

ignees have been recognized, the following Senators be recognized each for 15 minutes and in the order stated: Senators HARRY F. BYRD, JR., BUCKLEY, and ROBERT C. BYRD.

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

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL, S. 1401, TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the aforementioned orders, the Senate resume the consideration of S. 1401.

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

PROGRAM

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

After the two leaders or their designees

have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes and in the order stated: Senators HARRY F. BYRD, JR., BUCKLEY, and ROBERT C. BYRD.

At the conclusion of the aforementioned orders, the Senate will resume the consideration of S. 1401, the mandatory death penalty bill. Yea-and-nay votes are expected on tomorrow.

Mr. President, what is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to S. 1401.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I move in accordance with the previous order of the Senate that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m., tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:49 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 13, 1974, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 12, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

John T. Pierpont, Jr., of Missouri, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Missouri for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

John L. Buck, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JAMES E. WELLS, OF DETROIT, TESTIFIES AGAINST FORCED BUSING

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, in February, I had the privilege of testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary relative to constitutional amendments to prohibit forced busing of schoolchildren. James Wells, of Detroit, also testified during those hearings and made a very good statement on behalf of Liberty Lobby on this topic:

FORCED BUSING OF SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am James E. Wells, an attorney from Detroit, Mich. I have represented Neighborhood Academies, Pontiac, Mich., the so-called freedom-of-choice schools. I am also a special consultant for Liberty Lobby, and appreciate this opportunity to present the views of Liberty Lobby's 20,000-member Board of Policy, and also to appear on behalf of the approximately quarter million readers of its monthly legislative report, Liberty Letter.

The Pontiac School District was vitally affected by a school busing decision in 1971. Enrollment in the public school district dropped dramatically that year, while private school enrollment increased substantially. The white population began to move from within the school boundaries to other districts. NAACP predicted that within five years, the city of Pontiac would revert to a substantially segregated school system by reason of "white flight." Enrollment in the Neighborhood Academies totaled 400 at the height of the busing dispute in Pontiac, and by the fall of 1972, the enrollment had diminished to 10. This fact was reflected in a survey of the children in the Pontiac Neighborhood Academies. It indicated that 73% of the enrollees had moved with their families

or had been transferred by their families to other school districts, often in other states.

The busing situation in Pontiac (and many other communities) has been further complicated by gasoline shortages. The Board of Education required an additional 106 buses to transport students for racial integration within the district. These buses use more than 1,500 gallons of gasoline daily. When stored gas supplies fell short recently, the school buses were filled at local service stations with consequent line-ups, delays, and frustrations to the schools and citizens in the area. Thus, in thousands of school districts, there is some basis, in fact, for the popular opinion that conservation of desperately needed gasoline has not been allowed to interfere with the socially-orientated goals of the Nation's social planners. It is further noteworthy that on Jan. 6, 1974, the Director of Transportation of the Pontiac School District announced that supplies of gasoline to the schools were exhausted, and that the school buses would be filled by local filling stations in competition with the public, since the school would pay the prevailing retail gas price.

S. 1737, to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964, tends to answer the questions raised by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*. There was some confusion on the part of the Court as to whether the plain language of the proviso in Sec. 2000c(b) and 2000c-6 said what it meant, or meant what it said. Congress there said:

"Desegregation means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but 'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance. . . . Nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance, or otherwise enlarge the existing power of the court to insure compliance with constitutional standards."

This bill should clarify the matter for the Court. It will be recalled that the Court interpreted the legislative history of the Act to indicate "that Congress was concerned

that the Act might be read as creating a right of action under the 14th Amendment in the situation of so-called defacto-segregation. . . ." The legislative history of this bill, together with its reference in S. 1737 to the Court's jurisdiction, should leave no room for doubt of the bill's intent. Nevertheless, discussion on this point is necessary in the history of S. 1737, since the Court previously has questioned whether the Civil Rights Act did "withdraw from courts historic equitable remedial powers."

The Supreme Court, in reviewing cases involving the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, announced the following doctrine "unless a statute in so many words, or by a necessary and inescapable inference, restricts the scope of equity that jurisdiction is to be recognized and applied." This doctrine was based upon a dictum casually written in an 1836 opinion, *Brown v. Swann*, 10 Peters 497, 503. The extension of this doctrine of doubtful origin into school busing has been disastrous. School busing has become punitive in character, since its benefits have been considered negligible or non-existent by educational authorities. The 1836 opinion also stated that "equity will be converted by the section into an assistant for the enforcement of a penalty; which has never been its province." In order that our traditional check and balance system shall not be discarded by judicial misunderstanding, this amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (S. 1737) seems appropriate.

This bill should further remedy not only the wastage of gasoline in the transportation of students to achieve social policy by judicial decree, but may well prevent further resegregation of existing desegregated districts by eliminating the need felt by some parents to remove from the community. Those who have taken the view that they will not conserve the fuel in this critical time, when school buses are running, may alter their views upon passage of this bill.

It seems clear to me that national policy in a time of crisis must override far-reaching social planning schemes where reinforced by judicial edict based upon judicial "misunderstanding."

It is the combined judgment of Liberty Lobby and the vast majority of citizens as shown in all polls that busing of school children to create a racial balance has proved to be a punitive act against the best education

of children. We believe that the passage of S. 1737 or similar legislation will take care of Congressional opposition to a Constitutional Amendment against busing, and yet fill the legal vacuum needed to stop the useless and unnecessary busing of children away from their neighborhood schools—and against their parents' wishes.

Thank you again for the opportunity to appear today and to present our views.

SENATOR MOSS ADDRESSES MONTANA DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on February 23, Montanans honored the Democratic members of their legislative assembly.

They were privileged to have as their speaker the junior Senator from Utah, Mr. Moss.

Ted Moss is one of Montana's best friends in the Senate. As a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he has demonstrated an effective interest in the problems of Montana, concerned as we are with energy and our land and water resources.

I respect him. I am proud to be one of his colleagues. I know my colleagues will be interested, as I was, to read his address: "It's Good To Be a Democrat." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

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

IT'S GOOD TO BE A DEMOCRAT

(Speech of Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Legislative Dinner, Montana Democratic Central Committee, Helena, Mont., February 23, 1974)

It is a pleasure to be here in what I, from my vantage point in the United States Senate, think of as Mansfield-Metcalf land. No State has sent to the Senate two more respected Members—nor two men whose friendship I value more highly. Mike, Lee and I work practically in tandem.

I marvel every day at the breadth of vision and spirit of the majority leader. He is in there, quietly and firmly moving through the Senate, measure after measure of enormous importance to the entire country—often of the entire world—and at the same time he does not forget for a moment what is happening in Helena, Butte and Billings. When the day is done we find that some of the Nation's most crucial problems have been solved, and we find also that the Forest Service regional headquarters will not be moved out of Missoula. Sometimes, it seems almost like sleight of hand.

As for Lee Metcalf—I can best tell you how highly I regard him by saying that the Moss-Metcalf voting record is almost identical. Lee and I find ourselves on the same side of almost every issue.

There is no better way to get to know a man than to fight shoulder to shoulder with him for something which you both feel is important. I can tell you from firsthand experience that Lee Metcalf is a fine human being and a fine public servant.

He was protecting the little man from large corporate control back when even to talk of regulating windfall profits was to risk censure as a subversive. He was pushing bills to protect our environment when the word

"ecology" was almost unknown. He was fighting for decent health protection and improved social security benefits and better working conditions long before they became so obviously necessary that even the Nixon administration is espousing some of them. Lee Metcalf is a man who has always been ahead of his times, and who will stay ahead.

I've worked on some of our western problems with your energetic young Democratic Congressman—John Melcher—the third man whose name begins with the letter "M" in the Montana delegation. And let me tell you, he is someone of whom Montana can be proud. He continues the great Montana tradition.

As for Governor Judge (Governor, how did you ever get elected in a State which specializes in electing only people whose name begins with an "M"?), Governor Judge is proving that despite his name handicap, he is running well—and running the State well—and I want to extend to him a special greeting tonight not only for myself, but from Utah's great Democratic Governor, Cal Rampton. In his tenth year Rampton has had 2 years with both Houses. I wish I could call the roll of Democrats in the State government so long as this in Utah.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House—in whose honor we meet tonight—I also extend warm greetings from Utah, and from the Utah State legislature, to you the members of the Montana State legislature who are here this evening. It is appropriate that for you this dinner is being given. I know well the kind of problems you are wrestling with, because they are so much like those with which we wrestle in Utah.

And finally, may I mention how glad I am to meet all of the Democratic State party leaders who are here—State chairman John Bartlett, State vice chairman, Ruth Carrington, national committeewoman Gladys Makela and national committeeman, Leif Erickson, and members of the central committee, county chairmen, district chairmen, and democratic workers. I know that without your efforts, Montana would not be so superbly represented in both Washington and Helena.

