world. President Magrath's final point was that we must recognize the problem as an urgent one, requiring a major national commitment.

A brief sketch of the historical background of our land-grant universities illustrates and places in perspective:

> The remarkable progress we have made in agricultural education and research in just one century . . . [and] that our land-grant universities have the potential to be even more significant forces in ending worldwide hunger.

The point of the President's speech is that agricultural research is cost effective. But, our land-grant schools need assurance "that funding for education and research would not capriciously be turned on and off, for to do so would severely hinder what we would be trying to accomplish." Of course, this message is aimed at us here in Washington and I hope we receive it loud and clear.

I believe President Magrath makes a strong case, and I welcome his admonition:

That we should be more concerned with helping hungry people than with what certain political leaders around the world might think about us at any given time.

The entire speech follows:

THE ROLE OF AMERICAN LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES IN MEETING THE WORLD FOOD CRISIS

Lester R. Brown, a distinguished authority on the world food crisis, has written: "Few of man's needs have resisted fulfillment so strenuously as has the need for food." The recent barrage of news photographs and commentaries about starving and dying people in Africa and South Asia certainly confirms this. But if Mr. Brown's observation is correct—and, I am afraid it is tragically accurate—the condition he describes is clearly unacceptable.

I do not wish to take up your time this morning citing the causes of the current food crisis; there are other people in this room far better qualified than I to do that.

Rather, and in addition to some personal notes, I want to present the case for a more active role for our land-grant universities, and particularly the University of Minnesota, in meeting this crisis.

Our land-grant universities have played, and still play, a central role in the development of America's unequalled agri-business industry. (By agri-business, I am referring to the great numbers of people, farmers and others, involved in the production, processing, and distribution of food and fiber products.) These universities have also been instrumental in helping bring modern and more productive agricultural techniques to the people of the world—techniques that have meant more food—and more nourishing food—for millions of people.

But as we all know there are too many people who are still hungry, and the prospects of an even more calamitous situation are real. Our land-grant universities, with proper support, can be major forces in an expanded commitment by our Nation to end starvation wherever it may afflict helpless people.

Before talking at greater length, however, about what I think the University of Minnestoa—and our sister institution—can contribute to the solving of this crisis, I think it is important to make three points.

The first is that if it becomes the policy of the United States to make a major commitment—in concert with cther nations—in seeing to it that no one in the world goes hungry, and if that commitment entails a measure of sacrifice by our people (as it probably will), I think it is crucial that this effort be borne equally. Farmers and others involved in agri-business must not be asked to shoulder an unfair share of a burden that results from a commendable and humane national policy choice.

I say this because I sense a degree of hostility in some quarters towards agri-business, a hostility, that in my opinion is mostly unfair and unjustified. To be sure, rising food prices are the prime cause of this tension. But we must remember that if inflation is taking bites from everyone's budgets, it is taking painful chunks out of the budgets and earning powers of many people who supply our nation and much of the world with food and fiber. We must, moreover, acknowledge that American agriculture and its related businesses have served us well. Our food and fiber production and distribution problems seem manageable, indeed, when compared to those of other nations. I say this not just to be gracious, but because I sincerely believe it to be true.

John T. Caldwell, chancellor of North Carolina State University, has written that people take for granted the great variety of abundant foods available to them, and that there is a vast ignorance about today's agriculture. "An overwhelming urban population," he has written, "can easily take for granted an efficient agriculture. And then those few who become concerned about it may bring with their concern an ignorance, and innocence, and a romanticism that misses the point entirely."

The second point that must be made is this: the United States has made a major commitment in sharing our technology and our bountiful harvests with the people of the world. According to Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, the U.S. has given away about $25 billion worth of food to other nations in the past 20 years. This is in addition to the staggering amount of food we have sold to other nations, $21 billion last year alone, according to Secretary Butz. Although we have an obligation to do even more to help millions of people meet this most basic of human needs, I reject the argument that the United States has been oblivious and unconcerned about hungry people.

The third and final introductory point has to do with whether the situation we face can properly be described as a crisis. Some observers say the problem we are contending with is, without question, of crisis proportions. Others are not as extreme. Some say that the food situation will be catastrophic in the not too distant future. Again, others are less pessimistic.

Without intending to be an alarmist, we clearly do face a crisis situation—if for no other reason than that all observers seem to agree that there are literally hundreds of millions of people around the world who, right now, end each day hungry, and who have little immediate hope of relief. I think simple humanity demands that we confront this matter—this very real crisis—with the urgency and commitment it deserves.

Six months after he signed the Emancipation Proclamation, President Abraham Lincoln signed, on July 2, 1862, a bill that was also to have a significant and profoundly positive impact on this Nation. It was the Land-Grant Act, written and shepherded through Congress by a Senator from Vermont Justin S. Morrill.

The bill provided, in its own words:

". . . the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college in each state where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to each branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes."

Grants of land were made to the states on a basis of 30,000 acres for each member of Congress. The income from the sale of this land was to endow the colleges, and the states were to be the administrators. The University of Minnesota still realizes revenue from the endowment.

A turn-of-the century Minnesota senator, Knute Nelson, said of the Land-Grant, or Morrill, Act:

"It has wrought a revolution in American education . . . The system of education is now suited to the needs alike of workers, businessmen, homemakers, technicians and professionals."

This is not to say that these new and innovative institutions were without problems in their early years. There was at that time, in fact, no science of agriculture. There was neither any pattern nor precedent for the new curricula. There were no trained faculty, no accepted methods of instruction, and few students with sufficient secondary school preparation.

Although McCormick's reaper was already being used by farmers, and the Industrial Revolution in America was well underway, many believed that science was not a fit subject for Christian study. One New England newspaper editor opposed a plan for street lighting by saying, "Artificial lighting is an attempt to interfere with the divine plan of the world which called for dark during the night time." And one farmer allegedly put it this way: "What you goin' to do with that college up there? Larn 'em to rake 'arder?"

To make one-sentence short the interesting story of how these problems were overcome, let me simply say that the willingness of many educators to investigate agricultural problems first hand—that is, on the farms—and their commitment to research and experimentation, are among the principal reasons why fruitful progress was made.

Research and experimentation proved so successful, and, in fact, necessary, to the study of agriculture as a science, that in 1887 Congress passed the Hatch Act establishing an experiment station in every state in connection with its land-grant college.

In turn, these land-grant colleges set up extension courses to transfer the very practical knowledge gleaned through research to those who needed it the most but who could not get to a campus—the farmers and their wives. Early extension agents demonstrated to those who worked the land how to use improved methods of agriculture, while home economists helped women improve rural home life through instruction in meal planning, the use of labor-saving devices, and interior decorating. Congress, recognizing these early efforts in extension, passed the Smith-Lever Act in 1914 providing federal funding for its expansion.

The Morrill Act in 1862, the Hatch Act in 1887, and the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, in addition to strong support from the states, gave shape to the triumvirate of resident teaching, research, and extension, that has been at the heart of the land-grant philosophy.

I hope you have not minded this brief history lesson. Although my degree is in political science, much of my research and teaching has dealt with American history, and I used to be regularly admonished by colleagues for practicing history without a license. The story of how our land-grant universities developed is worth telling—and worth remembering—for it put in plain perspective the remarkable progress we have made in agricultural education and research in just one century. Knowing how much we have already accomplished, makes me confident that our land-grant universities have the potential to be even more significant forces in ending worldwide hunger.

What kind of programs am I talking about? Generally, more of what the University of Minnesota and other universities are already doing: training students from other countries so they can return home prepared to make tangible contributions; assisting other nations in setting up their own educational, extension, and data collecting efforts; and working jointly with them in conducting the kind of scientific research essential to modern agriculture, and which must be tailored to an individual region's unique climate, soil, and other conditions.

It is useful in situations like this to be quite specific in showing some of the valuable breakthroughs that have resulted from agricultural research in land-grant university settings. It is also a good opportunity to dramatize the point that money used for research—especially agriculturally-related research—almost invariably pays important dividends, and that such funding should not be viewed as obligatory expenditures, but, rather, as wise investments.

We can happily look to the University of Minnesota for a few of these examples. Many of you are well familiar with some of them, but I think they are worth noting again.

ERA, a Hard Red Spring wheat of the semi-dwarf type, was developed and released by the Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station in 1970. This new wheat variety was grown on over 900,000 acres of Minnesota farm land in 1973, and on over 1,600,000 acres in 1974, and produces yields of six bushels per acre more than standard varieties. This resulted in $26 million of additional farm income in 1973, and an estimated $40 million of additional farm income this year, plus $20 million of additional income this year alone resulting from the multiplier effect. Of special significance as we try to help feed a hungry world is the fact that ERA wheat grown in Minnesota was responsible for producing 270,000,000 additional loaves of bread in 1973, and 460,000,000 in 1974–75.

The development of ERA wheat, which has already meant tens of millions of dollars of new income to the State of Minnesota, and which is proving helpful in feeding people, cost about $300,000 to develop—or a fraction of the return that is now accruing.

Hodgson and Evans soybeans were released in April of this year by University of Minnesota researchers. It is expected that they will be grown on 2,000,000 acres of state farm lands in 1976, with the extra yield expected to generate $9–12 million in additional income for farmers, and an additional $4 million income through the multiplier effect. It is further anticipated that this increased yield will produce enough additional protein to meet the needs of 1,000,000 people everyday for one year. What, you may ask, were the development costs for Hodgson and Evans soybeans? The answer: $100,000.

Research currently underway at the North Central Experiment Station in Grand Rapids is of particular interest now that many people are questioning the correctness of the heavy use of grains in producing beef animals, when that same amount of grain can be used directly in feeding more people. Researchers there are trying to determine the minimum amount of grain needed by pregnant beef cows to produce healthy and vigorous calves. They are also investigating how to provide the best possible beef from grass-fed cattle.

When Minnesota's advances are seen as part of a national effort by land-grant universities to achieve progress through agricultural research, it is clear that these institutions can be of great help in a drive by the United States to meet the world food crisis. And while universities, assuredly, cannot do the job alone, our national network of land-grant universities—if given adequate support—can join with the American agri-business community, and other nations, to become even more vigorous and productive participants in a foreign policy of rarely precedented compassion and wisdom. I deliberately use the word "wisdom" because I believe it to be clearly in the interest of the United States not to have an already fragile world order shaken and attacked by hungry people in a frantic, if understandable, search for food.

First steps to enable us to take a more active role have already been taken. A new Land-Grant/United States Department of Agriculture Council on International Research and Education is being formed that should strengthen the efforts of both universities and the Department of Agriculture in making an impact on this problem.

Representative Paul Findley of Illinois has introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, perhaps somewhat optimistically called the "Famine Prevention Act of 1974," which aims, in part, to have land-grant universities share with governments all over the world their knowledge and experience. "Our experience," he points out, "has made America the best fed, clothed, and sheltered nation in the world." "Under my bill," he explains:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to contract with the land-grant colleges and universities for their *long-term* continuing assistance in one of the developing countries. For example, a typical contract might provide the College of Agriculture of the University of Illinois with 10 years in which to help a country establish, organize, and staff a land-grant type of agricultural education institution—with classroom, extension, and research services." (Note: emphasis supplied)

I am not prepared to pass reasoned judgment on the specifics of Congressman Findley's proposed legislation, but I certainly support his intent.

The University of Minnesota is enthusiastic about playing a bigger role in meeting this crisis, and we are currently taking a close look at our capacities and talents. We have an encouraging history of worthwhile cooperative efforts with other nations, and if we are afforded the proper support—and this means appropriate federal funding—we are prepared to do more. We currently have contracts with the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) to provide educational services in agriculture in Tunisia and Morocco.

Much can be said for having universities, with the great breadth of talents and resources that they have, assume leadership roles in this effort. Insofar as the food problems of developing nations are invariably enmeshed with economic, political, and social problems, I think it is important that students of agriculture be versed as fully as possible in these other disciplines. It is also important that professionals in agriculture have access to the interdisciplinary expertise available in our universities.

To have our nation's land-grant institutions embark on such a course would, of course, pose some basic problems, some more difficult to solve than others.

Perhaps the first assurance I would like to see is agreement that funding for education and research would not capriciously be turned on and off, for to do so would severely hinder what we would be trying to accomplish. One of the more serious problems facing higher education today is a confusion over the extent to which the federal government is committed to supporting research, both pure and applied. In order for education and research to bear fruit, or to put it in simpler terms, for us to get our money's worth, support must be *steady*. Continuity of support has been one of the great strengths in agricultural research and extension in the United States.

A commitment by the United States to help poorer nations with their education and research needs must stand firm to pressures that might sporadically be aimed at weakening that commitment. Funding must not be used as a pawn, but rather, must be provided on an uninterrupted basis as long as the need exists. We must not let transient political considerations undermine our will to help people feed themselves. I hasten to add that we should be more concerned with helping hungry people than with what certain political leaders around the world might think about us at any given time.

The United States, for a host of reasons, some justified and many not, will always be criticized and condemned by some. But if we make a commitment as a nation that we sincerely believe is generous and appropriate, I, for one, will not be bothered too much by what sundry namecallers have to say about us.

I would be remiss if I did not at least briefly touch on some related issues which are integral if we are to overcome this crisis.

I see no alternative but to make a concerted effort to limit world population growth. We are all too familiar with projections pointing to such sobering developments as the doubling of the world's population to approximately seven billion people by the end of the century. We must not let population further outstrip our food supply.

As Americans, we have to take a close look at some of the ways in which we lead our daily lives; not in the spirit of responding to a fad or temporary call for sacrifice, but in the somber realization that things have changed.

I do not think we can correctly ignore any longer the impact of some of the things we routinely do, such as the fact that we use great amounts of fertilizer on our cemeteries, lawns, and golf courses, while other nations do not have enough fertilizer to grow food. Nor can we ignore the fact that in a protein-starved world, we feed three pounds of grain, averaged over the feeding period, to a beef animal in order to produce one pound of beef.

It is here that my earlier point applies regarding the guarantee that farmers and others involved in agri-business must have in not being forced to make inordinate sacrifices as we change our priorities to meet national policy objectives. Frankly, I do not know how this can easily be accomplished, although I know it must be.

The United States cannot feed the world alone. But our historical good fortune, industriousness, and compassion present us with a life-giving opportunity to contribute profoundly to hundreds of millions of human lives. We must take a lead role in convincing nations that are also capable of extending assistance to other nations that this is the proper and necessary course for them to follow, too. We must attach to this effort a singleness of purpose and determination that marked our quest for the moon; we must convince ourselves that this new journey is every bit as important and beautiful to make.

We read daily of new scarcities and the imminent depletion of precious natural resources. We must remember that food is not finite, and that harvests need not cease. But, most of all, we must remember that human intelligence, creativity, and determination are not finite either, but are infinite resources that can be used for the enoblement and well-being of all people.

The University of Minnesota welcomes the opportunity to do its share. We look forward to joining with members of the Minnesota Agri-Growth Council and others in this life-saving work.

BAD JOURNALISM AND MR. BUTZ

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the December 14 Washington Post editorial page contained an example of good journalism concerning an episode around which has swirled much poor journalism, both electronic and printed.

It was the feature written by Charles B. Seib, a member of the Post editorial board, and it put in proper perspective the ridiculous distortions and overplay concerning the Italian dialect joke voiced the other day by Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz.

The article should be required reading for everyone who had any role whatever in the handling of the Butz joke story. It should also be required reading in all journalism schools henceforth.

Mr. Seib comment:

THE BUTZ STORY—AND HOW IT GREW

(By Charles B. Seib)

What is news? Wise journalists duck that one. Those less wise offer definitions ranging from the inane—"news is what happens"—to the arrogant—"News is what we say it is."