This is a good time to be a Democrat. I've always been very satisfied with my choice of a political party, but I am even more satisfied today.

How about you?

I cannot believe that the Democratic party with its philosophy of government for the benefit of all, and its love of justice and human decency, could ever have chosen and elected a president who would preside over the "mission incredible" that we call Watergate.

Many Republicans are still in a state of shock—and I don't blame them. Already 18 of the top Republican members of the House of Representatives in Washington—men with seven, eight, nine terms of service—have announced they would not run again. Resignations are running far ahead of 1972—and there are probably more to come. Last week the 5th Congressional District in Michigan—Jerry Ford's old district—went Democratic for the first time since 1910!

Some of my Republican colleagues in the Senate express their misgivings in one way or another almost every day. Even Barry Goldwater has been losing the faith—Republican faith, that is. That thin-reedy whistling you may have heard last week emanated from Republican headquarters as, like the small boy passing the graveyard, bolstered his spirits after the Michigan returns of last week!

But we Democrats cannot afford one moment of smugness. Watergate has splashed over on everyone who holds public office.

As Senator Biden of Delaware so aptly put it:

"Watergate has done for politicians what the Boston strangler did for door-to-door salesmen."

The misuse of public institutions for private power, the corruption, the meanness of spirit, the violation of public trust which has occurred in the Nixon administration on a scale large enough to very nearly become, standard operating procedure, has shaken the American people to the point that all too many of them are shrugging their shoulders and saying:

"Oh, well, all politicians do it."

First of all, you and I know all politicians don't do it.

And secondly, all politicians are not the President of the United States or the Vice President of the United States.

But these responses fall on deaf ears.

Furthermore, it is not enough to point out that not one elected official has been indicted in the Watergate scandals—that all of the culprits so far are men appointed by President Nixon.

This distinction means a great deal to elected officials and those who work with us in politics, but it is lost on far too many other people.

Watergate is a challenge—it throws down the gauntlet to every man and woman who holds public office, to so conduct himself, to so motivate his every action, that the American people will again come to trust and support us as they did before the Watergate horror descended upon us. Being a United States Senator, or a member of the Montana State legislature, has always been a hazardous occupation. It's a high trapeze act today.

One thing democrats can and should do is insist that we reach all sides and the bottom of this unprecedented political scandal. Only then can our political process be fully cleansed and our system of government preserved, because only then can we take the necessary action to insure that Watergate can never happen again.

We must not, however, allow the Vice President, or angry young men in the White House who have been writing his speeches for him, to foist upon the public the idea that Watergate is being kept alive only by a small and inspired group of "political grudge fighters" who seek to exploit the President's troubles for partisanship advantage. This facile allegation ignores the fact that the Watergate crimes have brought into play a number of irreversible constitutional processes, and that the Justice Department and tax courts and criminal courts and the impeachment machinery of the House of Representatives must run the course that the constitution requires.

The White House is also playing the insistent theme: "It's popular to finish quickly with Watergate."

Or the event more insistent one: "Get off the President's back!"

We Democrats are just as tired of Watergate as anybody else.

And the courts and Congress will get off the President's back when he releases the Watergate-related tapes and other documents which they need to decide whether anybody should have been on the President's back in the first place.

The President himself can bring an end to much of the Watergate nightmare whenever he wishes.

These are indeed the times which "try men's souls."

Everything seems to be coming apart at the seams.

After going through one year of Watergate (which we all agree is more than enough) and being well launched into a second year, we are now facing a year, at least, of an energy crisis.

The energy crisis—and the Nixon administration's plans for dealing with the long-term problems of providing an adequate energy supply—has a special significance for Montana. The administration is placing heavy reliance on vast increases in coal production to achieve what is regarded by many

as an unrealistic goal of domestic self-sufficiency in energy by the year 1980.

Montana has an estimated 43 billion tons of strippable low-sulphur coal and an apparent surplus of water nearby. That is a vision to set spinning the heads of those looking for an easy way out of the energy crisis. However, proponents of vast increases in strip mining either haven't learned the old truth that there is no such thing as a free lunch, or are trying cynically to manipulate public opinion, knowing full well that someone else will be picking up the tab.

Who will pay the costs of strip mining coal? The people of Montana and the people of other states which have strippable coal reserves?

The true costs of such a program are immense.

First, consider the expense of converting Montana's agricultural economy to dependence on coal and then consider the fact that coal is, after all, an exhaustible resource.

Next, consider the problems inherent in full-scale development of these coal reserves—development which would bring a great influx of industrial plants seeking sites closer to energy sources.

And finally, consider the effect on the environment of the coal mining operation.

Montana legislators have had the foresight to enact one of the strongest state surface mining laws in the country. The good work of Lee Metcalf, as chairman of the fuels subcommittee and manager of the federal surface mining bill enacted last year by the Senate, is a triumph that I enjoyed sharing. The federal bill on surface mining is the first such bill to pass in the history of the Senate. It may not be the best bill in the world—but it is a start at correcting a national wrong. And, as you know, the Montana Senators led the fight.

This Federal bill would help enormously to protect Montana's environment, but it is clear that we really know very little of the total picture of the effects of surface mining in the west. There is a great need for more information on the hydrologic consequences of mining and reclamation operations. I congratulate Governor Judge on the great foresight and commitment to orderly planning, which he showed in seeking from the legislature a 3-year moratorium on all allocations of water from the Yellowstone River Basin. The moratorium will give you time to plan the future of an even more valuable resource, water.

The energy crisis has been lowering its skies upon us for some time, but the Arab embargo focused attention upon the shortage with startling speed. That suddenness plus indications that the crisis is bringing vast increases in the profits of the major oil companies have raised the question in the minds of many people whether the "crisis" is real.

Let me tell you it is—as I understand Montana discovered first hand, in the recent trucker's strike.

There are two aspects of what is loosely called the "energy crisis" which need to be examined separately.

The first is the shortage of crude oil and refined petroleum products which the country is now engulfed. You people here in Montana have been lucky, as have the people in my state of Utah, to be self-sufficient in terms of fuel and total energy requirements. But, although most of the rest of the country has not actually been cold, because of a mild winter, the lines into the gas stations have been intolerably long in many places these past few weeks.

The Federal Energy Office has begun an independent audit of oil company price, profit, and supply records, which hopefully will give us more adequate and accurate assessment of the current situation. We must assure the government of independent energy information.

The current shortage is the result of a

number of factors. Even without the Arab oil embargo, it appears that there would have been serious spot shortages this winter. Moreover, over the course of the year a shortage of natural gas led to a jump in the demand for oil and environmental regulations forced some industries to convert from coal to oil as an energy source. Meanwhile, the government failed to plan adequately for the existence of shortages or the development of new sources of energy.

As recently as last May the President declared that although we have some energy problems, there would be no crisis until the 1980's. Imports, mostly from the Mideast, were expected to make up the needed extra supply. Thus, the embargo by the Arabs turned a serious problem into the present crisis.

And now, even in the crunch of an energy crisis, the administration can't get together on how serious it is, or what should be done.

Last week, within 24 hours, Roy Ash, the budget director said the energy crisis is a "one time" crisis and will end this year—and Herbert Stein, the economic council chairman, was publicly critical of the pricing policies of Bill Simon—the energy czar—then both Ash and Stein disputed Simon's assertions, that there is an energy crisis. As I see it, not only do we suffer from an energy crisis, but we suffer a leadership crisis in an executive branch totally unable to cope.

The rising cost of gasoline at the pump does not enrich the service station operators, but is simply a reflection of higher costs which operators are paying for gasoline. No one seems to have an adequate explanation, however, of how such steep price increases are justified for the oil companies who are refining and distributing the gasoline. Many of us in Congress are not convinced that the rising price of foreign oil, necessitates a noncomitant rising price in domestic oil. We are already inquiring more deeply into the economics of the oil and gas industry.

The second aspect of the energy crisis is the long-term problem of finding new energy sources and further developing existing ones in order to meet the constantly growing demand for energy. Various parts of the country will continue to suffer shortages of petroleum products for at least the next 4 or 5 years, even if supplies of oil are increased, because of insufficient refinery capacity.

Unfortunately, refineries cannot be built in a day. Due to population growth, rising incomes, and environmental controls, total energy requirements are rising at a rate of 4 to 5 percent a year. Therefore, in order to achieve self-sufficiency in energy, we must find new techniques to increase recovery rates of oil and gas, build more refineries; and we must expand and develop new technologies to develop new kinds of energy.

Then too, the consequences of the energy conversion processes which accompany those increased energy producing activities must be carefully scrutinized. For example, the National Academy of Sciences report concludes that "water consumption and related on- and off-site environmental impacts that would result from conversion of coal by gasification, liquefaction, or its use for electricity generation could far exceed the impacts from coal mining alone." (End of quote).