But even though they can't define the product, newspaper people pride themselves on their "news judgment," the ability to tell news from non-news. And their exercise of that claimed ability is what determines the content of your newspaper each day.

News is not only amorphous; it is sometimes downright spooky. Once publication has authenticated an event as genuine news, it can take on a life of its own, expanding like one of those blobs from another planet in a late movie.

Our case in point is the Butz joke story, which began its brief public career Thanksgiving morning and enlivened, if that's the word, a dull holiday weekend. Its aftershocks are still being felt. What happened was this:

Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz breakfasted the day before Thanksgiving with 29 reporters. These breakfasts are a Washington institution; their purpose is to milk information from officials and other public figures in a relaxed and friendly atmosphere. The Butz session was on the record—that is the reporters could quote anything he said and attribute it to him—with one small exception.

The exception was a joke Butz told—a mildly funny, mildly tasteless joke he said he had heard at the Rome food conference. An Italian woman, the joke goes, is asked about the Pope's stand on birth control and replies, "he no playa the game, he no maka the rules."

It's not a good joke or a new one—the warm-up comic used a version at Frank Sinatra's Carnegie Hall concert earlier this year and it goes back a lot further than that. And it has a nasty ethnic/religious sneer to it. But there was a polite titter, and then Butz, who is slowly learning the facts of political life, asked that it be off the record. Just what was said in response is unclear; there are several versions. In any case, 28 of the 29 reporters didn't report the joke. But one decided that Butz' use of it was of public interest and that an after-the-fact request to go off the record doesn't wash unless specifically agreed to. So he used the joke in a column he wrote for the Thanksgiving morning edition of his paper, the New York Daily News.

In New York a Daily News editor, exercising that news judgment we mentioned earlier, directed that the item be lifted from the column and turned it into a two-paragraph story that appeared on page two of the paper with the headline: "Butz Raps the Pope." The Italian woman was gone and the punch line was attributed directly to Butz and presented as a dismissal by Butz of the Pope's position on population control.

Then the blob began to grow. Within hours, a spokesman for the New York Roman Catholic archdiocese wired President Ford to complain about the "crude, pointed insult" to the Pope and demanded Butz' apology or resignation. Members of Congress also protested. By Friday morning the story that had been worth two paragraphs had blossomed into a page one banner story for the Daily News. Other papers began climbing aboard, although not so flamboyantly. All three networks included an item on Butz' troubles on their evening news, giving the event the imprimatur that comes only with a mention by Walter Cronkite.

Friday was not one of Butz's best days. He tried to put the fire out by saying he meant no harm, but that wasn't enough. President Ford called him in for a little talk, after which he issued a formal apology.

The President's entry into the case escalated the story another notch. Saturday morning it made the front pages of the New York Times and the Washington Star-News. The Post had a teaser on page one and the story on page five. The networks reported the new development. The only bright spot for Butz was the fact that the Daily News gave the story only a secondary spot on page one, indicating, perhaps, a feeling that it had about run its course.

So there you have the life history of a news story. It isn't quite dead; it takes a long time for such stories to die. But a quiet senescence has begun, punctuated by occasional editorial harpoons for Butz (including one from this newspaper) and outbursts like the one from a usually calm columnist who declared that every day Butz remains in office he advertises America's insensitivity to suffering.

Without in any way defending Butz as a humanitarian or as a public official, one must ask whether that miserable joke told over breakfast justified what followed.

True, the story developed as the hours went by. There were the protests to be reported, and the presidential dressing down. Also, it received additional momentum from the fact that just a few weeks earlier Gen. George S. Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, got himself in trouble—and drew a presidential rebuke—with remarks about Jewish influence on American foreign policy. But it still comes back to the old chicken or egg question: did the Butz story generate the coverage or did the coverage generate the story?

One must ask also whether there is some flaw in our whole approach to news that permits a story to mushroom beyond all reason. Is there a way to control the blob before it begins to grow?

It is the fashion these days to blame media excesses on Watergate. The sharks of the press, it is said, are kept in a constant state of ferocity by the blood that still tints the water. Whatever happened in the Butz case, the cause of balance and perspective and maturity in the press was not advanced. And everybody—the media, the indignant protesters, the stern President, and, of course, Butz himself—ended up looking faintly ridiculous. A Vatican spokesman must be credited with the sanest statement in the whole episode. In declining comment, he said possibly with a touch of bewilderment, "All we know is what we read in the newspapers."

HON. LESLIE ARENDS

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, it is most difficult to add to that which has been said about our distinguished colleague from Illinois, LES ARENDS, by those of you who have served with him much longer than I. It is a privilege for me to pay tribute to this fine man as he retires after 40 years of service to the people of the 15th District of Illinois, the Nation, and the Republican Party.

LES ARENDS has always taken the time to discuss and counsel junior Members on legislation and legislative procedures, and I well remember the many times his guidance has benefited me in serving my constituents.

He has had the respect and admiration of Members on both sides of the aisle regardless of political philosophy. He has worked tirelessly during his years in Congress to serve his constituents and his party. LES ARENDS will be missed by all who know him.

I hope the years ahead will hold much happiness and contentment for LES and his wife, Betty, and that their retirement will be the most fulfilling and best years of their lives.

NATIONAL DIVIDEND PLAN OFFERS HOPE FOR IMPERILED AMERICANS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we are a troubled, upset Nation. The American people are deeply worried about the future of the Republic. Food costs, inflationary theft of life savings, loss of jobs, and wild Government spending have upset the lives of millions. I share their worry—I believe this moment is as critical as Valley Forge in 1778 and the Union in 1860.

Our economic situation is grave because the Federal Treasury is bare; the country's bills are paid with printing press money and more and more borrowing; production man-hours decline; laws are flagrantly disobeyed, and Congress goes irresponsibly on its way passing programs with no plans for funding them.

Prices rose at an annual rate of nearly 11 percent during the first half of this year. They are still going up today, and no decline is in sight.

Real output of goods and services fell at about 4 percent during the first half of this year. It is still going down.

The unemployment rate rose from 4.5 percent in October of 1973 to 6 percent in October of this year. And it is still rising.

In late September, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress filed an interim report containing recommendations for an action program to reduce inflation and restore economic growth.

The recommendations were disappointing. Two of our House colleagues who serve on the Joint Economic Committee—Representative CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio, and Representative BEN BLACKBURN, of Georgia—disagreed with the report.

I concur in their written dissent, which I quote in part:

> At least two members of the Committee believe that the recommendations in this report represent a re-hash of the same old belief in the omnipotence of the government over the private sector for the purpose of manipulating social/political policy by the use of deficit spending. It is precisely this kind of fiscal policy which has created our inflationary problems.

I also am disappointed in the program President Ford has advanced to bring inflation under control.

It is a mish-mash of contradictions. It

is more of the same old stuff that has failed for 20 years.

Even if Congress provided all the legislation he has requested and the public cooperates, it is at best, only a stopgap, short-term program aimed at treating the symptoms rather than curing the cause. We will never achieve permanent recovery that way.

The Republican Party, as attested by the last election, is a political failure. The Democratic Party is an economic failure. It is time for both parties to stop traveling the road to national tragedy.

Is there an alternative to failure? I believe so.

We must use a total systems approach to our problems if we hope to find the proper, lasting solutions that will enable us to move into the future with newfound economic vigor. The first essential step must be to stop Federal spending deficits.

A new outlook embodying old principles and new dreams for America must be enacted, making our country more equitable for all.

The National Dividend Plan is an economic proposal embodying a total systems approach. I have studied it in recent months and I believe it provides the framework by means of which we can put the country on a fair and sound track for the future.

I am by no means alone in my interest in the National Dividend Plan—NDP. Deep concern about our economic problems has brought increasing interest by a growing number of national organizations. Among them are the Conference Board, the American Enterprise Institute, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the U.S. League of Savings and Loan Associations, and the U.S. Jaycees.

I note with pride that the Jaycees of Iowa, under the presidency of El Sievers, a young banker in Marion, took the lead 3 years ago in bringing this intriguing proposal to the attention of the U.S. Jaycees. This resulted in a national educational program by the Jaycees to generate public awareness of NDP's potential for economic growth and internal benefits to all voters.

The high standard of living we have achieved in the two centuries since this Nation was established attests to the economic success of our free enterprise profit-and-loss system. However, we cannot escape the fact that this system is so scrambled and buffeted today that it is approaching political failure as the Nation approaches financial failure.

If we are to make our free market economic system a political success, the voters—the grassroots of our decision-making process—must participate in its rewards. At the same time, they must understand that for us to survive as a free nation, we must pay for our social progress out of earnings—not out of increased taxes or greater deficits.

The National Dividend Plan is a way to get the voting citizen on the side of sound, efficient management of the Federal Government and, simultaneously, properly appeal to his own self-interest.

The NDP is a simple, commonsense economic proposal. Nationally known economists and political scientists acknowledge its feasibility.

Lionel D. Edie & Co., a research subsidiary of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, made an indepth feasibility study of NDP. In summarizing its study, the Edie Co. said, in part, and I quote:

> The NDP program, which is designed to reduce the dependence of our economy on Federal Government spending and allow private enterprise to regain its rightful role in determining the direction of economic and other activity, is endorsed by us.

The National Dividend Program recognizes that profitable productivity is absolutely essential to our economic well-being and is possible only through an increased flow of investment dollars into the free enterprise system, and sustained consumer buying power to purchase the goods.

Simplicity is the appealing principle of the National Dividend Plan.

First, it provides incentives to invest by imposing a 50-percent maximum on Federal corporate income taxes and by eliminating Federal personal income taxes on corporate dividends.

Corporate income taxes have ranged around 50 percent on the Federal level for the last quarter century. NDP simply says that the rate, which still will be set by Congress, cannot exceed 50 percent. This would give assurance of long-term investment capital.

The Federal personal income tax on dividends is a double tax borne by nearly 40 million Americans who own shares in corporations. It is a punitive tax, it strangles investment incentive and it should have been removed long ago. This would create huge amounts of capital that business desperately needs to stay alive and grow.

Second, NDP distributes all Federal corporate income tax collections equally—and free of Federal personal income taxes—to every citizen who legally registered to vote in the preceding Federal general election. It will make voters profit-sharing partners in the Nation's progress. Such an incentive would give us a strong increase in productivity and would be a long needed move for a more equitable Nation.

Third, NDP would be passed into operation over a 5-year period, 20 percent per year.

NDP payments would be made quarterly to each registered voter. They are estimated upward from $500 per year per voter at the end of the 5-year phase-in. Those payments, of course, could be increased substantially when management and the Nation's working force cooperate to achieve higher production.

There is a secret statistic. It is that an increase of one-tenth of 1 percent in additional production per man-hour increases the gross national product by more than $1 billion annually. We would outpace the world if we improve 2 or 3 percent in our productivity.

A strict moratorium on any new, major Federal spending programs is proposed during the 5-year phase-in of NDP. The Congress must tighten its grip on expenditures—an absolute necessity if inflation is ever to be overcome. Present funded programs must be made to work for the best interests of our total society, not just for special segments.

As the economic impact generated by NDP increases, political justification or need for many programs will be reduced, or will vanish. They too, would be cut back or eliminated by the Congress.

NDP payments can be distributed virtually cost free. The Treasury will send quarterly checks to each State and the District of Columbia based on registered voter population. The States, in turn, will use local banks as depositories to distribute checks to individual voters in the various communities. The cost-free use of these funds by the banks for short periods of time will more than compensate them for their services.

NDP can be funded without damage to any necessary functions of the Federal Government. This is possible from the annual growth in Federal cash receipts from several factors built into our economy.

They are: First, growth of the labor force; second, greater capital investment; third, increased productivity per man-hour; and fourth, the movement of individuals into higher personal income tax brackets because of pay increases.

Combined, these factors have brought a substantial annual increase in Federal receipts since 1950. In the last 5 years, this income has risen by 45 percent, or at an annual rate of fully 9 percent. Thus, on this basis, during the 5-year phase-in, Federal cash receipts could be expected to increase another 45 percent.

Corporate income tax collections represent about 16 percent of the Federal budget. Revenue lost from exempting dividend payments from personal income taxes will amount to roughly 2 percent more. Therefore, at full implementation about 18 percent of the budget revenue would be diverted to NDP payments.

In the meantime, Federal receipts would have increased by about 45 percent, leaving a substantial revenue cushion to cover escalations built into present programs.

Costs of many existing programs already have soared beyond the control of their administrators. Comptroller General Elmer Staats has indicated that up to 75 percent of budgeted Federal expenditures are uncontrollable because these obligations were spelled out and locked in by law for more than 1 fiscal year. Some say nothing can be done about this. I disagree. These catastrophic obligations came into being through legislation enacted by Congress. They can and should be changed with new legislation enacted now. Here is what we have done to our fellow citizens by not being prudent.

In the last quarter century, Government spending has climbed faster than the national output of goods and services. By the mid-1950's, roughly 25 percent of all production went to meet the costs of Government. In 1973, the public sector's spending for the purchase of goods and services, interest, welfare, and social security amounted to 33 percent of our entire gross national product. These costs will undoubtedly mount as inflation breeds new demands for higher pay for Government workers, as well as expanded welfare benefits and unprecedented rates of interest on Government bonds.

We devalued our dollar twice within 14 months. No matter how you view it, devaluation simply means others in the world have lost faith in our ability to meet our financial obligations. Their concern is understandable. Continuing deficits have driven our national debt up to almost half a trillion dollars.

The gravity of our inflationary problems can hardly be overestimated—the future of our country is in jeopardy. I agree with my friend Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR. The Nation is out of fiscal control.

As every Member of this House knows, our economic troubles have been building for years. There has been a recurring liquidity crisis in both the public and private sectors. Borrowing by the Federal Government and its agencies now takes about 60 percent of the funds raised in the private securities markets. No wonder business cannot get the capital it needs to fully employ our people.

Replacing old, low-interest, national debt obligations sends the Federal Government into the money markets with increasing frequency and has pushed borrowing costs to their present abnormally high levels. This, of course, has reduced sharply the loan funds available to the private sector for the financial nourishment it must have if we ever expect its productivity to pull us out of our current economic chaos.

Far too many Americans do not understand, and few public officials will admit, that unrestrained—often irresponsible—Federal spending has been the primary contributor to the destructive inflation we are experiencing.

Unfortunately, the public views the Federal Treasury as a free-flowing, inexhaustible fountain of funds and benefits. But the basic fact remains that Government must first take from the people everything it gives to the people.

Most Federal spending is nonregenerative with a very low economic multiplier. The bulk of the funds are not spent by Government for the production of goods for the trade stream. The principal effect is to create inflationary demand in excess of the capacity of private industry and business to produce goods and services.

NDP will involve distribution of earned dollars, those taxed out of the earnings of the Nation's corporations. Dollars earned in the production of goods and services are real dollars, not printing press money, so they are noninflationary.

Virtually all social legislation enacted since the 1930's has called for greater outlays of printing press money and larger Federal debt. This has brought increased deficit spending and an overexpansion in the money supply.

Most of this social engineering has been developed for relatively small, special interest groups. Most of it has not been needed by a majority of the American people, especially in recent years. This has created serious resentment and divisiveness in our society.

Each Federal program has its own administrative costs. Once started, few are discontinued. They become costlier each year. They grow like weeds. The social planners put their emphasis on what they think the recipients should get, not what the economy can afford. They have chosen to emphasize the benefits and to disregard the costs to the taxpayers.

Old ideas that Federal intervention will solve everything simply are not working. They never did.

NDP is a viable alternative, a new approach if we hope to preserve personal freedom and our faltering free enterprise society. We must stop borrowing from tomorrow. This deficit spending is wrecking us. We must stop living beyond our means. We must stop spending money we have not yet earned.