Equally important as the question of environmental impacts, are the issues of social and economic impacts. The construction of a coal gasification plant in a small community brings with it enormous and difficult problems. Population increases precede increases in tax revenues to the community. Sooner or later there comes the question of how to find the capital required to expand sewage and water treatment plants, schools, firefighting capabilities, and the whole range of governmental services.

The population increases also bring inflation, and the social problems experienced in boom towns.

In the end, I am confident, we will find responsible ways to use Montana's great coal reserves, and Utah's great coal reserves, and to use other sources of energy in a responsible way to meet our needs. We have in America the sources of power to make our Nation self-sufficient in energy, and we will develop them with typical American skill and determination.

We have learned (and learned the hard way) the pitfalls of energy dependence. But we will, of course, work through this whole era of crises. Even this will end!

And so with Watergate! It will be with us for some time yet. However, as trials are completed, verdicts are rendered, and appeals completed, Nixon men will march off to jail!

By May or June we should know whether the House will have an impeachment resolution before it. The House Judiciary Committee is working now, on its onerous assignment, and should be able, in a couple of months, to decide whether the impeachment resolution should be sent to the House floor. If the impeachment resolution comes out of committee—and I think it may—then the whole House will debate and vote on the issue. Should the House vote impeachment—and there is no reliable head count on this—then the Senate would have to sit as a court in judgment. This could take the rest of the congressional session.

But regardless of what happens, no exorcist will ever be able to purge Watergate completely from our consciousness. Its scars will be on the body politic for all time to come.

So, I reiterate, these are "times that try men's souls", but we will work out of them as we have worked out of all other hard times in the history of our republic. It will take the best we all have to give—but surely we are all willing to give our best.

Those of us who are public officials—who have asked for the public trust—have to give more than our best—the people ask it of us, and they have the right to.

As we clean the Augean stables in the White House, we Democrats must collectively be Hercules. Our party as it had in desperate depression 30's and the World War II holocaust, will arise to this very demanding occasion.

May I say that Montana is showing the way with a great Democratic Governor, Democratic Senate and House, and three out of four Democrats in Congress!

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the 93d Congress, the House of Representatives will be diminished by the loss of one of its most dedicated and conscientious Members, the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN of Washington State. Mrs. HANSEN has decided to retire after almost four decades of service to her country in Federal, State and city positions.

Mrs. HANSEN has been a pioneer in the Congress, attaining positions of authority previously unheard of for a woman. She has represented the interests of her constituents not only in matters of local interest, but in the long-range needs of environmental concern, energy resources, education and others vital to the welfare of all Americans.

It has been an honor to serve with Congresswoman HANSEN during her 14 years

in the House of Representatives, and I wish her every happiness in the years ahead. I know the people of Washington State will continue to benefit from her wisdom and experience in public affairs.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND TITLE XI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 29 I introduced legislation which would amend title XI of the Social Security Act to repeal the provision for the establishment of the Professional Standards Review Organizations.

I am submitting for the RECORD a letter I received from the president of the Medical Association of Georgia which outlines the dangers of this law and why it should be repealed:

MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF GEORGIA,
Atlanta, Ga., February 28, 1974.

Hon. Dawson Mathis,
Member of Congress, Cannon House Office
Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MATHIS: In the discussions with you recently, the Medical Association of Georgia delegation indicated to you our interest in seeking your support for the repeal of Section 249F of P.L. 92-603 (the PSRO law). As you can well understand, considerable time and thoughtful study has gone into our decision to seek repeal of the PSRO law. In the comments that follow, we wish to briefly describe to you our basis for opposing implementation of this onerous law.

Although medical records have been made available to insurers, peer review organizations and others on a selective basis and ordinarily with the consent of the patient, the wholesale intrusion of government into confidential medical records is now threatened. The PSRO law (Section 1155(b)(3-4), Title 11 of the Social Security Act) provides for an unprecedented invasion of privacy. There is even an implication that private patients records may be scrutinized to assure that the same quality of care is being provided to them as to Medicare and Medicaid patients. No protection is available to the unsuspecting patient. He is neither consulted nor allowed the privilege of refusing to release his personal medical records.

In establishing certain criteria (Sec. 1155(a)(1)(A&C)) and requiring the development of norms (Sec. 1155(a)(1)(b)), the PSRO law places physicians into an intellectual straight jacket. No longer will the practicing physician be able to use his own best judgment, based on years of study and clinical experience, to determine a patient's condition and the treatment necessary for cure. The physician must now face the intimidation of retroactive review of his judgment—Monday morning quarter-backing at its worst. The reviewer bases his judgment not on observation and examination of the patient, but on whether there was compliance with community standards of health care, a meeting of the norms required for a particular diagnosis, and a satisfaction of criteria more concerned with the cost of care than the needs of the patient.

Physicians will be encouraged to practice medicine by the PSRO "cookbook" in order that they can be assured of payment for their services and of protection from malpractice suit. Either malpractice actions will

be greatly stimulated or an increased practice of "defensive medicine" will occur as physicians are forced to work under the PSRO's standards, norms and criteria.

Implicit in the tremendous scientific advances made by American medicine over the past several decades has been the dedicated effort of physicians working in their laboratory, hospital or office unfettered by government guidelines, rules and regulations. Unfortunately, the imposition of PSRO on practicing physicians will severely limit their ability and their interest in advancing new techniques or innovative therapy. Peer pressure resulting from the imposition of community standards, the necessity to conform with HEW's PSRO criteria, and the admonition to comply with PSRO developed norms will all serve to inhibit the physician's willingness to consider new concepts in medical practice. Not only would the incentive be lost, but, indeed, there might be a disincentive or even a penalty attached to medical practice not complying with HEW's and the PSRO's standards, criteria and norms. Not only the threat of financial loss due to denial of payment for claims, but a threat of malpractice would hang over any physician attempting innovative methods in his practice. Acceptance of change is difficult for any organization but imagine the resistance of a governmental organization such as a PSRO to changes in medical treatment. History records many instances of medical discoveries being ridiculed and rejected by the discoverer's fellow physicians. What could be expected from a bureaucracy the likes of HEW and PSRO?

There will obviously be a significant increase in the overall cost of health care delivery with the advent of PSRO's just in the increased HEW central and regional state and local bureaucracies required. However, a more subtle factor will also be at work among the medical community. Physicians, today, are very often accused of practicing "defensive medicine" in their attempt to protect themselves from a malpractice suit. This most often is exemplified by the ordering of lab and other test procedures to assure themselves, as much as possible, of the accuracy of their diagnosis. If, in addition to this, medical doctors comply with all the norms of PSRO in order to assure that they practice medicine acceptable to HEW, there will undoubtedly occur a significant increase in the cost of medical care. The PSRO's norms will serve as a minimum base for patient care regardless of a particular patient's need for the services, thereby causing physicians to order tests and procedures which they ordinarily would not.

As the cost of medical care is driven up by the increased bureaucracy and forced compliance with the PSRO's norms, a point will be reached at which the question of fund allocation will be raised. If limited funds are available for medical care, and its cost has been driven up, then following HEW logic, which can be currently seen in Medicare and Medicaid practices, cost control will have to be imposed. This type of control would probably be in the areas of limitations on elective hospital admissions and restrictions on physician-patient encounters. Such limitations and restrictions are already in effect in California and other areas where the cost of Medicaid has strained the state budget. This sort of rationing of medical services will be greatly detrimental to those under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, since the aged and the poor are the ones who are usually in greatest need of medical care.

Another factor which may well reduce the availability of physicians to provide medical care is the massive input of physician time that the PSRO's will require in order to function. Medical doctors will be spending a great deal of time reviewing medical services rather than being on the firing line providing care to their patients.

In conclusion, we would point out that the physicians' concern is not so much for the effect that it will have on us but rather on the damaging effect the PSRO law will have on patient care. The threat of loss of confidentiality of medical records, of forced compliance to a "medical cookbook," disincentives for medical innovations, of increasing rather than controlled costs and of rationing of medical services is very real. Action by Congress is needed now before it is too late, before our private enterprise system of medicine is destroyed. The dangers of PSRO are dangers for every American. I urge you to help us, not just the physicians, but all Americans.

PSRO is a bad law. It should be repealed. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. BOHLER, M.D.,
President.

THE GREAT PROTEIN ROBBERY: NO. 15

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, support continues to grow for legislation to establish a 200-mile interim fish conservation zone off our shores to preserve and protect our valuable marine resources. The Studds-Magnuson bill, H.R. 8665, now has 72 cosponsors in the House and I hope to be able to announce the date of hearings soon. Many people in both the public and private sectors believe that we must begin to conserve and protect our marine resources because they represent a valuable source of protein. We all need the protection of a 200-mile fish conservation zone so that we can regulate the taking of these resources to insure the continuation of the individual species for generations to come. I am encouraged by the reaffirmation by the New England Governors' Conference of support for this 200-mile legislation at their February meeting. I include in the RECORD at this point the text of the Governors' resolution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the virtual extinction of New England's offshore fisheries resources by foreign factory vessels is a clear and present danger to the region's commercial fishing industry; and

Whereas, the continued exploitation of this irreplaceable natural resource threatens the stability of the region's marine environment; and

Whereas, the need for intelligent management of New England's marine resources requires the extension of jurisdiction over living marine resources beyond the present 12-mile limit;

Now therefore be it resolved that the New England Governors' Conference hereby urges the New England Congressional Delegation and the Executive Branch of the Federal Government to lend their full support to passage of emergency legislation which would extend fisheries jurisdiction 200 miles from our nation's shoreline or to the one hundred fathom curve. We are convinced this policy is essential to both the health of our regional maritime economy and our nation's ecological balance.

Kenneth M. Curtis, Governor of Maine;
Deance C. Davis, Governor of Vermont;
Frank Licht, Governor of

Rhode Island; Thomas J. Meskill, Governor of Connecticut; Walter R. Peterson, Governor of New Hampshire; Francis W. Sargent, Governor of Massachusetts.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. GUNN MCKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, last week I had a pleasant visit in my office with Mr. Marvin Franklin, former acting commissioner at the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Mr. Franklin has been involved with the Indians most of his life, and there are few men in Washington more familiar with their needs and problems. During the course of our discussion, we talked about the announced retirement of Representative JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, and I thought Mr. Franklin's remarks were especially pertinent.

Mr. Franklin told me:

The Indians trusted JULIA HANSEN more than anyone in Congress, they knew her word was good, and they hate to see her go.

Mr. Speaker, the respect which the Indians have for Mrs. HANSEN is typical of the support she has. Her thoroughness and dedication on the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee have earned her the respect of every department within the subcommittee's vast responsibilities.

When I became a member of Mrs. HANSEN's subcommittee a little more than a year ago, I was not sure what to expect. One thing immediately became clear: witnesses should never assume that Mrs. HANSEN is a frail or a weak chairman. I know no other subcommittee chairman with a better knowledge of his jurisdiction, and JULIA is not one of the Tuesday-Thursday chairmen. She works early and late, and has a genuine concern that the viewpoint of every single concerned Member of Congress is heard.

In my association with Mrs. HANSEN, she has been a helpful and a considerate colleague. If there has been a single thrust of her leadership in the Interior Subcommittee, it has been her concentration on planning for the future. She was very serious about the direction of the committee, and examination of testimony during her tenure as chairman evidences her overriding concern and concentration on planning. Witnesses learned to come prepared for her probing questions about program impacts in the next year, the next decade, or even the next century.

One example, Mr. Speaker, was Mrs. HANSEN's guidance during the energy crisis. Besides the testimony we have heard this year, during the most acute shortages, Mrs. HANSEN was urging more fully developed energy resources as long as 8 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Washington, Mrs. HANSEN, leaves a powerful legacy of leadership in the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee. Her firm and sure guidance there will be missed,

as will her counsel and her association. I am grateful to have served with Mrs. HANSEN on the subcommittee and in Congress, and I am hopeful that her retirement will bring her all of the peace and satisfaction she desires.

OIL AND FOOD—A TWO-EDGED SWORD

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the events surrounding the tragic hostilities in the Middle East throw light on a vitally important domestic policy dilemma.

The Arabs have cut off oil exports to this country to protest American foreign policy in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Without going into the why and wherefore of American policy in the Middle East, I would like to point out that this situation illustrates the dangers of our being dependent upon any foreign power for vital resources.

America currently imports about 10 percent of her petroleum needs from the Middle East. In the next decade, our imports from that region are expected to climb to about 25 percent of our total petroleum consumption. This is a precarious position for our country to be in. Equally serious, this situation generates a financial imbalance that may unravel the fabric of the international monetary system. We simply cannot function as a nation if we allow this situation to continue.

A factor making this dilemma worse is America's relative weakness in the international marketplace for manufactured goods. Among other factors, we have made the basic decision that American workers should have their rightful share in the abundance of the American way of life. As a consequence, American manufactured goods are of high quality, but are too expensive to compete with those of the low-wage industrial countries like Japan and Taiwan. Thus, the market for American televisions, automobiles, and other manufactured goods is simply too weak to offset our need for Arab oil.

It would be politically and ethically unsound for us to expect American workers to absorb a relatively smaller piece of the economic pie, so we must now identify those strengths in American economic society that will permit us to compete in the world's marketplace with confidence and strength.

Without a doubt, America's greatest physical resources is our ability to produce food. We are the only Nation that can consistently produce large export quantities of the protein-rich foodstuffs that the rest of the world so desperately needs. In the past, this simple truth has been a source of embarrassment and difficulty. During the post World War II era, we have literally expended billions of dollars and millions of manhours to depress food production and to dispose of excess crop yields. We have given vast stores of food away and we have even de-

stroyed some of it. We have done all this while producing food at what reliable experts believe to be one-third to one-half of our optimal production capacity.

What does this mean to Americans and to our 3 billion other riders on spaceship-earth? It means that the world will become increasingly dependent upon American food exports even while demands for our manufactured products diminish. It means that many nations seeking to blackmail us with raw materials are themselves vulnerable to reciprocal blackmail via American foodstuffs. It means that America does not have to act like the proverbial "pitiful, helpless giant" when other nations try to put the screws to us.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to suggest that we should enforce a "pax Americana" on mankind by starving the children of the third world. Such a policy would run counter to our heritage and would violate the principles of humanitarianism and generosity that we have long sought to embody as a people.

I do suggest, however, that American agricultural potential represents a significant untapped resource that can be used to better the lives of untold millions of people while furthering the interests of our own people. Realizing this, it is important that we give serious consideration to programs and policies aimed at taking advantage of this new situation.

Specifically, we should investigate the possibility of catalyzing massive increases in agricultural output. We should identify the physical impediments to increased output and, perhaps even more importantly, we should pinpoint those factors in our political and economic structure that impede production of agricultural products. We should recognize that our domestic market for foodstuffs is built on the assumption that output will not swamp demand and that a new market system may be needed to see that large scale exporting will not dump new economic burdens on American producers or consumers.

An almost unlimited demand for American foodstuffs would be a situation that we have little or no experience with. Even the great economist-demographer, Thomas Malthus, never foresaw a situation in which an agriculturally prolific nation would experience a tapering off of population growth while the agriculturally poor nations suffer unparalleled population growth.

This reality has crystallized with such amazing speed that many of our attitudes and policies toward food production are already outmoded. An example of this can be seen in the report of the National Water Commission, which was released only a few months ago. This report states that we already have too much arable land and that we should end programs to increase arable acreage, such as the 70-year-old Bureau of Reclamation program to turn millions of arid acres in the West into productive agricultural land.

The NWC report was written with great sincerity. But the compounding realities of a new era obviated many of

its conclusions before the ink was dry. Just as copies were being distributed, American consumers were jolted by unprecedented food price increases partially caused by foreign exports too large for the domestic market to absorb. Today the National Water Commission's report stands as a relic of an era passed and a symbol of the pressing need to rethink the assumptions that have underlined national agricultural policy for generations.

Mr. Speaker, we stand at the doorway of a new era in which a pesty stepchild is becoming a favored son. The agricultural abundance that has been a problem to us in the past now turns out to be our trump card in the future. If we face this new era with seriousness and deliberation, we can reap enormous political advantage. If we fail to grasp its importance and potential, we will have squandered an irretrievable opportunity.

NEW JERSEY TAKES A BIG STEP

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, as one of the strongest advocates of youth camp safety legislation in the Congress, I am pleased to report to my colleagues, that my home State of New Jersey has just recently passed the "New Jersey Youth Camp Safety Act."

The purpose of the act is to "promote, protect, and safeguard the health and well-being of the youth of the State attending day camps and resident camps." I am extremely proud that New Jersey has taken the initiative that few other States have taken toward protecting our youngsters. Presently, only six other States have adequate, enforced safety laws pertaining to youth camps. There are only 28 States in the entire Nation that have even the barest sanitation and/or safety regulations applicable to summer camps. This is, indeed, a sad commentary upon State priorities.