Our almost unmanageable Federal Government can be curbed and decentralized. We can replace the waste and inefficiency which have sapped our economic strength for years with a policy which puts earned dollars into the hands of individuals and lets them fill their needs in the private market place.

NDP will strengthen rather than stifle our free market economy. It will generate capital formation. Capital is to the corporate body—to the free market economy—as food is to the human body. Without it companies cannot expand or modernize to remain competitive.

The profit motive is the one force which can keep our political and economic system free. Every American should benefit from it. Unfortunately, many people who do not understand the law of supply and demand and the intricate free market mechanism, all too often condemn the profit motive as the source of all our economic trouble.

When permitted to function, the law of supply and demand is the most efficient allocator of resources in a free market society.

However, political tampering seriously inhibits its efficiency and creates economic distortions. When left alone, the law of supply and demand provides checks and balances on both overproduction and underproduction. It produces, with some cyclical exceptions, a smooth flow of goods to meet a sustained consumer demand at a profitable rate.

Because NDP is linked so closely to profits, it will encourage reliance on the law of supply and demand. It will encourage emphasis on reducing costs rather than adding to them, in both the private and public sectors.

Under NDP, the public will see more clearly that profits keep costs down rather than push prices up. Since competition sets the price in the free market system, the producer can make a profit only if he can keep his costs below the selling price. Otherwise, he suffers a loss.

Our free enterprise system owes its success to the driving force of the profit motive. Unlike socialism and communism, this system takes the financial burden off the consumer by funding our progress with private money rather than public funds. It gives the consumer the benefit of the lowest prices because of competition.

In the nonprofit, government-monopoly societies, the public pays excessively because there is no human motive to become efficient and keep costs down.

NDP makes the voting public an integral part of the profit motive by giving it a share of the profits. However, it does not take any more away from the owners—the investing stockholders—of the Nation's corporations than already is being taken from them in corporate income taxes. In that way, it insures that the economic system which already has done so much for us, will continue to progress on an even stronger basis.

We have spent nearly half a trillion dollars on welfare since 1935 and the problem is worse than ever. NDP is not a specific solution to this problem, but it holds more promise in this area than anything suggested to date.

In its feasibility study made in 1970, the Edie Co. found that when fully implemented, NDP would lift more than 50 percent of the poverty families in America above the poverty level. Those remaining would be raised toward the escape threshold.

With more than 50 percent of these families out of poverty, the financial burden of welfare would ease. And the number of hard-core cases would be more manageable.

Many persons concerned about unemployment propose creation of thousands of new, so-called public service jobs funded by the Federal Government. Such jobs would put people to work and they would serve to disguise unemployment. However, NDP, with its capital formation capabilities, would encourage new productive capacity in shortage areas, as well as development of new products, plants, and jobs in the private sector.

Seminars and panel discussions on NDP have been held on many college and university campuses. Students have responded with interest and often with enthusiasm. They see NDP as a constructive social and economic realinement which offers them a piece of the action in our Nation's future.

Senior citizens on fixed incomes, the large family, the working family on low income, and the family heavily in debt suffer most when hard hit by taxes, inflation, and high interest rates. For many of these, the extra income from NDP—$1,000 or upward annually for a man and wife when fully implemented—would mean the difference between independence or having to turn to public assistance.

Under the Federal Revenue Sharing Act now authorized through fiscal 1977, some $30 billion will be transferred to State and local governments. Advocates of revenue sharing contend it is not simply a new way to spend Federal tax moneys. They say it represents a major transfer of decisionmaking power from Federal to State and local levels of government. However, NDP is a far more practical way to do it.

First, NDP will be funded by a specific revenue source—corporate income taxes. It will not require new or higher taxes. It merely changes the method of distributing these tax collections.

Second, it will go directly to the individual voters, thereby targeting the payments where the people and their problems are concentrated.

Third, the economic activity stimulated by the payments directly to the voters will generate increases in State sales, excise, and income tax revenues. With NDP fully implemented, this extra revenue in those States which have sales taxes will approximate the amount disbursed annually under the present revenue sharing program.

The unfunded liabilities of the social security system further increase the probability of economic chaos for us when added to the already strained financial condition of the country.

The social security program started with modest employer and employee contributions. It was intended to go toward income and financial security for retirement. But like many other politically inspired ideas, it has become a cruel rip-off.

The mandatory contributions have risen steadily over the years, and another increase is coming in January. The social security tax now exceeds the federal personal income tax liability of millions of workers. In countless cases, there is no chance of the worker getting back in real dollars what he and his employers have contributed.

The system has not worked out as planned. Its unfunded liabilities now are estimated by various sources as somewhere between one-half trillion and more than 2 trillion dollars. The inflation resulting from the cost of adequately funding such a program will necessitate further increases in the payouts. And these will continue to accelerate the cycle so that at some point the program will have to be repudiated.

Enactment of NDP would be a partial substitute for the unfundable portion of social security, thus relieving the Federal Government of commitments it obviously is unable to keep. By giving the voters equity in our country, we can pay for our security out of earnings.

Use of the voters as the basis for distributing NDP payments is based upon sound reasoning:

First, voting records already are maintained in every community. There is no need for a costly, new agency to do the job.

Second, the voting system assures complete equality of treatment for all without regard to sex, race, creed, or national origin. Political pressure and manipulation are removed as factors in the distribution.

Third, by matching voter signatures in poll books with endorsements of NDP checks, tombstone and other fraudulent voting can be eliminated. Voter lists can be cleansed on a national basis by the double check.

Fourth, with voting registration the basic requirement for participation in NDP, millions more will take part in this essential function of the citizen in a democracy.

As a bonus, those who do not require NDP payment to meet current needs can save and invest those funds. This along with exemption of corporate dividends from their present double taxation, will provide much needed stimulus to capital formation. The new investment capital will contribute to the further expansion, production and profits of free enterprise. And that would create more earnings for distribution in NDP payments.

There is another bonus, too. By being equitable to all voters, NDP would ease the discontent and divisiveness caused by social legislation that benefits special groups. Much of the legislation aimed at making sexes or races or classes equal is not only counterproductive, it is extremely expensive. NDP will transfer the thrust of political pressure from special interests to the public as a whole.

With this realinement, it goes without saying that Members of the Congress would be more responsive to the public in general. And a big majority of the voting public would support them in eliminating costly, inefficient programs if NDP is there as an incentive.

We cannot delay corrective action any longer because the situation has become critical. To summarize:

It is time to make a bigger pie. We must have incentives to go to work—work efficiently, produce more.

Excessive Government spending—Federal, State, and local racing ahead of productivity, and excessive increases in the money supply have a direct relationship to the inflation in our economy.

After a brief period of economic stability following World War II, governmental spending started increasing at an inflationary rate in 1950 and has not been checked since. It now amounts to one-third of the gross national product.

The interest drain of the Federal debt now outpaces the annual growth of the GNP. The inflationary effects of Federal deficit financing have necessitated frequent increases in the money supply. These have reached hyperinflationary proportions.

Meanwhile, purchasing power of the dollar has declined relentlessly from 100 cents at the end of World War II to about 25 cents today.

Extension of these trends into the future will create a condition of diminishing returns which could lead to collapse of the economy because the people no longer will be able to support the demands of Government.

We must give top priority to checking inflation and restoring the fiscal credibility of the dollar.

NDP can help achieve economic stability, generate capital formation, encourage investment, increase profitable productivity and hold present levels of Federal spending without risking increased unemployment. Here is how:

By diverting Federal corporate income tax collections directly to the consumer, and by eliminating the punitive double tax on dividends, NDP will shift money back to where it will do the most good for the national economy and the individual, and reduce need for any major, new Federal spending programs.

Everyone will benefit in direct proportion to corporate profits. With NDP, the free enterprise system can become a political success because it will let the economic law of supply and demand fill the needs of our consumers in the marketplace without Government interference.

As a tax reform proposal, NDP is an ideal income redistribution system. It would benefit society directly without any costly dilution of effect due to administrative costs and without raising taxes.

There will be less dependency on welfare and proverty programs with NDP giving every registered voter an equitable participation in taxable corporate earnings.

NDP's direct involvement of people will tend to exert pressure on the Congress for a more responsible budget and to revise those Federal programs which contain uncontrollable costs.

By holding Federal spending to present levels, we can save about $27 billion in 1 year, sufficient to balance the budget and begin implementation of NDP. As I explained, Federal revenues increase by about 9 percent per year from certain built-in economic factors. On the basis of a $300 billion total budget, this would provide $17 billion toward a balanced budget the following year, plus $10 billion for NDP's first year phase-in—20 percent of an estimated $50 billion in corporate income tax collections.

The $27 billion savings would bring these beneficial results:

First. No increase would be needed in the money supply;

Second. No increase in the national debt;

Third. It would prevent an increase of about $27 billion in the cost of the Federal Government.

Fourth. The national economy would be stimulated with earned dollars rather than deficit dollars; and

Fifth. The amount of $10 billion more real money would be added to the private sector to help lower interest rates by making funds available for increased investment and to aid in creation of real employment for the Nation's work force.

As you know, I am moving into the final days of my quarter of a century of service in this House. I have tried with all the resources at my command to serve the best interests of the people of my district and my nation during those years. I am continuing to do that as I urge those of you who will return in January, and the new Members who will be seated at that time, to thoroughly consider the national dividend plan and its potential benefits for our country.

The National Dividend Plan is a progressive, new policy which builds upon, rather than seeks to destroy, our existing free enterprise system and our free society. It is economically, politically and socially feasible. We need it.

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, there's a beautiful ring in saying—national champions. The folks of Mount

Pleasant, Mich., and, in particular, Central Michigan University students, still are celebrating that national title so decisively won by the magnificent Central Michigan football team.

From the game's opening play—a 68-yard touchdown run by Fullback Dick Dunham—Coach Roy Kramer's Chips completely dominated all phases of the game to overwhelm the University of Delaware, 54 to 14, last Saturday to win the National Collegiate Athletic Association's Division II championship in the Camellia Bowl at Sacramento, Calif.

Hail to the Chips. That is the cry in the heartland of our 10th Congressional District and I am honored to join with thousands in extending congratulations to a truly great football team.

The mark of any championship team is the ability to come back. Weeks ago, early in September, this Chippewa team opened season's play. It lost a heartbreaker to Kent State University; but this team—destined for greatness—came roaring back. Saturday's triumph—its most important of the year—was its 13th consecutive victory. That is the mark of a champion.

In the days and weeks ahead, Coach Kramer, his coaching staff, the team, the cheerleaders, the band, the entire school and the Mount Pleasant community will share further honors and celebrations. But few will match the performance of last Saturday when the Chippewas, thousands of miles from home, recorded a historic national accomplishment for their school and the Mount Pleasant community.

I am inserting the report on that national championship game which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, December 15. It reads as follows:

CAMILLIA BOWL: SOPH LEADS CENTRAL MICHIGAN ROMP

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—Fullback Dick Dunham ran 68 yards for a touchdown on the game's first play and plunged for three more scores Saturday as Central Michigan buried Delaware 54–14 in the Camillia Bowl for the national small-college championship.

Dunham, a 205-pound sophomore, and quarter-back Mike Franckowiak teamed to lead the Chippewas, 13–1, to their 13th straight victory in the finale of the NCAA's eight-team playoffs.

Franckowiak, a second team Little All-American, mixed option runs and pitches with deadly passing as the midwesterners, playing their last game in the small-college ranks, moved the ball at will.

He completed 11 of 13 passes for 186 yards and one touchdown, and kicked field goals of 39 and 27 yards.

Dunham tied an NCAA playoff record with his four touchdowns and gained 121 yards in 16 carries.

On the opening play, he burst up the middle behind a block by center Wes Gamble and put the Chippewas ahead to stay with 16 seconds gone.

A FIELD goal and a two-yard run by Walt Hodges made it 16–0 after one quarter. But Delaware, 12–2, mounted a long touchdown drive early in the second period, ending in a one-yard sneak by Bill Zwann and a two-point conversion pass to Vern Roberts.

Central Michigan then put the game away with a 68-yard march that included a 43-yard pass from Franchowiak to Matt Means.

The Chippewas intercepted three Zwan passes and recovered two Delaware fumbles.

Hodges wound up with 112 yards in 27 carries, going over 100 yards for the 11th straight game.

It was the worst defeat for Delaware since 1933 and the most points scored against the Blue Hens since 1921.

A defense led by middle guard Rick Newsome smothered Delaware's shifting wing-T offense and put a hard rush on Zwann all game.

DR. BOOKER T. WHATLEY RECEIVES AGRICULTURE AWARD

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, in this day of widespread malnutrition it is particularly important to recognize the outstanding efforts of our American horticultural experts.

At a recent meeting of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, a constituent of mine and an outstanding American agricultural expert, Dr. Booker T. Whatley, professor of plant and soil science, at the Tuskegee Institute School of Agriculture, was awarded the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation's Service of Agriculture Award for 1974.

Dr. Whatley is a man who has devoted his life to the study of agriculture and is most truly deserving of the prestigious award. I would like to take this opportunity to submit to the RECORD of this body the introduction which was given by Mr. J. D. Hays, president, Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, just prior to Dr. Whatley receiving the award. Dr. Whatley's efforts are appreciated both at home and abroad.

SERVICE TO AGRICULTURE AWARD, DR. BOOKER T. WHATLEY, TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE, DECEMBER 3, 1974

It has been my pleasure to personally know the recipient of this year's Service to Agriculture Award—Dr. Booker Tillman Whatley. Dr. Whatley is professor of plant and soils science at Tuskegee Institute and a research associate of the Carver Research Foundation at the same institution. More specifically Dr. Whatley is director of the sweet potato and small food's breeding production and utilization programs at Tuskegee

Dr. Whatley, a native of Anniston, Ala., received his bachelor's degree in 1941 from Alabama A&M University and was awarded the doctorate in 1957 from Rutgers University with a major in horticulture. He is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College, Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the Biomedical telemetry, Smithsonian Institute, Washington.

He has had a wide variety of experience including: professor and head of the department of horticulture at Southern University, technical operations officer at the Chofu Hydroponic Farm, Japan, horticulture adviser to Ghana, West Africa, consultant to technical and tropical agriculture to the Peace Corps, collaborator crops research branch of the USDA, adjunct professor, Vegetable Crops Department, Cornell University, visiting lecturer University of Florida, University of Maryland, University of Arkansas, Southern University, Fort Valley State College, Alabama A & M University, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, Tennessee State University, and the University of Georgia.

Dr. Whatley has been involved for a number of years in sweet potato and small fruits breeding and to say he has become a recognized expert in this field would be a gross understatement.

He is a member of the American Society of Horticultural Science, the American Society of Agronomy, The American Society of Plant Physiologists, American Soybean Association, the Association of Southern Agricultural Scientists, the Association for Tropical Biology, Crop Science Society of America, International Plant Propagators Society, Society of Economic Botany, Society of Sigma XI, Soil Science Society of America, and many others.

In 1971 Dr. Whatley was awarded the outstanding alumni award from Alabama A&M University. In 1972 he received the outstanding faculty achievement award from Tuskegee Institute and in 1970 he was listed in the Personalities of the South Publication. He is a member of the Lions Club, the American Legion, he is a Mason and a member of the Maxwell Officers Club. He has traveled extensively in Africa, Europe, South America, the near east and far east. He is a retired military major and served overseas during both World War II and the Korean conflict.

Dr. Whatley is the author of 15 scientific books.

Truly an outstanding agricultural researcher and a man who has given undevoted, dedicated service to his fellow man and service to agriculture—Dr. Booker T. Whatley of Tuskegee Institute.

TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE,
Tuskegee, Ala., December 1, 1974.

Mr. J. D. HAYS,
President, Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, Montgomery, Ala.

DEAR MR. HAYS: Thank you for your kind letter dated 26 November, 1974.