New Jersey's newly passed legislation is one of, if not the strongest in the Nation, in terms of requiring high standards for the protection of youth attending camps. This law makes it impossible for a camp in New Jersey to be organized or operated without the authority of a valid certificate of approval, valid for only one year, issued by the Commissioner of Health. In addition, the Commissioner is responsible for the enforcement of the State youth camp safety standards and to implement this responsibility he may hold hearings, enter and inspect youth camps and their records, question employees, investigate facts, conditions, and practices and otherwise investigate charges of violations. All camps operating in the State must report annually all accidents resulting in death, injury, and illness other than minor first aid treatment. The Commissioner must subsequently summarize these statistics in his annual report to the Governor.

Under the recently passed law, the Commissioner may revoke the certificate of approval thereby making a camp's operation illegal and he may also impose a penalty not exceeding \$1,000 for any violation of a rule or regulation pursuant to the act.

The New Jersey Youth Camp Safety Act establishes within the Department of Health and Advisory Council on Youth Camp Safety to advise and consult on policy matters relating to youth camp safety, particularly in the promulgation of standards.

I am delighted that the State of New Jersey has moved to the forefront in passing legislation which is so responsive to the needs of our children. It is my fervent hope that this action on the part of my home State will convince other States to follow suit, and enact further protective legislation. As chairman of the House Select Labor Subcommittee, it is my intent to hold Congressional hearings in the near future for the purpose of passing legislation to provide for minimum Federal standards in our Nation's youth camps.

Those of my colleagues who may be interested in reviewing New Jersey's "Youth Camp Safety Act" may obtain a copy from my subcommittee office, B345A Rayburn House Office Building.

NEED FOR THE 200 MILE FISHING LIMIT

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1974

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting into the RECORD, a series of articles on the problems facing American fishermen off the east coast of our country, because of overfishing by foreign fleets.

The authors of this series, Bruce Bailey and James McQueeney, have done an excellent job of researching these problems, and I feel their presentation effectively describes current conditions. Most assuredly they have pointed out the need for full congressional discussion on this subject—before we find that there is no discussion necessary, because the overfishing which is presently going on has destroyed the entire fish population.

I believe this is a subject which requires the attention of all Members of Congress—not just those representing coastal districts. Whether our constituency includes fishermen or not, our constituency does use the products of their labor as a relatively inexpensive, high-quality protein source. It is the responsibility of this body, I feel, to protect that source for all Americans.

I have introduced legislation to deal with this problem. This bill, while immediately extending our fishing limits to 197 miles outside the territorial sea, would also allow for consideration and adaptation of any decisions arising from the Law of the Sea Conference. It has been my view that none of us would want to prevent other countries from obtain-

ing a supply of fish, particularly fish which are not available off their own coastlines. We must, however, take care to insure that all fishing is done with great consideration for the continuing supply of such fish for the future. In the waters off the coast of New Jersey, this has simply not been the case. The foreign fishing fleets have been literally scraping the bottom of the ocean, leaving no fish at all and no means for the fish to regenerate and procreate for the coming seasons.

It is my hope that those who have had the opportunity to read the Star-Ledger series will contact their representatives and will urge their friends to do so, to demonstrate the great interest in this subject.

I also heartily commend this excellent series to my colleagues:

RED FISHING FLEET TAKING HUGE HAUL OFF JERSEY COAST

(By James McQueeney and Bruce Bailey)

Foreign fishing fleets—the majority flying the Soviet flag—prowl the Atlantic Ocean off New Jersey in massive fish harvests that have depleted the edible stock by 65 per cent in the last 10 years.

The East Coast fisherman has been left bobbing in the wake of the modern foreign flotillas whose catch this year will be approximately 780,900 metric tons compared to any 195,000 for the domestic market.

More than 75 long-range foreign trawlers, each capable of remaining at sea the year-round, are presently sweeping the Atlantic between Long Branch and Barnegat Light as they move toward another harvest off the North Carolina coast in mid-April and May.

Thirty-six Russian trawlers, accompanied by six "mother" factory ships, have established an ocean-going processing center 14 miles out of Brielle and are ravaging the "Mud Hole" for a distance of 18 miles where the silver hake (whiting) and red hake (ling) spawn this time of the year.

During January, there were 269 foreign trawlers off New Jersey and Long Island, hauling in tons of fish in quarter-mile mid-water stern nets regardless of specie, size or age—far out-distancing the smaller American dragners whose skippers are forced to watch the depletion of the stock with bitterness.

Before the end of the year, it is expected some 800 foreign fishing vessels will have served as a "giant rake" from Cape Cod to Cape Hatteras with only a few restrictions placed on them by the U.S. Coast Guard and the Department of Commerce.

Every living creature in the ocean is fair prey for the foreign trawlers and those fish and crustaceans not wanted for the "home" market are sorted out and ground up for fertilizer.

The foreign trawlers, some 400 feet in length and 80 per cent mechanized in fish processing, are capable of bringing aboard three metric tons of fish in a 15-minute period and while they operate outside of the international 12-mile limit, they are easily seen from the Jersey Shore.

The foreign craft, most of which are subsidized by their governments, are equipped with the latest electronic tracking gear and can follow schools of fish until the last is hauled into the nets.

Their presence is resented by the economically hurt New Jersey fishermen—but tacitly accepted by the United States government even though other nations have unilaterally extended the 12-mile limit for fishing purposes.

Ecuador, Chile and Peru have set 200-mile limits to protect their tuna industries while Iceland has established a 50-mile limit aimed

particularly at the fishing fleets of England and Scandinavian countries.

However, the United States has not shown an inclination to change its 12-mile limit for fishing although it adheres to an 95-mile continental shelf limit for oil rights.

The United States will be one of 135 nations scheduled to attend a Law of the Sea Conference in Venezuela next June but a State Department spokesman, queried by The Star-Ledger, said:

"There is no intention on the part of the United States to seek an extension of the present internationally recognized 12-mile limit."

But, William Gordon, regional director of the National Marine Fisheries Service of the U.S. Department of Commerce, said the "State Department plays diplomatic games in regard to the 12-mile limit and fishing quotas."

"Our fishing banks have been over-fished for the last five years," he said.

Gordon explained that in the interests of conservation a quota system for threatened species of fish has been established and while United States fishermen face severe fines if they fish beyond their quotas, the foreign trawler captains are more or less on the "honor" system.

"True," Gordon said, "our inspectors and the U.S. Coast Guard make random checks, but it is very easy for a foreign trawler captain to dispose of evidence of over-catches. Right into the fish grinders they go when our boats approach and since they are banned from United States ports, there can never be an accurate check on their tonnage."

Gordon said strict enforcement of the 12-mile limit means very little in the way of protecting the fish stock off New Jersey because most of the large hauls are made between 20 and 50 miles at sea.

Fishing grounds off the New Jersey and New England coasts are said to be the most lucrative in the world, with a multitude of edible species attracted to the area by the confluence of currents and ready food sources.

When Communist bloc countries began to experience crop failures a decade ago, the attack on East Coast fishing grounds by foreign trawlers began in earnest and the fleets of the intruders expanded 1,000 per cent in a five-year period.

"As a result," Gordon said, "juvenile fish, females carrying eggs—the whole lot has fallen victim to the relentless tracking by the foreign trawlers equipped with the most sophisticated sensing devices known in the industry."

Charles L. Philbrook, chief marine enforcement agent for the Division of Foreign Fisheries, said that by mid-January of each year the foreign trawlers begin sweeping the Atlantic Ocean from Montank Point, L.I. to Cape May and the Delaware Bay.

During this past January, Philbrook said of the 269 foreign trawlers sighted, 122 were Russian, 35 were Polish, 28 were East German, 10 were Bulgarian, three were Romanian, 44 were Spanish, 16 were Japanese and 11 were Italian.

Philbrook said the Spanish, Japanese and Italian craft are relatively new to the New Jersey coast and they are seeking mainly squid "although they undoubtedly take anything they can haul from the ocean bottom, including lobsters which is an illegal catch for anyone."

The fish taken off the Jersey Coast, according to Philbrook, include mackerel, silver hake (whiting), flounder, blues, haddock, cod, black bass, fluke, ling and porgies. Porgies are now all but extinct.

Philbrook said some of the foreign fishing trawlers are guilty of violating the 12-mile limit, the temptation is there:

"If a trawler captain is chasing a large school of fish and they get within the 12-mile limit, the temptation is there to pursue

them further and we are sure this is being done."

"In fact," he added, "a Russian skipper once boasted that when he is able to slip inside the 12-mile limit he is able to go home that much sooner."

Philbrook said the 75 foreign trawlers off the New Jersey coast now will grow to be at least 125 before mid-April "for the final sweep to the Delaware Bay and then to the coasts of Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina."

"Once they are finished down there," he said, "they will return to New England waters and the whole thing begins over again."

"Where we once had an ample supply of fish for the American market," Philbrook added, "the unrestricted numbers of foreign trawlers are pushing our stock to the brink of extinction."