I am highly honored to be the recipient of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation's Service to Agriculture Award for 1974. Being selected to receive an award by home folks makes it doubly special to me.

I will arrive in Mobile, Monday afternoon and it will be necessary for me to depart Mobile at 10:43 p.m., Tuesday night in order to attend the Annual Meeting of the International Plant Propagators' Society and present a paper at 10:15 a.m. Wednesday morning in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

I attended my first Farm Bureau picnic with my Daddy, Uncle and Granddaddy at Sulphur Springs (Calhoun County) in the summer of 1925.

Please accept my deepest gratitude for the kindness shown me.

Sincerely,

BOOKER T. WHATLEY,
Professor, Plant and Soil Science.

ALABAMA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Montgomery, Ala., November 26, 1974.

Dr. BOOKER T. WHATLEY,
Professor of Plant Science, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.

DEAR DR. WHATLEY: It is with pleasure that I inform you of your selection as the recipient of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation's Service to Agriculture Award for 1974. This Award will be made during the organization's 53rd Annual Convention in Mobile, December 1–4.

It will be my personal and distinct honor to present the Award to you on Tuesday evening, December 3 at the General Session beginning at 7:30 p.m. in the Mobile Municipal Theater. The presentation will follow the Farm Bureau Queen Contest and precede an evening of entertainment by Danny Davis and the Nashville Brass. It will be one of the highlights of our convention. We hope you can make arrangements to attend all of our convention and we particularly hope that you can attend this session so that we may honor you as our 1974 Service to Agriculture recipient.

Would you let me know as soon as possible if your schedule will permit your attendance. We will look forward to hearing from you and seeing you at the convention. In the meantime would you please submit to us a black and white glossy photograph and a biographical sketch so that we may properly present you to our Farm Bureau delegates.

Best personal regards,

J. D. HAYS,
President, Alabama Farm Bureau Federation.

DEMOCRATS HOLD SUCCESSFUL CHARTER CONVENTION

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star-News recently carried an editorial entitled "Democrats Get It Together," which is typical of many comments which have appeared in the metropolitan and weekly press throughout the country concerning the recent Democratic Charter Convention held in Kansas City.

The editorial cites the overwhelming Democratic victory at the polls in November, the recent changes in procedures approved by the House Democratic Caucus and the unity convention—and concludes that:

The fall of 1974 might be described as a time when the Democrats put it all together.

It is significant that in the preamble of the new charter adopted at the convention, the first words are:

We, the Democrats of the United States of America, united in common purpose, hereby rededicate ourselves to the principles which have historically sustained our Party.

And the preamble concludes:

. . . Under God and for these ends, and upon these principles, we do establish and adopt this Charter of the Democratic Party.

The Star editorial points out that there was a spirit of compromise at the convention "for the sake of unity."

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter, I place the editorial from the Star-News in the RECORD herewith. The editorial follows:

DEMOCRATS GET IT TOGETHER

In political terms, the fall of 1974 might be described as a time when the Democrats began to get it all together. They scored large gains in the congressional elections; then they pushed through significant and overdue procedural reforms in the House of Representatives; and over the past weekend they adopted the party's first charter with an uncharacteristic display of unity.

Any one of these is important in itself but taken together they give the party a spirit and momentum that Republicans will find hard to stop in 1976. It does not guarantee victory in the presidential race, of course, for many things can happen in two years. But combined with the heavy burdens of inflation, a sagging economy and Watergate, the developments in the Democratic party over the past six weeks can only be bad news to the Republicans.

There was evidence at the midterm convention in Kansas City that the Democrats have moved a long way toward restoring the coalition put together by Franklin Roosevelt in 1932 that has given the Democrats the White House in seven of the past eleven elections. Probably none of the some 2,000 delegates was totally happy with the charter that was adopted, but most of them were willing to compromise for the sake of party unity. The contrast between this gathering and the riotous, Vietnam-beleagured convention of 1968 and the "new policies" fiasco of 1972 was almost unbelievable.

No convention is without a few flies in the ointment, however, and the one in Kansas City was no exception. The major one was the attitude of AFL-CIO President George Meany, whose clout in internal Democratic party affairs has been slipping over the past several years but whose participation in election campaigns is important to the party. Meany's minions felt that party leaders, particularly chairman Robert Strauss, doublecrossed them by agreeing to last-minute changes in an anti-discrimination section of the charter, changes that will make it easier for minorities, women and young people to challenge delegations to national conventions.

Facing the probability of a walkout of blacks and the convention blowing up in his face, Strauss agreed to the changes. He felt probably correctly, that a divisive midterm convention would damage the party much more than letting Meany's nose get out of joint a bit.

What Meany is unable or unwilling to accept is the fact that the old days when a few people, including himself, could decide who goes to national Democratic conventions are gone forever. There is no turning back from the progress that has been made in opening the party to freer participation by blacks and other minorities, by women and by young people. The most significant action at the midterm convention was that this progress was written into the charter in language that is unmistakable. Moreover, it was done without requiring "quotas."

The contrast between the Democratic and Republican parties on the issue of openness was never more evident than it was last weekend. While the Democrats were making their open door policies a part of their party's constitution, Republicans haggled in Washington over opening the GOP's door a crack. A proposal by Representative Margaret Heckler of Massachusetts that would have forced state parties to devise "positive-action" plans to enlist more participation from minorities, women, ethnic groups and young people was turned down by a so-called "reform" committee in favor of a largely voluntary program without muscle.

Ironically, the Republican party is vastly more in need of broadening its base than is the Democratic party. Without new blood at the grassroots, the GOP faces a real danger of perishing. Republicans have relied heavily in the past on the Democrats defeating themselves by dividing into warring camps. What happened in Kansas City last weekend should make it clear to the Republicans that they can't count on it in 1976.

IGNORING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

HON. J. KENNETH ROBINSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at 11:45 a.m. today—just 15 minutes before the commencement of this meeting of the House—I asked a member of my staff to make inquiry as to the number of the resolution listed first on the list of suspensions, described as "making conference reports in order on day reported."

The report returned to me was that the resolution was not available, in that it had not been introduced, and, therefore, bore no number. Additionally, of course, no written report was available.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that this is a procedural resolution, but I believe it is a procedural resolution of some consequence.

It seems to me that, if the leadership proposes to present such a resolution as the first order of business, the Members should have the text available for advance study.

The listing of a "blind" resolution is a disservice to the Members and to orderly procedure.

FULL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Dallas Times Herald calls attention to the inconsistency of requiring full financial disclosure by Nelson Rockefeller in his confirmation hearings, but allowing Members of Congress to make a very limited report of their financial holdings.

I will be reintroducing legislation to require full financial disclosure by Members of Congress and other policymaking Government officials in the next session of Congress. As the Times Herald points out, the potential for conflict of interest exists here just as it does in the Vice Presidency, and I commend the editorial to my colleagues attention.

The text of the editorial follows:

DISCLOSURE FOR ALL

Members of the House Judiciary Committee, holding confirmation of Nelson Rockefeller for Vice President, are getting tough about financial disclosure.

Rockefeller is being asked to outline his and his family's wealth in great detail. And voluntarily, he is doing just that.

Getting tougher about financial disclosure for government officials is well and good. Certainly a stronger movement in that direction is being made in the Rockefeller case.

The nation has a right to know if there are any dangers of conflicting interests between the vast financial empire of the Rockefellers and the duties of the vice presidency.

But in the light of the enthusiasm that the House Judiciary Committee members are exhibiting for full financial disclosure by the Rockefellers, it is appropriate to contrast the demands on Rockefeller with the glaring lack of financial disclosure by members of Congress.

Congressmen and women are not required to fully reveal their net worth, assets, investments and income.

In fact, Congress has skirted the issue of financial disclosure in its own chambers, burying reform legislation in committees.

There are men and women in Congress who possess great financial power in their own right.

There are also members of Congress who acquire wealth while in public service.

Should we not expect the persons who write our laws to make a full financial disclosure?

Shouldn't congressmen demand as much disclosure of their finances as they are now requiring of persons appointed to public office?

We hope the House Judiciary Committee's action is an indication of the reform mindedness in Congress and not the hypocrisy.

THE HOPI-NAVAJO DISPUTE

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 10, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House has concurred with the Senate amendments to H.R. 10337 which authorizes the partition of surface rights in the joint use area of the 1882 Executive order reservation and the judicial partition of the 1934 Navajo Reservation between the Hopi and Navajo Tribes.

When I first introduced H.R. 10337, my primary concern was that the holdings of the court be effectuated and bring to an end a problem which Congress has failed to resolve over the past 50 years. As the bill has now passed both the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Hopi people will be guaranteed their one-half of the land. While some Hopis are dissatisfied that they are unable to receive all of the land which they once owned, they will receive for their use and exclusive possession all of the land decreed to be theirs by the decision of Healing against Jones. Likewise, the Navajo Tribe will receive for its exclusive possession the same amount of land as the Hopis in the joint use area of the Executive order reservation.

I am hopeful that both tribes will use the negotiation process provided by the Senate amendment to seriously consider their differences and ultimately draw a boundary line dividing their respective lands fairly and equally according to the Court decision, thus avoiding the necessity of a prolonged partition suit in the Federal court. However, if the tribes are unable to resolve their differences, I am satisfied that the provisions of H.R. 10337 as they relate to the partition will be carried out in such a manner by the court so as to protect equal rights of both tribes in and to the land.

None of us in Congress has been insensitive to the hardships which have been part of the daily life of both tribes. We are familiar with the long history of Hopi dispossession with its attendant economic retardation sanctioned by bureaucratic inaction and indifference. Both tribes have suffered unnecessarily by reason of the unwise overgrazing practices and poor land use planning. We all understand the hardship which will be experienced by the Navajo people principally in having to be relocated in exclusive Navajo areas. The wisdom of the legislation is evident as it ameliorates the harsh consequences of prolonged overgrazing and economic depression. The Senate amendments augment the very liberal provisions of the House version insofar as housing, land rehabilitation, economic incentives and relocation expenses. The bill does not make judgmental decisions as to the rights between the Navajo and Hopi except to implement in a very humane fashion that the Courts have determined to be the equities.

While I am somewhat disappointed with the Senate version regarding the Moencopi area, I am pleased that the tribes will have an opportunity to fully litigate the matter and decide once and for all the respective interests of both tribes.

I am confident that the courts will see the wisdom in linking the area partitioned exclusively to the Hopis in the 1934 reservation to their exclusive interests in the 1882 reservation.

It goes without saying that in a partition natural boundaries or highways ought to be used wherever possible. We struck what we felt was a fair settlement of the 1934 reservation area claims and provided for an equivalent 250,000 acres to be added to the Navajo Reservation in return for the acreage partitioned exclusively to the Hopi under our original House bill. Concededly, the Hopi interest could far exceed the 250,000 acres, but inasmuch as we had decided on that acreage for the Hopi to be carved out of the Navajo Reservation, we felt it more than fair to compensate the Navajos by additions to their reservation in the same amount of acreage. While provision for adding 250,000 acres to the Navajo Reservation is contained in the Senate amendments, it should not be construed in any manner to limit the interest of the Hopi Tribe in the 1934 Navajo Reservation to 250,000 acres.

I am pleased that this legislation will finally bring an overdue resolution to the Navajo-Hopi dispute, and I am proud that my colleagues have used the good judgment and perception necessary to make it a lasting one.

RESCIND FEDERAL SUBSIDY PAYMENTS FOR SUGAR

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, my distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. PEYSER) and I sent a letter to President Ford urging him to rescind Federal subsidy payments of $85 million this year to domestic sugar growers. We were outraged that sugar growers should be getting a penny of Federal subsidy funds when sugar prices are profits are so outrageously high.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a lady in Worland, Wyo., who had some choice comments about subsidies to sugar growers. I submit this letter for the RECORD, with the admonition that it is time to pull this sweet tooth out of the fat sugar growers:

THE HAZEL SHOP,
Worland, Wyo., December 11, 1974.

Representative SILVIO O. CONTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONTE: Noted in a news item that you and Representative Peyser are urging President Ford to strip subsidy payments for sugar from the agriculture appropriations bill and wish to commend you for your stand.

I live in a sugar beet growing area and the growers here appear to have more money than they know what to do with. This is a small town of 5,000 population and this fall so far 14 Cadillacs as well as Lincolns and other luxury cars have been purchased by the sugar beet growers. They take trips hither and yon and I resent paying taxes to subsidize people who can live in comparative luxury while I have to scrimp to get along and try to cope with this terrible inflation.

My husband and I operate a small business which is down about 6% this year. In 18 years we have had one week's vacation so you can realize our frustration since the government does not subsidize us, nor should it. However, by the same token neither should it subsidize the sugar industry which has made outrageous profits this year.

In my opinion Congress is totally fiscally irresponsible. It seems that anyone must realize that the government's income is going to go down with so many people out of work and many businesses in trouble, but it continues to appropriate money as though there were no end to it.

Certainly hope that your efforts with the president will have some results in this sugar matter. Wish Congress could learn to say "no" to some of these pressure groups but it seems they cannot.

Thank you for listening to one small voice out of the millions who are equally frustrated but only complain among themselves.

Yours sincerely,

MRS. C. H. OUTTEN.

MEMORIES AND REFLECTIONS

HON. HAROLD V. FROEHLICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. FROEHLICH. Mr. Speaker, I insert my final newsletter to citizens of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin:

MEMORIES AND REFLECTIONS

Two years ago at this time, I was preoccupied with the problems of selecting my staff, organizing my office, and moving my family to the Nation's Capital. As I prepared to take the oath of office, our economy was strong. We were coming to the end of a long, devisive war. It was a time of confidence and optimism for the American people and for the new Congressman from Northeastern Wisconsin.

Now, as I close out my office and prepare to return home to private life, my mind is flooded with the bittersweet memories of the difficult times we have all been through. Our once-booming economy is in disarray; our political system has been traumatized by scandal; our people are somber and disenchanted. In this final Letter from Washington, I would like to reflect upon some of the events that have made the period of my term as your Representative one of the most troublesome in our history.

A Member of Congress plays many roles. He is a policymaker and a law maker for the

Nation, concerned with the great national and international issues of the day. He is the representative of a specific geographic area, concerned with the problems and views of his state and district. He is also the last hope of many citizens who have encountered difficulties with some federal agency and do not know where else to turn. By championing the interests of individuals, a Congressman monitors the administration of government programs and tries to assure a responsive bureaucracy. The problems that come to light in this process often inspire legislation to revise and correct the system.

Each Congressman must decide what emphasis he will give to these and other roles. Some Members never make a significant contribution to the legislative process because they concentrate almost exclusively on local problems. Others lose touch with their constituency because of their involvement in "big" national issues.

From the outset of my term, I decided to divide my time equitably among all these roles because all are important. Wisconsin's Congressional delegation has a significant impact on national affairs. I did not want to be an exception to that pattern, or a rubberstamp. Yet, from my 10 years experience in State government, I was convinced that our State had sometimes suffered from insufficient attention to Wisconsin's problems, and I wanted to assure that I would not be guilty on that score.

During my term, I tried to visit not only the county seats and the large cities, but also the smallest villages in the district to seek our people's views and be available. The Green Bay Congressional office was expanded. A district office was opened in Appleton for the first time. A Winnebago trailer served as a mobile office for myself and my staff throughout most of 1974. Two questionnaires and a steady appeal for your letters were part of an overall effort to keep my finger on the pulse of the district and to stay on top of local problems.

An enormous amount of my time was devoted to problems of a local nature. They often related to the geography of the area— to Lake Michigan and Green Bay, the dairy farms and fields, the dense forests, the heavy industry concentrated along the Fox River, the sparse population, inadequate transportation, and declining tax base of the north. The district has a substantial Indian population which needs assistance. The Menominee people saw the passage of my bill, the Menominee Restoration Act, the most important Indian legislation of the 93rd Congress.

I devoted my time to housing, sewer and water projects, industrial parks, post offices, bridges, highways, airports, and harbors. I remember the day that I blocked the passage of a multi-billion dollar transportation bill as part of a successful strategy to restore Coast Guard search and rescue service to Northern Door County.

But these labors were overshadowed by great national crises which engulfed many lawmakers in an atmosphere of rejection.

Early in my term I was assigned to a seat on the House Committee on the Judiciary. From there I was destined to play a role in the confirmation of two Vice President under the new 25th Amendment and the near impeachment of a President. Passing judgment upon the President of the United States was a particularly arduous responsibility, which I could not reasonably anticipate when I assumed office. When the evidence in the impeachment inquiry unfolded over a period of months, I could not escape the conclusion that the President was personally involved in criminal misconduct, but a vote for his impeachment ran counter to many of my strongest loyalties and raised doubts in my mind about the Nation's best interest. It was difficult not only to indict the leader of my party but also to associate myself with some of the members of the opposite party with whom, on virtually all else, I passionately disagreed. It was wrenching, as I followed my own conscience, to be accused by various factions of insensitivity, vacillation, grandstanding, and treason. One can only hope that from this great national tragedy will emerge a new commitment to decency and integrity among both our public officials and our people.

As we look to the future, the attention of the Nation is riveted upon the economy— the precipitous inflation that has eroded our standard of living and the developing recession that has produced cutbacks, layoffs, and unemployment. These phenomena have been immensely complicated by shortages of energy, particularly natural gas, and by our growing dependency upon foreign oil.

Throughout my term, I have been deeply involved in these issues. Although I can claim no special vision, I have worked for two years to develop alternate sources of energy. It has been frustrating to watch Congress fumble the ball on this matter that required emergency attention. I have also tried to contribute in a useful, constructive way to the debate on economic policy. My first bill was a budget reform bill and my most significant legislative accomplishment may turn out to be the little resolution requiring "inflation impact statements" for all new legislation pending in the House.

I see no easy answers to our hard economic problems. We may face fundamental readjustments in our growth, our consumption, and our standard of living. We may be forced to austerity and sacrifice. If this is the case, each American must do his part. We must all pull together.

As we make adjustments, I hope we can avoid government management of the economy. Government is not always the answer. Reckless deficit spending in recent years has demonstrated beyond all doubt that government lacks the discipline and self-restraint, much less the competence, for so massive an undertaking. Most people who advocate a return to tight controls have no real conception of the quagmire into which they would push us.

In hard times, we must also reject demagogues and scapegoats. They will not increase production and reinvigorate our economy. They will only divide us for selfish purposes.

These two years have been a privilege for me and a priceless experience. The pain of unfilled plans, hopes, and aspirations is more than outweighed by the satisfaction of hard work and accomplishment for those who have given me their trust and support. I am in your debt.

Thank you for this opportunity, and best wishes.

HAROLD V. FROEHLICH,
Member of Congress.

LOGIC OF BART ROWEN DEMANDS ACTION

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the need for an overall national energy policy has to me become increasingly urgent. We and the other oil importing, industrialized nations must move forcefully to cut our consumption of petroleum and develop alternative energy sources. I am pleased to note that the Ford administration has hopefully recognized the need for another review of the energy situation, looking toward more stringent controls in the United States next year.

The magnitude of the energy problem and the economic impact of current consumption patterns at today's prices were brought out in a recent column by Hobart Rowen of the Washington Post. He points out that, by World Bank estimates, the OPEC nations will accumulate wealth both this year and next in an amount equal to the net foreign assets of the United States. If current trends continue, by 1980 the OPEC countries will have wealth totalling $650 billion, the value of the entire New York stock exchange, and by 1985 an amount almost twice that, or $1.2 trillion. As is evident, resource transfers of such staggering proportions would pose grave dangers for the economic systems of the industrialized nations.

I believe that, to deal effectively with this situation, the United States needs to institute a comprehensive fuel rationing program, keep domestic oil prices fully controlled, and also start a large-scale energy development program for the longer term. We must try to satisfy our requirements with the energy resources available within our own hemisphere. This means changing our lifestyle and learning to live with smaller, cheaper, and more efficient automobiles. We need an equitable rationing program that considers the needs of every sector of our economy.

I also think that we should keep controls on domestic oil, and, if anything, reduce the price, keeping it separate from the outrageous prices of foreign oil. I do not see any reason why regulation should remove the incentives needed for the development of additional energy resources. But if there is a problem, some Government competition ought to help solve it and also get us going on new forms of energy. For the longer term, in my view we need a large-scale public development program for alternative energy sources, say $100 billion over 10 years. This would enable us to get going on development in such areas as nuclear power, gassification of coal, solar and geothermal power, and oil shale recovery procedures, as well as additional oil resources. In the short term, however, we and the rest of the Western World must concentrate on cutting energy consumption. That is the thrust of Bart Rowen's article that follows:

. . . AND THE TOUGH DECISIONS AHEAD

(By Hobart Rowen)

Sooner or later, the Ford administration will have to adopt "stronger" measures to cut energy consumption 15 to 20 per cent, as suggested by Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur F. Burns. And the sooner, the better.

No political leader relishes the necessity of confronting the public with a demand for "austerity"—it is much more in the American tradition to promise an ever-broadening standard of living.

But like it or not, the United States and other Western countries are engaged in a desperate power struggle with the Organization for Petroleum Exporting Countries, and unless the West wants to yield abjectly to the cartel, it must make some tough decisions soon.

To put it in the most stark terms, the oil producers are accumulating so much wealth that they will be able—if current prices and current consumption levels are maintained—to buy up the rest of the world.

An outrageous exaggeration? The World Bank estimates that the cartel's reserves will be about $653 billion by 1980 and $1,206 billion by 1985, or six times the world total at the end of 1973.

In this year alone, the OPEC countries will add $65 billion to their wealth, and another $65 billion or so in 1975. To put that figure in perspective, the U.S.—a year shy of a 200-year history—has net foreign assets of $63 billion, or less than OPEC now acquires in a single year.

The World Bank's estimate that by 1985, the cartel will pile up the incredible reserve total of $1,206 billion has received wide publicity. What has not been reported fully is that five countries with what the Bank describes as "limited" capacity to use the money in their own economies will hold $996 billion of the total. They are Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Libya, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates.

Another $197 billion would be held by four countries, including Iran, with a slightly greater "absorptive" capacity.

Paul Erdman's fictional account in the Dec. 2 New York Magazine depicting a two-day war in which the Shah of Iran conquers the Persian Gulf states, controls almost all the world's oil supply, and then dominates the world is an exercise in fantasy. But it provides food for thought.

Assistant Secretary of State Thomas O. Enders, in a controversial speech at Yale University on Nov. 25, said bluntly that "unless they act, the industrial democracies face an inexorably rising danger of financial collapse, or depression, or both over the next decade.

"As oil debts pile up in the industrial countries, first the weaker, then the stronger will find their credit unacceptable, and will try to balance their external accounts by restrictions on trade and on the level of economic activity."

What, then, is the answer, since the cartel has made clear that it is not interested in abandoning the rigged price that has caused all the trouble?

The answer is not, as Enders suggested, to couple a conservation program with a guarantee that new energy investments be assured a price of $10 to $11 a barrel, plus an allowance for inflation.

By the time Enders appeared before a congressional committee four days later, he had been called off this unwise suggestion by Treasury Secretary William E. Simons and others. There is plenty of incentive for what former Interior Secretary Stewart Udall calls the "oil boomers" without letting the cartel set the domestic U.S. oil price.

The immediate response of the Western World should be drastic cuts in energy consumption. The sheer waste, especially in the United States, is enormous.

Much fat can be trimmed, with little loss to anyone—except the exporting cartel. But the reductions will have to affect the muscle below the fat: a sizable gas tax, as Burns recommended, or gas rationing, and a tax on auto horsepower will hurt the economy. But we can adjust to that. We can eventually build more of our own sources of energy, as well.

But what we cannot and should not adjust to is dictation by the cartel, turning its oil on and off to accomplish its political goals.

If we drift along this way, letting the cartel call the signals, merrily burning up gasoline and electricity, then, as Burns says, "we may face a permanent decline of our nation's economic and political power in a very troubled world."

ROCKEFELLER: THE COLDEST WARRIOR OF ALL

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks, I have called to the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary numerous matters regarding the nomination of Nelson Rockefeller as Vice President which I thought should be investigated prior to a vote on confirmation. Among those lines of inquiry which have not been thoroughly pursued are Mr. Rockefeller's views on nuclear power and world affairs. In an article in the New York Times on December 13, Tom Wicker explored further some of the matters I mentioned in my testimony before the Judiciary Committee, and reemphasized the importance of ascertaining Mr. Rockefeller's current thinking on such vital issues before voting on his confirmation. I fully agree that it is essential that the Congress know where Mr. Rockefeller stands on matters of national security and world affairs, and I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Mr. Wicker's article:

THE COLDEST WARRIOR OF ALL

(By Tom Wicker)

The nomination of Nelson Rockefeller to be Vice President was in deep trouble a month ago, but now it is speeding through Congress, with the House likely to vote final approval next week. A major—if generally unspoken—reason for the turnabout is the growing belief on Capitol Hill that President Ford is so inept that if his Administration is to stay afloat it needs the help of a vigorous and experienced political leader like Mr. Rockefeller.

That judgment of Mr. Ford is widely shared, but the notion that an able Vice President can somehow take hold of an Administration and run it flies in the face of history. The United States has had many weak Presidents, but there is no case on record where one of them in fact permitted his Vice President to run things, or build up much influence. The office has no statutory authority, little prestige (particularly when it is appointive), and even its constitutional function of presiding over the Senate is vacuous and offers little potential for legislative influence.

Even if Mr. Ford and Mr. Rockefeller prove exceptions to the historical rule, the Democrats controlling Congress are playing with political fire. If Mr. Rockefeller could make himself the real power in the Ford Administration, he could certainly make himself a formidable Republican nominee in 1976—perhaps as an incumbent President, through Mr. Ford's resignation.

But the worst aspect of the haste with which the Rockefeller nomination is now moving is that, for all the time consumed so far, many important lines of inquiry have not even been put to him. In neither the House nor the Senate committee, moreover, was any real or intelligent attention paid to Mr. Rockefeller's vaunted record in foreign and national security affairs—which in fact and in hindsight discloses him to have been one of the hawkiest and most belligerent of Cold Warriors.

In 1959, for instance, he called on the Eisenhower Administration to resume nuclear testing "to preserve peace in the world." He was speaking then of underground tests, but on Oct. 27, 1961, he went further and demanded resumption of tests in the atmosphere. When President Kennedy, instead, sought a test-ban treaty with the Soviets, Mr. Rockefeller said on Nov. 14, 1961, that "to sign any test ban, at this time, could place in jeopardy both our national safety and the defense of freedom throughout the world."

These views were influenced, no doubt, by Mr. Rockefeller's belief, expressed in 1959, that nuclear warfare was dangerous but not unthinkable because it "does not mean annihilation, or the end of the civilization we have known." He thought then that as many as three out of four people might survive in bomb shelters.

Mr. Rockefeller supported President Kennedy, however, at the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion. He said Americans must "stand united behind the President to give him the support for *whatever action is necessary* in the defense of freedom." (Italics mine.)

Mr. Rockefeller stuck with that general view at least until 1964, when he still thought force might have to be used against Cuba "at the right time." But by then, in a television interview, he was criticizing Mr. Kennedy's refusal to use American air power at the Bay of Pigs. "There is no question but force is an integral part of international diplomacy, and at times we have hesitated to use it when it should have been used," he said.

During the Oregon Presidential primary that same year year, Mr. Rockefeller said in a luncheon speech at Grant's Pass on April 27 that the United States should increase its military commitment in Thailand, stop troop withdrawals from South Vietnam, and carry the war there into Communist sanctuaries in Laos, Cambodia and North Vietnam, including bombing North Vietnam and Loas. That was almost a year before President Johnson began the bombing of North Vietnam.

The same day, Mr. Rockefeller confided to an audience in Klamath Falls that he had told Soviet Premier Khrushchev that he did not believe in Soviet-American "co-existence" because it was "a very clever means of trying to pull us into close cooperation where they can then undermine the forces of human freedom.

If Mr. Rockefeller's views on these matters have changed substantially, even in the era of détente with the Soviet Union and China, what he now thinks is not clearly on the record of the confirmation proceedings. And in fact his aggressive views seem to have been deeply held. "American *principle demands*," he said in 1961 (again the italics are mine), "that we refuse to be bluffed, bullied or blackmailed into compromising the liberties of other human beings, or depriving them of a chance to win their freedom."

That was the "principle" that "demanded" nearly a decade of ruinous war in Vietnam. The American people should know whether it is still the principle of the man Congress is about to place first in line of succession to the Presidency.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues may be fully aware of what will transpire when the House takes up H.R. 17409 tomorrow, I insert in the RECORD at the appropriate place a list of technical amendments to that bill.

These amendments, which will be offered by my colleague from Maine and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Crime, WILLIAM S. COHEN, are of two types: The first set of amendments is composed of technical and conforming amendments to amendments made to the bill by the Committee on the Judiciary. The second group of amendments would make technical, conforming, and perfecting changes to H.R. 17409 itself.

It is my hope that these technical amendments may be considered expeditiously so that full discussion on this important measure can go forward. To that end, Mr. COHEN will ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en banc, by type.

AMERICAN SEAPOWER PROTECTS AMERICA AND MUST REMAIN CREDIBLE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation approaches its Bicentennial, the American people would do well to reflect on the major role played by U.S. seapower in the preservation of our Republic.

From the fledgling days of the United States right up to today's nuclear age, the U.S. Navy has been at the heart of this Nation's fight for survival and its expansion into the world's greatest power.

The Honorable J. William Middendorf II, Secretary of the Navy, recently provided an incisive and timely analysis of the Navy's contributions to our history and of its continuing importance in our modern world. Secretary Middendorf presented his remarks at a meeting of the San Francisco Rotary Club on December 3.

I insert Secretary Middendorf's remarks in the RECORD as follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY MIDDENDORF

The Bay Area has indeed had a long association with the Navy. One of the first mayors of San Francisco, back in the days of the Gold Rush, was a naval officer—LT Washington A. Bartlett. More recently, the Naval Air Station, Alameda, has been the homeport for our attack aircraft carriers ENTERPRISE, RANGER, CORAL SEA, and HANCOCK. And Mare Island has been the cradle of much of our submarine force of the Pacific Fleet. And many great steam ship companies sail their ships under the Golden Gate.

It is therefore a real pleasure to be back in San Francisco again.

Throughout the history of the United States, seapower has been an integral part in making this nation great. A strong merchant marine has enabled the development of our economy and has transported the raw materials needed for our industrial base.

And a strong Navy has defended our coasts, protected our sea lines of communication, deterred aggression, and projected the presence of the United States throughout the world.

On 13 October 1775, the Continental Congress authorized the acquisition and construction of ships for the Continental Navy. Our country was severely challenged then. The perception of that Congress and of the peoples of those colonies, which lined the eastern seaboard, was necessarily fixed on the Atlantic Ocean and across it to Europe. For it was from Europe, across the Atlantic, that would come any foreign intervention. And it was Europe, across the Atlantic, upon which the agricultrual and maritime economies of the colonies depended for our external markets and many manufactured goods.

And therefore a strong Navy was properly regarded as an essential element of defense to meet the challenges of the first decade of American history.