Dr. Bradford Brown, head of fishery management and biology investigations for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, said the overall fish stock off the East Coast is now down 65 per cent and some species are rapidly being depleted.

Brown said that during the last three years, the flounder stock has been depleted by 45 per cent.

"And this specie," he said, "has been a constant source of fish for both the American sport fisherman and the commercial fisherman."

Brown said that prior to 1960, the average metric tonnage of flounder taken aboard United States vessels was 16,000 tons.

"The foreign fleets moved in," he said, "and with the Russians leading the way the flounder catch was more than doubled."

"As a result," he added, "herring, mackerel and flounder off the New Jersey coast are becoming extinct because they just do not have the opportunity to reproduce themselves fast enough."

Brown said the most "crippled" specie has been the haddock, which has been depleted by 90 per cent since 1962.

The federal official said it's inadvisable for any specie to drop off by more than 50 per cent in a given year to permit its resurgence the following season.

"When the depletion rate exceeds 50 per cent and reaches the 65 per cent rate of today, there will be total depletion of fish within a matter of a few short years," he said.

Brown said the high depletion rate, for instance, of the haddock has so hampered reproduction of the specie that, even with the current "honor system" ban on catching it during certain periods of the year, it will take up to 10 years for the specie to flourish again.

"American fishermen, far out-numbered by their foreign rivals in most areas of the East Coast, were already fishing close to the limit of depletion prior to the large-scale appearance of the foreign fishing fleets," Brown said.

William Beers, an inspector for the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF), said Russia and the Communist bloc nations entered the New Jersey waters to fish when their economic planners envisioned a cheap source of high protein.

"They decided the ocean could answer a lot of protein problems and this was a source that couldn't be exhausted. How wrong they were," Beers said.

Beers said of enforcement under the "honor system" for quotas: "It's still an honor system and we're basically taking each nation's word for what is being caught and how much."

However, Beers conceded that when the average American fisherman only spends two or three days at sea at a time before returning to port and yet is expected to meet the Atlantic quota of 195,000 metric tons well before the year's end, the foreign trawlers will probably exceed the 780,900 metric ton quota set for them.

Quotas are established through international agreement according to the population of a nation, the availability of fish to that nation and the geographic area which would permit commercial fishing.

Of the foreign metric ton quota, Russia will take the lion's share with 342,000 tons. Poland will follow with 152,200 tons and Romania and Bulgaria will take a combined total of 33,900.

Beers pointed out that a quota of 850,000 tons has been set for foreign trawlers for 1975 and it is hoped the Law of the Sea Conference in June will iron out agreements to make this quota a working fact.

Beers said the Communist bloc nations have given ground a little and have agreed not to "bottom fish" off New England between July and December to allow the yellowtail flounder and the young haddock to mature.

However, Beers said New Jersey "is still fair game and not a hell of a lot has been agreed upon to protect the fish there. It's bottom fishing all the way along the coast."

U.S. Secretary of Commerce Frederick B. Dent, who has urged greater conservation restrictions for East Coast fishing banks, pointed out that of the nearly 2,000 fishing vessels off the Atlantic Coast, only 15 per cent are from the United States.

"Last year," he said, "the total fishing effort generated by foreign countries was 80 percent while the United States effort decreased by 30 per cent."

Last June, Dent, disturbed at foreign over-fishing and lack of progress in the IGNAF called in urgent terms for major reductions in foreign fishing off the Coast, particularly in New Jersey.

Dent said this past week that if ICNAF is not strengthened "the United States should seriously reconsider whether it should retain ICNAF membership."

The secretary said he hoped the upcoming June conference, which will be sponsored by the United Nations, "will give us the answers we need to halt the further depletion of our fish."

Whether or not the conference will succeed in limiting the size of foreign fishing fleets off New Jersey remains to be seen, but concerning those trawlers working the coast now, a Coast Guard pilot said:

"I wonder sometimes how they do it without bumping into each other. They look, at times, as though you could just jump from one ship to the other."

"HONOR CODE" GOVERNS HIGH-SEAS FISHING—ARM OF U.S. LAW REACHES ONLY 12 MILES OFF JERSEY

(By James McQueeney and Bruce Bailey)

The prevailing "law" on the conservation of fish beyond 12 miles at sea is little more than an industry honor code that has been unable to stem the reaper-like harvests by foreign fleets.

The code is regulated by an international body reluctant to step on any toes and risk upsetting delicately negotiated fishing quotas and seasonal bans it hopes are not too late to check the further depletion of fish stocks.

The present 12-mile contiguous offshore limit is the outermost reach of national law and its rigid penalties, though the United States claims rights to oil, mineral, and some shall creatures on the continental shelf, which extends up to 95 miles offshore.

A Bulgarian trawler felt the sting of U.S. law last month when it was caught fishing within the 12-mile boundary and fined \$125,000.

There are no such punitive sanctions for those who disregard fishing restrictions outside the limit set by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF), which has had jurisdiction over the region since 1949.

"The only law we have (beyond 12 miles) is that which these (ICNAF) members agree

to have among themselves," claims William Beers, an ICNAF inspector.

A laissez-faire, club atmosphere of the 15-nation organization was shattered after the mid-1960s when the dimension of Soviet and Polish fishing activities within the region surfaced in their periodical reports.

A steady and alarming decrease in the region's biomass—the estimated weight of all commercially exploited fish—and the near annihilation of some species spurred the organization into action.

A grudging cooperation was extended by member nations partly out of economic necessity with heavy state investments resting with some nationalized fleets.

Limited quotas were initiated in 1970, scaled lower each year, with 14 fish stocks covered last year. This year, virtually every species is covered.

"What we've done is this: Instead of going from the weakest measures to the strongest measures, they are going from the weakest to slightly better," said Beers, who doubles as a U.S. marine enforcement agent for the National Marine Fisheries Service.

"In fact, back at Enforcement and Surveillance (division) we say 'enforcement is 12 miles inward, and surveillance, 12 miles outward.' We're cops inside the limit and reporters outside."

In addition to ICNAF agreements, the Soviet Union, Poland, and Romania have entered into bilateral agreements with the United States promising not to fish in a banana-shaped spawning area off Long Island and New Jersey for several months.

The pact went into effect last month in exchange for leeward "loading zones" located within the 12-mile limit near Barnegat Inlet and Great Egg Inlet and offshore Long Island.

The loading zones, several miles square, are used for logistical, non-fishing, purposes such as cargo transfers, repairs, and storm refuge.

ICNAF, in cooperation with the U.S. Coast Guard, has conducted seven to 12 surveillance flights monthly over the region since 1961, and makes regular sea patrols and inspections from aboard cutters.

Last year, ICNAF made 125 routine inspection boardings, with 48 made on Russian ships, 24 Polish vessels, and 21 U.S. boats, and the remainder among East Bloc, European, and Japanese trawlers.

Some 15 shipboard violations, ranging from improper netting to quota violations, were registered by the 10 ICNAF inspectors working from Virginia to Portland, Maine. An ICNAF spokesman said the agency also noted 15 violations, mostly for fishing within "closed" spawning areas, from aircraft observations.

The violators are "written up," according to Beers with a copy of the violation kept by ICNAF, another sent to the State Department and forwarded to the government of the offending vessel—who is expected to face unspecified sanctions but apparently never do.

"When you catch someone under a bilateral or ICNAF . . . you are not authorized to hang the guy. You are authorized to fill out a form . . . and it's up to their enforcement officials to enforce that case and to investigate it," said Beers.

"Basically, it's an honor system," he said. "We can't hold him, we can't do anything, we can't confiscate anything," said Beers, who added the agency has "no enforcement powers at all."

The limits of ICNAF authority are apparent to many agents, said Beers. "If you get a (ICNAF) guy who's a real hard cop and he starts pushing his weight around out there . . . he's still only a guest aboard that vessel."

"They can throw you off," he said. "It's a frustrating job, a damn frustrating job. What it calls for out there is tact."

"What we're generally looking for is to see that they're not catching anything they're

not supposed to be catching, making sure of their log book records and writing in their fishing trawl book all the species they're supposed to have," he said.

Countries, however, use the violation statistics for negotiation leverage, he said, with offenders allegedly holding a weaker bargaining position when it comes to quota talks.

The next ICNAF meeting will be held in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in June.

The flight patrols by ICNAF inspectors serve another purpose besides enforcement as a deterrent. The National Marine Fisheries Service in Woods Hole, Mass., uses the data collected on the concentration of fishing ships to update a computer estimate on the existing biomass within the sea.

On one such flight last week, two concentrations of Russian fishing vessels were spotted offshore Long Island and some 50 miles east of Atlantic City.

The routine patrol in an HU 16, twin-engine "flying albatross," left Otis Air Force Base on Cape Cod at 8:30 a.m., heading south along the coastline.