The War of 1812 was fought ostensibly to defend the doctrine of "freedom of the seas." At the beginning of that war, the U.S. Navy was composed of just 14 seaworthy warships. But our Navy took to the high seas against overwhelming British seapower—1,048 men-of-war—and won a number of brilliant single ship actions.

In the late nineteenth century three developments occurred which led to the evolution of the U.S. Navy's *oceanic* strategy.

First, in 1890, RADM Alfred Thayer Mahan published his internationally famous work *The Influence of Sea Power on History*. Mahan's strategic analysis rested on the military principle that the key to defeating an enemy is concentrating superior offensive force against his main force. He also delineated the *vital* links between the burgeoning American industrial production, overseas markets, the merchant marine, and the Navy.

Secondly, westward expansion and development in the United States had increased tremendously along the Pacific Coast. American interests were expanding in the Pacific and the Caribbean. And the United States found itself facing increasing European naval competition in areas thought crucial to vigorous overseas commercial activity.

Finally, steam and steel warships were replacing the Navy's wooden sailing ships. These new ships greatly increased the Navy's sea-keeping and combat capabilities

Naval bases in Hawaii, Wake, Guam, Samoa, and the Philippines assured the United States access to the markets and raw materials of the Pacific Basin. These bases, together with the Panama Canal and additional bases in the Caribbean, would also give the United States a protective cordon to deter attack by any major power.

Rear Admiral Mahan was the strategic thinker.

President Theodore Roosevelt put seapower into action. The Spanish-American War had projected the United States into the role of a world power with overseas interests and territories requiring a strong Navy. In 1907 he sent his famous "Great White Fleet" on a two year, round-the-world cruise. This cruise demonstrated the U.S. Navy's technical proficiency, engendered good-will, and increased American prestige.

In reflecting on the cruise of the "Great White Fleet", Roosevelt said: "In my own judgment the most important service I rendered to peace was the voyage of the battle fleet around the world."

Since their practical application by Theodore Roosevelt American naval and, in many respects, our overall military strategy has reflected these geopolitical, oceanic concepts. And World War I and World War II represented the triumphs of that strategy. The United States Navy and Marine Corps had clearly and successfully fulfilled three missions:

(1) Sea control—primarily in anti-submarine warfare and principally in the North Atlantic, the Navy insured the unimpeded flow of men and material to Europe.

(2) Projection of power ashore—primarily in the Pacific theater, U.S. Marines and tactical aircraft effectively wrested strategic chains of islands from the Japanese.

(3) And the end of World War II saw a burgeoning of the Navy's mission of political presence, particularly through the continuous deployment of aircraft carriers to the Mediterranean and western Pacific.

Yet World War II ended with certainly the most significant weapon of strategic warfare. On July 16, 1945, the United States exploded its first atomic bomb at Alamogordo, New Mexico. The following month that weapon used twice to accelerate the end of the war with Japan.

Four years later, the U.S. monopoly of the atomic bomb ended, with President Truman's announcement on September 23, 1949, that an atomic explosion had occurred in the Soviet Union.

This event brought an entirely new equation into the broad spectrum of world affairs. Now the two superpowers had the capability to reap massive destruction on the other. And therefore the development of the military and political strategy of deterrence began to take shape.

For the Navy, this fourth mission took practical shape from 1950, when its first nuclear-capable carrier aircraft, the AJ-1/SAVAGE, was delivered. The Navy's strategic deterrence mission became more sophisticated in December 1960, when the USS *George Washington* went to sea with sixteen Polaris missiles.

Therefore, in the years after World War II, the Navy's three traditional missions of sea control, projection of power, and political presence and its fourth modern mission of strategic deterrence were successfully adapted to our national military strategy that encompassed potential warfare against major powers as well as a conventional naval role in smaller scale confrontations.

There is no doubt that seapower has played an integral role in the development of this country.

Today we as a nation are confronted by many crucial issues. And our ability to survive as a nation depends more on seapower than ever before.

The first of these issues is political. There has been an increase in tensions in the Middle East. As shown by previous crisis in this sensitive area, U.S. seapower has been manifest in the *stabilization* of potentially violent situations and the *deterrence* of or outside intervention.

U.S. seapower has inherent capabilities which can be used as instruments of national policy. Principal among the capabilities of U.S. seapower are:

(1) Ability to display a credible U.S. military commitment within range of almost any area of the world.

(2) Ability to protect or evacuate U.S. nationals in almost any area of the world.

(3) Ability to provide a military presence without an automatic commitment of forces.

(4) Ability to clearly demonstrate U.S. interest and capability, without disclosing precise intentions.

And seapower is the least susceptible to diplomatic constraints, base rights, overflight privileges or the pressures of host countries.

Today the international arena is characterized by a transition from the strict bipolarity of the immediate post World War II years. Now and in the future international issues will be increasingly characterized by political and economic issues. And U.S. seapower, within a broader national strategy, will be essential in providing international stability and in supporting our national interests.

The second issue is economic. During the past year, the monetary reserves owned by the oil producing countries have risen threefold from $13 billion to $38 billion. These reserves represent 19% of the world's monetary reserves, and are almost equal to the reserves of all of industrial Europe as recently as 1970. And Secretary of the Treasury William Simon recently noted that these accumulations of capital could exceed $500 billion by 1980, twelve times what it is now.

For example Saudi Arabia now ranks fourth among the world's countries with the largest monetary reserves. Last year at this time the Saudis held $4 billion, a healthy sum that placed them 13th on the world scale. Today their reserves total $11.5 billion. Ahead of the Saudis are only West Germany ($32.5 billion)—United States ($15.7 billion)—Japan ($13.2 billion).

This rapid accumulation of wealth, and its concentration in the extremely sensitive Middle East, threatens to create new pressures against the world's financial system.

U.S. seapower may well play a major role in the stability of this strategic area, wherein are concentrated more than 50% of the world's proven oil reserves.

Furthermore, the heaviest concentration of seaborne oil traffic in the world is through the Straits of Hormuz. Through this narrow waterway connecting the Arabian Gulf with the Indian Ocean pass an average approaching 20 million barrels of oil per day, representing half of world oil exports. Domination of these Straits by an unfriendly power could effectively cut off much of the free world from its prime source of oil. Similarly, domination of the Indian Ocean by unfriendly naval forces could hinder or deny freedom of passage to the oil carriers.

Soviet ships now regularly operate in the Indian Ocean with generally a missile-armed cruiser, some destroyers, an amphibious ship, and several auxiliary ships supporting Soviet interests. By contrast the U.S. Navy's Middle East Force is composed of only three ships. In addition the U.S. now periodically sends carrier task groups into the Indian Ocean.

The third issue is also economic. Today the United States is an island nation, growing increasingly dependent on foreign sources of raw materials and energy.

There are 71 strategic raw materials and metals which are integral to the economic base of the United States. We must *import* 68 of these raw materials and metals, all or in part *by sea.*

In 1973, the U.S. imported by sea more than 50 million tons of these raw materials and minerals valued in excess of $4 billion.

And in 10 years, it is estimated that half again as much of our essential imports will come by sea.

We are also dependent on energy imports. In 1973, we imported by sea about 580 million barrels of crude oil and refined products accounting for 29% of our domestic consumption.

Crude oil and refined products imported by sea sources 1973

	Percent
Arab Countries	10
Indonesia	1
Iran	2
Nigeria	3
Venezuela	12
Other	1
Percentage of total U.S. consumption	29

It is the mission of the U.S. Navy to protect the sea lanes for the transport of these critical imports. And it is the mission of the U.S. Navy to render a political and diplomatic presence in the world today in support of our national policy.

Yet today the U.S. Navy has the fewest number of ships in the active fleet since the period a year and a half before Pearl Harbor. The ships of today's Navy are indeed much more capable than their World War II-vintage counterparts.

Today's aircraft carrier ENTERPRISE (CVAN-68), with its Air Group of sophisticated F-14s, A-6s, and A-7s, packs a much more potent punch than her World War II predecessor (CV-6).

However, just six years ago we had an active fleet of nearly 1,000 ships. Because most of these were constructed during World War II, and because of budget restraints we have cut our Navy in half so that today we are about to go below 500 ships.

The service life expectancy for warships is 25 to 30 years. In 1968 the average age of the active fleet had increased to 18 years. It therefore became unmistakably clear that we had to reduce the numbers of our older ships in order to build the new ships we need.

Between 1963 and 1967 the Navy planned nearly 50 new ships per year. Then came the fiscal demands of the Vietnam war with its requirements for operating funds at the expense of shipbuilding.

We also undertook the costly conversion of 31 Polaris submarines to carry the Poseidon missile, which substantially upgraded the nation's strategic deterrenct capabilities.

In the last six years although we were forced to reduce the numbers of ageing ships in the active fleet, the Navy received authority to build 13 ships per year. This rate of shipbuilding—13 ships per year means that the U.S. Navy will never recover the strength of 900 ships but also will not even be able to sustain a fleet of 50 ships unless increases are made in the number of ships being built each year.

We have, in effect, undertook a course of action which if allowed to go uncorrected would amount to an unilateral naval disarmament.

There are a number of solutions to this critical problem.

In our 1975 shipbuilding program, we initiated two programs which will contribute to the fleet's numerical strength because we are buying and building in *numbers*.

The first ship is the Missile Patrol Hydrofoil (PHM). Capable of operating at high speeds in heavy sea conditions, the PHM will provide the Navy a potent punch in many different operational environments. And ships of this class can readily assume the patrol and surveillance functions formerly assigned to our larger ships, thereby relieving our SPRUANCE and KNOX class combatants for other duties such as carrier task force operations and anti-submarine warfare. We hope to build 30 missile patrol hydrofoils.

The second ship is the Patrol Frigate (PF). We envision this ship to be a low-cost workhorse for the fleet, designed to carry out the very important escort mission. We hope to build 50 of these ships.

Additionally we are continuing to build SPRUANCE class destroyers, LOS ANGELES class nuclear-powered attack submarines, and three nuclear-powered aircraft carriers.

An even more advanced concept is the Surface Effect Ship, which is capable of speeds in excess of 80 knots. Once the research and development is completed, we could build and deploy these ships over the oceans of the world. Their high speed capability and sophisticated weapons systems would make them a potent and nearly invulnerable ships of the future.

Congress is very much aware of the Navy's need for more ships and the problems in our shipbuilding programs. Congress approved the construction of 22 ships in the budget for this year.

However, this ghastly inflation, with which you and I are struggling, is crippling our shipbuilding effort.

For example, the price of scrap steel has nearly doubled in less than a year. And overall cost escalations will probably reach 20%. Therefore, due principally to inflation, our Navy shipbuilding programs are now $2 billion in debt.

I can assure you that people in all levels of government, are aware of these critical problems and are working to resolve them. I feel everyone in the Executive and Legislative Branches recognizes the *need*. It is ultimately a question of accomplishing the task of rebuilding the fleet in the context of the greater issues facing us.

It is within the foregoing that I would address a most significant *military* issue. Having cut the size of the U.S. fleet in half and having a shipbuilding program jeopardized by inflation, we now face the challenge of the Soviet Navy.

Let me say at the outset that the Soviet Navy is *not* ten feet tall. The U.S. Navy still has tremendous staying power and real, combat-proven strength.

Yet it is the *trend* of expanding Soviet naval capabilities that I personally view as one of the most significant strategic developments since the atomic bomb.

This *trend* is burgeoning Soviet naval capabilities, when considered together with other Soviet tactical and strategic military developments would give any Secretary of the Navy cause for concern.

With regard to the Soviet Navy:

(1) Since 1962 they have outbuilt us in every category of ship except aircraft carriers. During the period 1962–1973, they added 271 major surface combatants and submarines as opposed to our 176 new ships. (Charts 1 and 2)

Current ship inventories—major combatants and submarines

	Soviet Navy	U.S. Navy
Attack Carriers	2 (CHG)	14
Cruisers	30	6
Destroyers	80	90
Escorts	109	66
Submarines	325	115
Total	546	291

Ship numbers and comparisons can be extremely dangerous. We cannot compare a 90,000 ton U.S. aircraft carrier to an 850-ton Soviet "minor combatant." Yet the more than 135 guided-missile firing patrol boats in the Soviet inventory do pose a significant threat.

For example, the Soviet OSA and KOMAR classes, now more than 13 years old, have been used with success in combat. An 80-ton Egyptian KOMAR sunk the 2,500-ton Israeli destroyer EILAT on 21 October 1967. The operations of Indian OSAs against merchant shipping in the war with Pakistan in December 1971 were also very successful.

The Soviet 850-ton NANUCHKA-class carries the SS-N-9 surface-to-surface missile. Its 1,100-pound warhead is twice that of the surface-to-surface missile we plan for the future.

(2) The Soviets have deployed aboard their ships highly sophisticated sensors, electronics and offensive and defensive weapons systems. They have developed an arsenal of some 20 types of anti-ship capable missiles and their variants. Having ranges from 15 to 400 miles, these missiles can be fired from aircraft, surface ships, and from submerged submarines.

I personally believe that a number of years ago we made a serious error when we chose to put all of our missile capability on our sea-based aircraft without developing an over-the-horizon shipborne surface-to-surface missile. At that time we had a force of 23 aircraft carriers, combat proven during World War II. Now with only 14 aircraft carriers and a major Soviet anti-ship missile capability we are on a crash program to introduce our first over-the-horizon surface-to-surface missile—HARPOON.

(3) The Soviet Navy has gone to sea. From a coastal defense navy in 1962, today we observe Soviet ships circumnavigating Hawaii, exercising in the Caribbean, and operating near the strategic oil routes of the Indian Ocean.

(4) They have upgraded their strategic submarine ballistic missile force. The new Delta-class submarine carries the 4,200 mile SS-N-8 missile, which is capable of hitting us here in San Francisco from its homeport a few hundred miles west of Alaska.

(5) And these *naval* developments coincide with the impending Soviet deployment next year of *four* new classes of ICBMs with warheads of one-half to 25 megatons, and a new long-range bomber, the BACKFIRE.

(6) Furthermore, preliminary analysis of U.S. and Soviet military production rates indicates that the Soviets are outproducing us in all but a few categories of military equipment by from 2:1 to 12:1.

This is where we stand today and these are the issues we face. We are more dependent on *foreign* sources of raw materials and energy. We have a much smaller Navy to do the job than we did six years ago, and the Soviets are building a tremendous navy at a rate faster than we are. And we are faced with a tense world economic and political situation.

For this we need the credibility of a strong U.S. Navy more now than ever before.

I have never met an American who wants the U.S. Navy to become second best. Each of you in this room, either by your personal experience or knowledge, knows that the U.S. Navy was unchallenged—in Vietnam and in Korea and clearly won the battle for naval supremacy in World Wars I and II.

Yet for the United States to keep a Navy "second-to-none" we need the support of each of you. Each of you as leaders of the community can carry this message. *You* are the ones who will ultimately determine the futures of the Navy and this country.

MARY LEE B. HELM, WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 9, 1974, Mary Lee B. Helm was chosen Woman of the Year by the Women's division of the Fremont Chamber of Commerce. Mrs. Helm was honored, along with seven other nominees, by leaders of her community at a luncheon at the Plaza International Inn.

The criteria for the selection of the winner could very possibly have been written just for Mary Lee. Few individuals could match her list of accomplishments and service. She was nominated by the Fremont Branch of the American Association of University Women, of which she is an active member. She is also president of Fremont Friends of the Library and has spent endless hours collecting, sorting, and selling used books to raise funds for libraries.

Mary Lee serves as secretary and publicity chairperson for the Fremont Democratic Women's Forum and is an active member of the League of Women Voters. She is not new to the political arena and cochaired the Democratic headquarters for southern Alameda County during the 1972 presidential campaigns.

Her interests and sensitivity to others is exemplified by her work with FISH, a volunteer service group, and by her service as vice president of the women's fellowship at Niles Congregational Church.

A very significant part of Mary Lee's life is her family. She has been married to Del Helm for 23 years and has consistently received his support and encouragement for her activities. The Helms have three children, Marcy Ann, Robert Berkeley, and Mary Jane. Mary Lee has continuously worked with PTA's and parent clubs in all the schools her children have attended. She currently serves on the executive board of the Mission San Jose High School.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Mary Lee and Del for many years and have been honored by their friendship and support. The city of Fremont is fortunate to have them, and I commend the chamber of commerce for its wisdom in selecting Mary Lee Helm as their Woman of the Year for 1974.

CRIME SURVEY

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned over crime, as are many of my constituents. When I recently surveyed my constituents about their experiences with crime many indicated their concerns to me while requesting that their names be kept confidential. Some who had been hit by crime had not reported these crimes and requested that their names and addresses be kept confidential, indicating that they feared reprisals.

I am inserting responses to my questionnaire in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but am withholding the names and addresses of the respondents because I feel it my duty to respect and protect the confidentiality of my constituents' responses.

The questions which I asked on my questionnaire are the following:

First. Have you or a family member been the victim of a serious crime in the past 2 years?

Second. If so, what type of crime?

Third. Was this reported to the police?

Fourth. What loss(es) did you incur?

Fifth. Did the police catch a suspect?

Sixth. Did the case go to trial?

Seventh. If so, what was the outcome?

I have omitted some comments not relevant to the questionnaire.

Responses to my questionnaire follow:

RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIVE LONG OF MARYLAND'S QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONDENT 1

1. yes
2. stolen building material
3. yes
4. $800.00 plywood, etc.
5. no
6. no
7. —

Comments: Many such thefts have been reported with no let up and no end in sight.

RESPONDENT 2

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 3

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: I hope that I am not pushing our luck by having been fortunate enough to escape being a victim.

RESPONDENT 4

1. yes
2. theft
3. no
4. 500 gallons of gasoline, $300.00 worth of tools
5. no
6. no
7. —

Comments: These weren't reported to the police because, as you can imagine, after the thefts had taken place without any witnesses on a country road, there's just no way anyone can trace a non-reusable. . . .

RESPONDENT 5

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 6

1. fortunately, no.
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: We have a very large and very visible German shepherd—which may help.

RESPONDENT 7

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 8

1. no—Thank God!
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 9

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 10

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 11

1. —
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: We have not been the victims of any crime but thank you for caring.

RESPONDENT 12

1. Yes 3/13/74
2. vandalism
3. no
4. antenna broken from station wagon
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: My insurance company, Allstate Insurance Company, had the antenna replaced.

RESPONDENT 13

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 14

1. no
2–7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 15

1. no
2–7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 16

1. No, and let's hope not.
2–7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 17

1. Any crime which costs me money, I consider serious.
2. throwing of rocks at our home, breaking a window and denting the aluminum siding.
3. no—what for?
4–7. —.

Comments: not relevant to questionnaire.

RESPONDENT 18

1. —.
2. no.
3–7. —.

Comments: none.

RESPONDENT 19

1. no.
2–7. —.

Comments: none.

RESPONDENT 20

1. no.
2–7. —.

Comments: none.

RESPONDENT 21

1. no.
2–7. —.

Comments: none.

RESPONDENT 22

1. yes.
2. multi-band radio stolen from car.
3. no.
4. $100.00.
5. no.
6. no.
7. none.

Comments: Not enough police in this area. Hope we get new Chief of Police.

RESPONDENT 23

1. no.
2–7. —.

Comments: none.

RESPONDENT 24

1. no.
2–7. —.

Comments: none.

RESPONDENT 25

1. yes.
2. Broken window left car door.
3. no.
4. $35.00.
5. no.
6. no.
7. no.

Comments: I'm trying to car pool from I-83 and Middletown Road. Vandalism and theft is very frustrating. Make penalties tough! It is hard to convict suspects because of the many escape mechanisms.

RESPONDENT 26

1. no.
2–7. —.

Comments: only lived in area 9 months.

RESPONDENT 27

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

RESPONDENT 28

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 29

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 30

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: From comments of some of other families in the area, I'm proposing seriously of installing burglar detection systems in my home and on the property. There is little or no patrol car coverage on our country road but we have to protect ourselves by the best means for the crisis.

RESPONDENT 31

1. no
2. —
3. —
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: The only "crimes" I am aware of are speeding and reckless drivers and mini bikes operating on public roads.

RESPONDENT 32

1. —
2. —
3. no
4. —
5. —
6. —
7. —

Comments: We had our sign with our name on it and a painted pheasant above it stolen. It cost $30. I don't know if this is a serious crime, but we can't keep buying signs. We do try to keep our place as nice as possible.

RESPONDENT 33

1. no
2–7. —

Comments: Thank you for your concern.

RESPONDENT 34

1. no
2–7. —

Comments: none

RESPONDENT 35

1. yes
2. murder
3. yes
4. —
5. yes
6. Not yet. Caught 4 men, are locked up in Towson Jail.
7. Waiting for a trial.

Comments: My brother was shot in the head in his own home. Two men broke into home on June 20, 1973 and asked for money. He said, "My God, I don't have any; I don't make any." So one shot him; the other 2 stayed out in the car. They pulled down the road and threw the gun in Pretty Boy Dam. Capital punishment for everyone who shot and killed poor people for nothing. He was a very kind, hard-working man, only 59 years old, never had an enemy. Young people are so cruel. Please make laws to kill them. Stop the crime.

RESPONDENT 36

1. yes
2. Attack by a molester of a woman
3. yes
4. bruises to body
5. yes
6. ? it will
7. probably guilty

Comments: —

RESPONDENT 37

1. yes
2. rape
3. yes
4. How can you calculate this?
5. yes (The police were splendid to us and our little girl.)
6. yes
7. He was convicted and sentenced to 30 years in prison.

Comments: The child who was victimized has made good progress in recovering her self-esteem and psychological balance, and we do not wish to cause her any more embarrassment by further pursuit of this case. However, I would like to see some changes made in the procedures of the conduct of this type of case—for instance, automatic blood tests of the man accused in order to establish his freedom from syphilis instead of the plaintiff having to petition the court for this information. Also, I would like to see bail denied when the victim is under 16. This man was out on bail on the same charge when he assaulted our 11-year-old child, and it might have been prevented.

RESPONDENT 38

1–7.—

Comments: Because we have not been robbed, I passed your questionnaire on to a friend who had been robbed twice. This does not mean we are not concerned, because we wonder if we will be the next ones they hit . . . We do not need more police—we simply need to enforce the laws we have and that is not what is being done in North Baltimore County . . . The case of Paul Double, with which you are familiar, has been postponed three times in a year with enough evidence to put the victims away . . . Who is being paid off? . . . If you were a policeman, would you risk your life to make an arrest when you knew the case would be mishandled in the court?

FERTILIZER VERSUS FOOD HANDOUT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of debate concerning the controversy over the sense of humor of the Secretary of Agriculture as it relates to the recent World Food Conference in Rome.

In my judgment, the Food Conference was a failure as there were too many spokesmen attesting for the blame of the food shortage rather than trying to solve it. Therefore, I was especially interested in an article in today's Chicago Tribune, by Eliot Janeway, which very properly addressed this issue:

FERTILIZER VERSUS FOOD HANDOUT

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—The recent World Food Conference in Rome was able to claim credit for one remarkable achievement. It topped last *September's* economic summit conference as a time and word waster. In an era where consistent failure reaps instant applause, the managers of the Rome food conference have won a standing ovation for being irrelevant.

If the economic summit had been relevant, it would have made the obvious conclusion that the oil price hold-up is the cause of our present economic collapse. And if the summit had been realistic, it would have made plans to force oil costs back down.

If these summiteers had been responsible, they would have realized that each new drop in economic activity would load an automatic increase onto oil costs; the same cost is harder to carry with a lower income.

Finally, if these distinguished Presidential advisers had been resourceful, they would have worked out tough measures to force the "oil hold-up men" into becoming good citizens of the world economic community.

The Rome food conference has indirectly sanctioned the summit's wantonness by ignoring it. The food conference has blindly repeated the economic conference's mistakes by condemning America for tolerating the trubles of the food-poor. But it is the "oil-rich hold-up men" who are responsible for perpetuating starvation in their own poor relations, Egypt and Syria, not to mention in their own, oil-rich turf.

After all, not everyone below the level of sheik, or a colonel is able to eat like one. The political effect of the food conference's failure to single out the real culprit of the food shortage—the oil hold-up—is to allow the petropowers to continue to sit atop the present, desperate situation.

The failure of the food conference will prove more costly than the failure of the economic summit. The cost of the blindness at the summit is that even people with financial defenses are worrying about losing them.

But the cost of the ignorance and cowardice aired at Rome is the fear of starvation that millions of needy people will feel. The parallel between these two exercises in blindness is as striking as it is painful.

If the conference at Rome had been relevant, its members would have realized that the fertilizer shortage is the missing link—and critical one—between the oil hold-up and the food shortage.

If these conference members had been realistic, they would have seen that finding the road to subsistence, let alone plenty, means recycling oil gases, which are habitually wasted in Middle Eastern oil production, into by-product gas production, the preliminary measure in stepping up the fertilizer supply.

Finally, if all these so-called experts had been the least bit resourceful, they would have begun racing time to stop the gas waste in the Middle Eastern oil fields and to start the fertilizer flows, thereby eliminating the scandalous spectacle of billions of dollars unused in banks and millions of people starving in slums.

Rosewell Garst, America's elder statesman of agriculture, knows better than these conference members. He calls wasting natural gas anywhere "a crime against humanity." He has just written an open letter about this to the American delegates of the Rome food conference.

An excerpt from Garst's letter explains why wasting natural gas influences our food supply: "Practically all the natural gas in the Middle East and in North Africa is flared and burned to get rid of it. Gas, air, and wastes are the only ingredients needed to produce anhydrous ammonia, which is 82.5 per cent nitrogen and is used as the nitrogen element in such fertilizers as ammonium nitrate, ammonium phosphate, urea, and complete fertilizers.

"More natural gas is wasted every day in the Middle East than is used by all the nitrogen fixation in the world. Retrieving it would open the way for the food-poor countries to repeat the American miracle by using nitrogen fertilizer to multiply their own food production, and thus graduate from America's food welfare rolls."

To put this project on a commercial basis, Garst proposes that the Middle Eastern petropowers sell the oil companies the gas being wasted and reduce their oil-selling prices by the amount of their gas income after figuring the cost of building nitrogen fixation facilities.

The oil companies have the know-how to recover by-product gas and put it to use as the wonder-worker for soil fertility that America has proven it to be. But the backward countries of the Middle Eastern oil world are not likely to outgrow their self-imposed deprivation without an official lead.

Still, how can America offer such a lead, with the United States Steel Corp. running short of gas and slashing output by 70 per cent at its major nitrogen fertilizer facility in Cherokee, Ala.? It's easier for America's food users—rich and poor alike—to go on pressing Washington for food handouts than to start worrying where the golden stalks come from.

TRIBUTE TO H. R. GROSS, "THE CONSCIENCE OF THE HOUSE"

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with many of my colleagues in paying tribute to our beloved friend and colleague, H. R. GROSS who will be retiring from the House at the end of the current session of Congress. There will be many others from this Congress who will not be returning in January, but without a doubt, the departure of the "Conscience of the House," will represent the biggest loss to the House and the Nation as a whole.

There are perhaps few others in the history of Congress who have earned such a lasting place in the hearts of the Nation as H. R. GROSS. He was a man who commanded praise and incurred the wrath of his fellow colleagues depending on which side of the fence from him you were on. But, there was and continues to be universal respect for the gentleman from Iowa on both sides of the aisle for there are few others with the dedication and knowledge of the workings of the House than H. R. GROSS.

All of us have felt the presence of H. R. in our dealings in Congress. I am sure there are many among us who have introduced what we have considered to be worthwhile amendments of legislation, only to discover that when they were presented, our good friend H. R. GROSS was ready to give it his own personal examination, and somehow our initial enthusiasm would always be dimmed. How many of us breathed sighs of relief during encounters between H. R. and committee chairman during consideration of appropriation bills, relieved that it was them and not us having to answer to H. R.?

Each one of us in the House owes something to H. R. GROSS. For many, it meant being schooled in the fine art of parliamentary procedure. For me personally I owe this as well as my present physical fitness to H. R. for without his constant vigilance to maintaining a quorum in the House I would not have had the opportunity for my daily frantic races to the House floor.

Perhaps it is fitting that as H. R. GROSS leaves the House he departs as a sort of fiscal prophet. Here was a man 10 and 20 years ago fighting every penny of increased Federal spending warning that continued uncontrolled Federal spending would only drive this Nation into the kind of serious recession we are experiencing today. Perhaps, if we had listened more closely to his advice, our economy would not be in the desperate straits it is in today.

I have had the distinct privilege and honor to have known and served with H. R. for the past 5 years. He has taught me invaluable lessons about the operations of the House. I cannot say that he and I saw eye to eye on every issue, but I came to realize over time that before you went to battle with H. R. on the floor, you had better be prepared with the best of information to defend your argument, or else face the consequences.

Many of us in the Congress attempt to be jacks of all trades and end up being masters of none. There are others like H. R. who dedicate themselves to becoming recognized experts in limited areas. H. R. chose two, the operations of the House and the safeguarding of the Federal Treasury from unnecessary assaults from Congress. While he aspired to no specific leadership posts, he became the recognized leader and spokesman for those Members who were concerned about these two important areas.

We will be hard pressed to replace H. R. GROSS. He will be a man who will have further tributes paid to him by history. His fiscal logic, ignored for so long by so many of us, now seems more relevant than ever.

For a man to earn the title of "Conscience of the House," he must prove to have been an integral part of the day-to-day operations of the House. H. R. has proven to be such a person for a period of 26 years, and we are grateful for his efforts.

I hope that we can find a suitable memorial to honor H. R. GROSS. Perhaps a bust in the Capitol—but I almost forgot—H. R. himself would oppose this as being too extravagant. Perhaps we could amend the rules of the House to rename the quorum call after H. R. GROSS.

I could think of many other possible tributes to this great man, but they will have to wait, for in the background I hear the urgings of the three bells, telling me that H. R. GROSS is once again tending to his special area of expertise: making sure that the House of Representatives is doing its job for the American people.

FREEDOM TO TRADE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Brooks McCormick, the president and chief executive officer of International Harvester has an intimate knowledge of American agriculture. This background is evident in an eloquent statement on trade reform which Mr. McCormick made at the December 4 meeting of the Foundation for American Agriculture in Chicago. Mr. McCormick's logic is especially appropriate as we prepare to consider the conference report on the trade reform bill.

The text of the speech follows:

FREEDOM TO TRADE

(An Address by Brooks McCormick)

Thank you. As a life long observer of things important on the Banks of the Potomac, I can only assume Dana Bennett had some seventh sense which told him way back in June when he invited me to talk today that we would be right in the middle of the fight for the life of a new trade bill. One that we very much fear will never see the light of day after January 1. So I am happy to have this opportunity to meet with you today and to talk about freedom to trade. And I hasten right now to invite you to write, call, or use a carrier pigeon to communicate with your senator your interest in the passage of the trade bill. In few periods in recent years has the need for maintaining an open world trading system been more compelling. We face an international economy staggering under the weight of severe inflation, widespread commodity shortages, and dramatic price increases in energy.

The result has been a worldwide strain on the ability of most nations to manage their international balance of payments. Quadrupling of oil prices within a year has put trade positions into deficit and forced some governments into substantial foreign borrowing. Under these circumstances the temptation is obviously strong for national governments to cope with their payments and trade dilemmas through either export subsidies or import restrictions. Either action would solve their problems in the very short term, but trigger similar moves by other governments who, after all, are faced with the same predicament.