A little over an hour into the flight, the captain Lt. Commander James Cornell, radioed a message that a small fleet of two-dozen Russian trawlers were a few miles ahead in the so-called Moriches (Long Island) loading zone.

A low-level pass showed little activity aboard the ships which were marked by a distinctive hammer-and-sickle on their smokestacks.

The names and numbers of the vessels were noted by the crew on forms to be sent to ICNAF which did not post an inspector on the flight since an agent's two previous flights were cancelled due to poor weather.

After cruising at a low altitude along the Jersey coast for about an hour without spotting one of the larger Russian fleets which was last reported days ago to have been operating offshore, Captain Cornell swung over Cape May in an arcing 180-degree turn back to base.

"I guess we're out of luck," he kidded the crew of four.

About 15 minutes later, the captain's voice echoed through the ship's radio headsets—"we've got a message from another (Coast Guard) patrol, we've found them . . . just east of here."

The plane banked eastward and in a few minutes the pilot pointed to the right side of the cockpit. On the horizon, the dark group of dots stood out in the silver-reflected sea.

"That's them—the protein hunters," the captain laughed.

Two crewmen took the names and numbers of the ships radioed back from the cockpit by the captain and copilot. The ships, from the low altitude of 200 feet loomed past an opened bay-door in the rear of the plane.

The fleet was comprised of some 50 to 60 vessels, many with their aft smokestacks billowing wispy strands of white smoke indicating the shipboard "factories" were in operation.

Some of the fishing fleets, notably the Soviet and the Polish fleets, may number as many as 100 trawlers controlled by a base chief on board one of two base ships.

The Soviet fleets usually post a picket ship a mile or two from the 12-mile limit to mark the boundary, according to ICNAF officials. "Generally, they're pretty good about that," said Commander Cornell. "If they're within the 12-mile limit, it's usually an accident."

The vessels used in the Soviet fleets were built in the late-1950s or later and are of two types: Side-trawlers, which range in size from 125 to 200 feet long, and fish-factory trawlers, with range up to 300 feet long and carry crews of 96 to 102.

The mammoth fish transports, of which there are relatively few, are refrigerated passenger-freighters about 500 feet long. They occasionally act as base ships.

On side-trawlers, which have crews averaging a dozen, the catches are usually delivered to the base ships though the larger side-trawlers can process and refrigerate part of the catches.

The fish-factory-trawlers are more efficient in retrieving their catches and can make large hauls of more than 15 tons per set. Depending on the size of the vessel, daily quotas can range from 25 to 50 tons.

They can process their own fish and deliver it to a transport without further handling required. In addition to processing frozen and salted fish, they may manufacture fish meal and oil from by-catch and are equipped with filleting machines for handling haddock, ocean perch, and cod.

The transports are manned by a crew of about 200 including 40 women. It has doctors, well-equipped medical and dental facilities, two 12-bed hospital wards, and an out-patient clinic.

The Soviets eat four meals a day and entertainment includes movies shown twice daily on most of the larger vessels. They earn up to one and-a-half times the salary of an equal landside occupation.

In addition, under ICNAF regulations where each country is urged to supply inspectors, the Soviets' ocean-going tugs, which range up to 200 feet long, carry Soviet ICNAF agents on board.

The fishing vessels may be operated continuously for six months or more before being sent home for repairs and maintenance.

The ships off New Jersey were mostly stern trawlers according to the Coast Guard captain who piloted his craft up and down the staggered rows of vessels for about 15 minutes.

A few minutes after banking north toward Otis Air Force Base, the captain pointed to the orange-and-white Coast Guard cutter Unimac which was heading toward the Soviet concentration on routine patrol.

Near the end of the air patrol, the radar operator picked up a vessel near the 12-mile limit and the captain took the plane to the scene, about five minutes off course, near Montauk Point, Long Island.

"Is he Russian?" the captain asked the co-pilot, who remained silent staring for a few moments out his window.

"Yep," he said to the pilot, who dropped the plane to an altitude of a few hundred feet.

"How far out?" he asked.

"About 15 miles," a crewman shot back.

"O.K., well let's keep him honest," said the captain, who circled the stern trawler, apparently part of the fleet off Moriches spotted earlier in the flight, for a few minutes.

Another ICNAF inspector, Fred Wheeler, said that violators of the 12-mile limit tend to be "lone raiders."

"There are some penetrations in the continuous fishing zone that are spasmodic . . . this time of year off New Jersey and the backside of Long Island," he said.

According to Charles L. Philbrook, chief enforcement and surveillance (division) of the National Marine Fisheries Service in Gloucester, Mass., said the temptation to fish within the limit is apparent.

"I wouldn't say they don't, the temptation is there. For example, when they fish for mackerel, the mackerel run very fast, and when they move within the 12-mile limit who's to say they don't follow them?"

As for the surveillance, Russell T. Norris, the service's regional director, said "certainty it's not perfect."

But, he said it has added importance because "the critical issue has become survival of fish stocks at levels capable of supporting viable U.S. fisheries."

"The increasing levels of foreign fishing . . . appear to reflect a reckless and irresponsible attitude toward conservation on the part of foreign nations."

**POLONIA CONDEMNS COMMUNIST
ATTACK ON RELIGIOUS FREE-
DOM IN POLAND**

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress two articles, "Statement of the Polish American Executive Committee," and "Foreign Policy—The Art of Possible," both printed in the Polish-American Congress Newsletter.

The Polish-American Executive Committee, in resounding terms, has denounced the Communist attack on religious freedom in Poland. The Communist dictatorship continues its brutal attempts to erase from the minds of the Polish people the traditional concepts of Christianity.

Our own Nation was founded on the principles of freedom of religion and expression, and many emigrants came from Poland and other nations to exercise and enjoy this liberty. The Communist attacks on religious liberty must be condemned and I can tell you that the American Polonia will continue to speak out in defense of this precious freedom and to remind all Americans that no compromise can be made with totalitarianism.

The other article is a commentary representing the views of Polonia on a speech by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger on the substance and practical application of U.S. foreign policy. This article also merits the attention of every Member of Congress since it reemphasizes that despite a climate of détente our own foreign policy must always incorporate the ideals of peace and freedom, which are indivisible, and freedom in Poland means "independence from the dictates of the Kremlin."

At this point in the RECORD, I insert the articles from the Polish-American Congress Newsletter:

**POLONIA CONDEMNS COMMUNIST ATTACK ON
RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN POLAND—STATEMENT
OF THE PAC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

The Executive Committee of the Polish American Congress severely castigated the Communist government of Poland for its continuous efforts to restrict religious freedom and eliminate religious education. "We protest the continued repression of human rights and freedoms in Poland—concludes the statement—and strongly urge the Communist regime in Poland to desist in its campaign to intimidate and coerce the Polish people away from their strongly held ideals of Christian faith, freedom and independence."

The PAC statement was prompted by recent development in Poland where the Polish Sejm, the rubber-stamp parliament, passed a law introducing new educational system, which virtually eliminates any opportunity to provide Catholic instruction to Poland's youth. In fact, the effect of the new system is to establish the monopoly of Communist, atheistic influence upon the education of Poland's youth to the exclusion of parental and religious influences.

PAC statement quotes John, Cardinal Krol's recent critical report on the situation of the Catholic Church in Poland: "Poland is an arena in which the two ideologies of theism and atheism are locked in a mortal struggle—declared Card. Krol. The forces of atheism neither conceal nor disguise their ultimate goal. These forces do not risk the danger of advancing their cause on the merits of logic and reason. They make use of administrative and military power to improve their views. They control the mass media, the process of education and the means of social and economic coercion. The odds are against the forces of theism—religion."

**DEMOCRATIC FACADE VERSUS COMMUNIST
PRACTICE**

While noting that Poland's constitution theoretically guarantees its people all the democratic freedoms, and that Poland is a signatory of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, the statements observes that "it is a fact that the actual practice of the Communist dictatorship makes both these documents a sham relative to the people of Poland."

"Thus, the Communist dictatorship of land—reads the statement—rigidly controls and censors all media of communications, including even private letters.

It denies the Poles the freedom of expression.

Secret police methods including closed-door trials are widely used to suppress even minor acts of dissent.

Political freedom is non-existent in Poland. Single electoral lists make a mockery of the much heralded by Communist propagandists "people's democracy."

Ever since its political power was thrust upon the people of Poland by the brutal power of Soviet Russia in 1944, the Communist party wages a relentless struggle to erase from the minds of the Polish people the traditional concepts of Christianity.

Yet, after 30 years of incessant coercion, intimidation and indoctrination the Polish nation, led by its spiritual leaders: Cardinals Stefan Wyszyński and Karol Wojtyła, stand proudly by its millennial ideas for Christianity."