The net result of such unilateral remedies would be to intensify the problems of most countries, as each one attempted to solve its trade problems by exporting them to its trading partners. It's a game of dominoes in which no one will stand up very long. And, to complete the painting of this gloomy scene, national governments have added a new unilateral remedy to these international imbalances. I am referring to export restrictions on commodities in short supply. This latest form of economic isolationism has arisen in country after country over the past year. The Arab oil embargo—which was politically inspired and therefore not typical—tended to overshadow the fact that the United States imposed restraints on exports of soybeans, Brazil on castor beans, Thailand on rice—to mention just a few cases.

Fortunately, a more workable solution is at hand in the form of international negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). This international approach to common problems of trade has the twin objectives of furthering the 30-year-old movement toward trade expansion, while, at the same time, cushioning the disruptions brought by trade. One of these objectives without the other would be unrealistic.

The benefits of a liberal trade policy have been apparent to economists since they were first formulated about 200 years ago. A policy, I might add, under which my Company and its predecessor organizations have operated since 1851 when Cyrus McCormick exhibited his reaper in England and won the Council Medal, the highest award given, at the Crystal Palace Exhibition there. It really is very simple—nations are better off if they produce what they can turn out most efficiently and import from others what the latter, in turn, produce efficiently. In the United States we have been pursuing this idea of comparative advantage since 1934 when the original Trade Agreements Act was passed, authorizing the President to negotiate with other governments about reciprocal reductions of tariffs.

In those days 40 years ago, American tariffs were at their highest protective level in our history, an average of 50 percent as established by the 1930 Smoot-Hawley tariff act. History leaves no doubt that Hawley-Smoot was, in essence, a declaration of economic war—on the world. Retaliation was so swift that, by 1932, no less than twenty-five governments had imposed reprisals, including tariffs, quotas and anti-American embargoes. And their effect was to cut the volume of U.S. exports in *half*. Fortunately, since then we have legislated new presidential authority several times, and, through a series of negotiations brought our tariff levels down to an average of only 8 or 9 percent.

The United States took the lead in establishing the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade after World War II, and that provided a global framework for pursuing the benefits of liberalized and expanded trade. Through the six GATT negotiations so far, world-wide tariff levels have been brought down to fairly low levels. The most recent of these efforts, the so-called Kennedy Round, ended in mid-1967, and no sooner was it over than protectionism once again reared its head, and it has been a powerful force at home and abroad ever since.

Those of us that are deeply involved in international trade, that benefit from it directly, and that recognize its longer-term contribution to our own and other nations' welfare sometimes tend to disdain protectionism, or consider it neanderthal or some kind of political conspiracy. Actually, I cannot blame people for trying to protect their own interests, and the heat of import competition—which they want to restrict—has often been pretty hard to handle. This is especially true today in a period with high layoffs and roaring inflation. Which was not the case during the early days of the Kennedy Round when we enjoyed a nearly $7 billion surplus in our trade relations. By the later Sixties, however, we were starting to slip badly in our international competitiveness, and in 1971 we moved over the line into deficit for the first time in this century. The next year we sank deeper, into a $6.4 billion deficit, quite an astounding event for the world's leading economy.

During that period of weakened competitiveness, protectionism was both inevitable and understandable. Companies, industries, workers, labor unions, all felt the strength of the import challenge. In the aggregate our agricultural sector escaped this trend, enjoying a trade surplus throughout. Others less fortunate, clamored for import restraint or restrictions. We were fortunate that the protectionists failed to enact legislation cutting back imports, though I must say, there were moments in that legislative struggle when it looked like they might just carry the ball across the line. And, again, I might interject a personal note about International Harvester. All during this period, in fact during the past 20 years, operating under a policy in which there have been virtually no tariffs of any kind on farm equipment, our Company alone has contributed a favorable balance of more than three billion dollars on the credit side of U.S. trade.

Government policy, however, finally responded to the changed world circumstances that had weakened our competitiveness, and brought us to trade deficits and protectionism. Most prominent among the remedies chosen were two devaluations of the dollar, which more than anything else managed to turn around our trade position to the point where we crossed back into surplus in 1973, with a $1.7 billion surplus of exports over imports. But we embarked at the same time on a longer-term solution to some of the specific trading problems that we faced, and that was the decision to enter into another round of GATT negotiations.

The legislation to enter these talks has been moving through Congress for the past year and a half and remains a cliffhanger even today, though we are working hard to see that it is enacted. As you know, the Trade Reform Act was stalled for months over the issue of Soviet emigration policy, something that—for all its merits as a human rights topic—had nothing to do with our international trade problems. The Soviet emigration issue has now apparently been resolved, and our main problem is the shortage of time before year-end. And to repeat, there is great urgency to this legislation, for if we do not get it through in 1974 we predict the new Congress just elected will take a different view of the matter and not pass it during the next two years. And while all this was going on, our trade position, though now basically competitive, slid back again into deficit, due to the enormous increase in the cost of our oil imports.

The objectives of these GATT negotiations have changed a good deal since they were first conceived. Originally they were intended to support further access to foreign markets and to establish an international safeguards system that would internationalize the varying methods that individual governments currently employ to cushion the impact of rapidly rising imports. But events of the past year have overshadowed these goals, important though they are. The GATT negotiations will now also deal with the problem of access to supplies, and set up some kind of guidelines on how and when governments can restrict their exports. In light of the critical global food situation, commodity shortages, and the energy problem, this 30-year-old institution of GATT has become more important than ever.

On both sides of the equation—access to markets and access to supplies—agricultural trade could be a major beneficiary of these negotiations with their pursuit of liberalized, expanded, and freer trade. For American farm exporters the talks could and should be a vital tool to pry open overseas markets. For what has easily become the strongest competitive sector in our national export posture can only benefit on balance from further freeing of trade. Our agricultural trade has been performing brilliantly: exports in fiscal 1974 (ending last June 30) were a remarkable $21.3 billion, or 25 percent of all American exports. And since farm imports were only $9.5 billion, this trade gave us an $11.8 billion surplus. Not only did it offset our deficit in non-agricultural commerce, but it helped turn around our trade position in a single year from deficit.

One of the reasons why the United States has pursued trade negotiations is that we have concluded that, while tariffs have generally come down around the world, the great variety of NTB's (or non-tariff barriers) that impede the flow of goods is stacked against us. For that reason NTBs are to be a major topic of the next GATT round. Our government has felt that we are more sinned against than sinning, and perhaps nowhere is this more evident than in agriculture.

Our trading partners have not hesitated to tell us that our farm exports keep growing and that they keep taking more and more of them, whenever we complain about their import barriers. Yet, if we compare our barriers with those of the European Community, we come out looking like free traders, which I happen to believe we are! According to the President's Special Trade Representative, Ambassador William Eberle, the European Community's variable levy—which provides unlimited protection and seriously limits many U.S. farm exports—protects over two-thirds of the Community's agricultural production.

Major American exports affected are feed grains, wheat, rice, poultry and eggs, pork and lard. The Community also grants preferential treatment to a growing number of countries, thereby discriminating against a wide variety of U.S. exports.

In Japan, on the other hand, import quotas affect our exports of beef, prepared meats, processed cheese, fruits and vegetables, wheat, rice, and barley, among others. Variable levies have been substituted in place of quotas on live pigs, ham and bacon. In the United States, by contrast, import quotas are now in effect for only five agricultural commodities—wheat for human consumption, cotton, peanuts, dairy products, and sugar (which is only technically under quota). We do have a meat import quota trigger mechanism, but it has been suspended for the past two years. I do not know how long it will stay that way, since President Ford has recently put temporary import quotas on Canadian beef and pork.

Freedom of trade, therefore, should benefit American agriculture perhaps more than any other nation, for it would enable us to increase the output and export of the products we grow more efficiently than anyone else. Our government has made clear that this time around we do not want to move ahead on negotiations in industrial products without parallel progress in agriculture. Failure to do so was one of the big disappointments of the Kennedy Round. Even if we succeed, however, we will have adjustments to make, since agricultural imports, particularly in dairy products, will increase. We will have to improve our import adjustment mechanism. Fortunately, the Trade Reform Act does provide such improvements, as well as authorize the President to negotiate an international safeguards code.

Where we need to be reasonable above all, however, in coming months, is on the issue of export restrictions. Nothing has done more to undermine our credibility with our trading partners than the very-short-lived restrictions we put on soybean exports in 1973. It was a decision taken in haste, perhaps even in panic, and it played right into the hands of protectionists in Europe and Japan who used it as an excuse to justify their own aims.

This challenge of export restrictions is so new that we have not yet fully digested its implications. One complication it raises is that export markets, like any other business relationship, are built slowly and laboriously. Because of the long distances usually involved and the frequent differences in language and culture, we are really building trust when we expand our exports. That does not develop quickly, and it can evaporate overnight through hasty and short-term oriented government actions.

A second complication is that the United States has been the world leader in the search for freer trade relations. If we stumble and fall, succumb to temporary pressures to keep scarce commodities at home rather than letting them be sold abroad, others can hardly be expected to sustain what has taken us forty years to build. Given our strength in agriculture, surely it will be our farm products that are hurt by such government actions.

A third point—and it is on the minds of our own trade negotiators—is that this time of shortages is an excellent period to persuade trade liberalization, since, obviously, there are few surpluses lying around to challenge importing nations. In fact, our trade negotiators see this as a reason to move as quickly as possible in the GATT talks, once the trade bill is enacted. They think we are in good position to exchange assurance to the Europeans and Japanese of access to our own farm supplies for the assurance that we can enlarge our own access to their markets for both farm and industrial products. This is no time, then, to tamper with our 40-year-old support of liberal trade policies.

Let me close by saying that the art of government is the art of reasonable compromises, not only between competing interests at home and abroad but between the present and the future. It is imperative that we do not sacrifice the real longer-term benefits of our proven policies for the sake of temporary expediency. This is especially true of export trade, and particularly that dealing with agricultural commodities.

NEW YORK CITY PAYS TRIBUTE TO MUHAMMAD ALI

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, for many years Muhammad Ali has been one of the best-known sports figure in the world. He has often been described as one of boxing's alltime greats; his most dramatic victories have often come when he was a clear underdog and expected to be beaten badly. Declarations by experts that his best fights are behind him seem only to spur him on to additional outstanding performances. Even outside the boxing ring Muhammad Ali has proven himself a man who is willing to sacrifice and suffer adverse consequences rather than compromise his principles.

New York City recognized the champion's achievements by declaring Monday, December 9, 1974, to be Muhammad Ali Day by proclamation of Mayor Abraham Beame. The mayor presented Mr. Ali with the Bronze Medallion, the city's highest civic award, in noon ceremonies at city hall.

Mayor Beame said:

> It is a great pleasure for me to proclaim December 9th as Muhammad Ali Day in New York City. Muhammad Ali is one of the world's greatest athletes and this is one of the world's great sports towns. New Yorkers have followed his masterly performances and cheered him on with the rest of the world.

Based upon Muhammad Ali's achievements as an athlete as well as his position of leadership in the black community, I am confident that many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives join the citizens of our largest city in extending congratulations to Muhammad Ali on the occasion of the "Day."

FRANKING PRIVILEGES FOR CONSTITUENTS

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 1974

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the ideal of government is to serve the interest of the people but the ideas of the people are not always available to the officials of government.

We have the privilege of franking our responses to the requests of the people in our respective districts. However, the people do not have that same privilege available to them and they must pay increasing cost of informing their Members of Congress on issues of public interest.

We have made great effort to reform the procedures of the House of the People. Let us now reform the existing concept of communications and encourage the people to participate more fully in legislation.

Organizations and industries have full time staffs of trained personnel to inform us on issues of mutual interest and that is a tax deductible expense. Constituents, lacking the means to forward information to the Congress except by mail or telephone must pay for the privilege of addressing their legislative representative on issues of interest and separately they likely do not claim the cost as a tax deductible expense.

It is appropriate that legislation be enacted to provide free franking to the people that they may make known their support or opposition to legislation, inform the Members of Congress and the executive branch of our Government on all matters of public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is not a large item of expense to our constituents individually but it will encourage a greater interest and participation by all of our citizens and some of them that can least afford the ever-increasing cost of postage in expressing their timely comments on legislation in progress.

FAREWELL TO H. R. GROSS

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 9, 1974

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, in the nearly 200-year history of this Republic, many great men and women have stood on these floors and worked diligently to protect the rights and liberties of the American people.

But, the American people have had few defenders like the man I pay homage to today. For the gentleman from Iowa has protected more than just our rights, our liberties and our lives. He has also protected our purses.

Those Members interested in spending the taxpayers hard-earned dollars always knew they would be called upon to defend their programs by the Honorable H. R. GROSS. And they knew it would take a good defense—because my friend from Iowa has long had an uncanny knack for spotting the loopholes, the giveaways, and the waste.

As we look at our Nation under attack by the twin enemies of inflation and recession, I can only wish Mr. GROSS had had more support in shooting down the giveaways and in curbing the spenders.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress makes a contribution to his Nation, regardless of how slight. But few men had made the contribution Mr. GROSS has made.

He will be missed. He will be sorely missed.

I only hope that we who will be here after he leaves will look at each and every measure that comes before us and ask ourselves, "What would H. R. say about this?"

If we do that, the one and only, the original "Watchdog of the Treasury" will always be with us.

SENATE—*Tuesday, December 17, 1974*

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, by whose providence we have been given this new day, help us to work as the Master worked, not for ourselves but for others, for the Nation, and for humanity. Make us true ministers of state, as followers of Him who promised that whoever gives his life for others shall find it again—enlarged, recreated, and made new. May the blessings of this holy season abound in these Halls and be manifested in our conduct and in our accomplishments, O Lord, our Light, our Helper, and our Friend. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 16, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER THAT NO ROLLCALL VOTES TAKE PLACE PRIOR TO THE HOUR OF 12 O'CLOCK NOON TODAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be no rollcall votes prior to the hour of 12 o'clock noon today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. This will give conference committees an opportunity to work on measures that are still in conference.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will please call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TO MEET DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER TRANSFERRING THE RESERVED TIME FOR SENATOR JAVITS TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time that was reserved for Senator JAVITS be reserved for myself.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the acting Republican leader (Mr. TAFT) desire recognition?

Mr. TAFT. No.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time the Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) for not to exceed 15 minutes.

PROPOSAL TO REDUCE FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, along with the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) we are submitting this morning for the consideration of the Senate a budget cut of approximately $3.2 billion in outlays, and $6.4 billion in new budget authority.

The U.S. Congress, on its own initiative, during the consideration of the various appropriations bills this year has already cut in outlays some $2.1 billion, and $4.5 billion in controllable authority. This is an additional amount to approximate just exactly what the President of the United States has asked for since the election in November.

He appeared on TV, and then later before the Business Advisory Council, and asked for four things, in the main: the confirmation of Mr. Rockefeller as Vice President; the public service employment program, plus an increase in unemployment compensation; a trade bill to help us out of this recession; and righting the balance of trade deficits that we have been experiencing. And, most of all, he asked for about a $4.6 billion cut in the budget.

Now, Mr. President, I was prepared, before I beseeched my colleagues to join in this particular initiative, to put my name on the President's request. I figured that the matter of the partisanship on the budget, inflation, and recession ended at the water's edge. The country was in too serious trouble to have your particular solution to the problem. If it was near right, even though all of us could find some defects in every particular proposal, I wanted to submit it for the President and get a vote on it and help in every way.

In reviewing with several authorities the $4.6 billion proposal of the President of the United States, I find you cannot get there from here. I find it impossible, I find it totally unrealistic. It calls for formative changes in the social security