DÉTENTE MUST BE A TWO-WAY STREET

The statement expresses the concern, that the continuous denial of basic human rights to the people of Poland may adversely affect the increasing economic, cultural and scientific cooperation between this country and Poland. As is well known, PAC is supporting and encouraging these developments on the premise that the détente with the Communist dictatorships will eventually help evolve the rigid political systems into more open societies.

But "the détente must be a two-way street." Yet "it is obvious by now, that while bidding for western commerce and technological assistance to bail out their economic failures, the Communists are actually tightening their ideological grip on their captive peoples."

The important document was signed by all members of the National Executive Committee: Aloysius Mazewski, President; Helen Zielinska and Kazimierz Lukomski, Vice Presidents; Valentine Janicki, Secretary; and Joseph Osajda, Treasurer.

FOREIGN POLICY—THE ART OF POSSIBLE

At the recent Pacem in Terris conference in Washington, D.C., Secretary of State Dr. Kissinger delivered an important address, which provides valuable insights into the substance and practical application of the U.S. foreign policy.

"This country has always had a sense of mission. Americans have always held the

view that America stood for something above and beyond its material achievements. . . . America cannot be true to itself without moral purpose," he maintained. The moral purpose of U.S. foreign policy is to promote and work for the establishment of universal freedom and fundamental liberties and application of humane principles in relations between men as well as between nations.

With this ultimate objectives in mind, Dr. Kissinger warns that while "a nation's values define what is just, its strength determines what is possible. . . . Progress will always be measured in partial steps. . . . Tension is unavoidable between values, which are invariably cast in maximum terms, and efforts to promote them, which of necessity involve compromise. . . . The policy maker must be concerned with the best that can be achieved, not the best that can be imagined." This is so Dr. Kissinger explains, because "foreign policy involves two partially conflicting endeavors: defining the interests, purposes and values of a society and relating them to the interests, purposes and values of others."

Understandably, the main concern of the U.S. foreign policy is its relations with Russia. Dr. Kissinger thus sums up U.S. policy relative to this crucial problem;

"This Administration has never had any illusions about the Soviet system. We have always insisted that progress in technical fields, such as trade, had to follow—and reflect—progress toward more stable international relations. We have maintained a strong military balance and a flexible defense posture as a buttress to stability. We have insisted that disarmament had to be mutual.

We have judged movement in our relations with the Soviet Union, not by atmospherics, but by how well concrete problems are resolved and by whether there is responsible international conduct.

Coexistence to us continues to have a very precise meaning:

We will oppose the attempt by any country to achieve a position of predominance either globally or regionally.

We will resist any attempt to exploit a policy of détente to weaken our alliances.

We will react if relaxation of tensions is used as a cover to exacerbate conflicts in international trouble spots.

The Soviet Union cannot disregard these principles in any area of the world without imperiling its entire relationship with the United States."

He then concluded with this statement:

"Our policy with respect to détente is clear: We shall resist aggressive foreign policies. Détente cannot survive irresponsibility in any area, including the Middle East. As for the internal policies of closed systems the United States will never forget that the antagonism between freedom and its enemies is part of the reality of the modern age. We are not neutral in that struggle.

"As long as we are powerful we will use our influence to promote freedom, as we always have. But in the nuclear age we are obliged to recognize that the issue of war and peace also involves human lives and that the attainment of peace is a profound moral concern."

U.S. foreign policy is of particular interest to Polonia because of our abiding concern for freedom and independence of Poland and all other East-Central European nations. The PAC has often reiterated the position that this remains our unalterable objective, which must be resolutely pursued throughout the forthcoming negotiations, and never abandoned. The PAC position incorporates an idealistic attitude—the "nation's values" of which Dr. Kissinger spoke—with a pragmatic approach based on a truism that "peace and freedom are indivisible." In plain English

it means that universal freedom must be established before universal peace can be achieved and perpetuated.

Freedom in Poland means independence from the dictates of Kremlin; it requires that the people, rather than the Politburo of the Communist party, decide their own internal and external policies; that freedom of expression is restored and all the rigid, state-controlled censorship of all media of communications, including even private letters, is abolished; that political freedom replaces Communist dictatorship hiding behind the mockery of single electoral list "free elections;" that the educational system is freed from forced attempts to impose on Poland's youth the atheistic concepts of marxism; and that the rule by secret police methods used to suppress any symptoms of dissent is abandoned.

There will be no peace and security in Europe until these conditions are met in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, but also in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and indeed within Russia itself.

As Sen. Henry Jackson (D.-Wash.) rightly pointed out, the detente with the Communist block cannot be meaningful and stable as long as Russia maintains its population in ignorance of world affairs, uses repression to stifle dissent of its intellectuals and resists open, bilateral cultural exchanges with the West.

Unfortunately, whether we like it or not, and even whether they like it or not, Polish Communist regime is obliged to fall in step and to actively support these Russian adventures, like the latest Russian intrusion into the Middle East. Such are the facts of political realities.

The PAC pursues a two-pronged policy relative to Poland: encouragement and support of the economic, technology and cultural exchanges but at the same time strict opposition to the Communist dictatorship.

It designed to promote conditions which will assist the Polish people to gradually win back, and then enlarge, the areas of freedom now drastically restricted by the Communist government. It is not an easy course to follow, but certainly the only one which considering current political realities best serves the interest of Poland within the framework of U.S. foreign policy.

BUDGET

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the face of almost certain attempts by neoisolationist and other elements to further reduce the defense budget and our military establishment, I feel it high time some of us speak out to the problem.

The defense budget proposed for fiscal year 1975 represents a smaller relative burden on our national economy than at any time in the past two decades, and as a percent of the total Federal spending, our defense budget is the lowest since fiscal year 1950, before the Korean war. Our uniformed force levels have gone from 3,547,000 in 1968 to an end fiscal year 1974 strength of below 2 million.

Were it not for the Israeli-Egyptian war, it is possible that further reductions of alarming proportions would have occurred.

While we should be pleased that world conditions allow us a period of peace, we must not forget that a strong national defense is our best hope for preserving that peace. Our defense must remain so strong that no nation will dare attack us. My fear is that we are falling behind in our defense capabilities.

Organized efforts are deliberately working to further reduce our already trimmed military force, and an ax-wielding Congress seems willing to oblige. Why? A unilateral reduction of our Armed Forces in the face of the tremendous momentum of Soviet military expansion could be literally devastating.

We stand at the door to a possible break-through in arms control measures through a series of highly complex, carefully planned and empirically conceived negotiations with the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. These negotiations include the strategic arms limitation talks—SALT—between the United States and the Soviet Union; the Conference on Security and Cooperation, Europe—CSCE—between NATO members and the Warsaw Pact, and the Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions—MBFR—between seven NATO members—the United States, Canada, Great Britain, West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg—and the Warsaw Pact countries of Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. The fact that the two traditional antagonist camps have agreed to talk is significant, and promises of success, however limited, are optimistic.

What has brought about this atmosphere we call detente? And, what is the algebra in the negotiation equation which permits a perception by the Soviet Union that they should begin talking seriously about arms control if, in fact, that is an accurate characterization of the Soviet Union's intention? The answer to both questions stems from the fact that the United States has maintained a large and powerful military machine, capable of defending the United States and U.S. interests through the entire spectrum of warfare. What is more, we have demonstrated throughout the years a willingness to use that force, the Korean war, the Cuban missile when it became obvious that diplomatic efforts were to no avail. I cite as examples, the Vietnam war, and more recently the Israeli-Egyptian war. We can be successful in a negotiation process with the Soviets only when we can deal from a position of strength. This indisputable fact is certainly not new. It has been a fact throughout history.

Questions such as "Why do we keep troops in Europe 25 years after World War II, why do we need such expensive and sophisticated weapons systems, and why do we need such a large standing military force in peacetime especially in this time described as an era of detente?" are headlined across the front and editorial pages of our newspapers and, therefore, echo through the halls of Congress. These questions are asked so per-

sistently and noisily, and the answers published so quietly that the questions have become, in some measure, rhetorical. The answer to all of these, and like, questions reveals somewhat of a paradox, which tracks something like this: Since World War II, we have continued to maintain a military force posture sufficient in size and power to deter any nation or group of nations from an outright attack upon us. We have not been attacked. Why, therefore, do we need such a large and powerful force, and especially why do we need to modernize and improve this force? Herein lies the paradox. We have not been attacked precisely because of our deterrent forces, not because the threat has diminished. We have demonstrated our capability and determination to uphold our commitments through the use of force if necessary. West of the Iron Curtain in Europe is NATO, armed with conventional and tactical nuclear weapons, including U.S. military forces—4½ Army divisions and 17 squadrons of tactical fighter aircraft. This NATO force is precisely why we have not had an extension of Communist influence into Western Europe, and precisely why we have troops in Europe 25 years after World War II.

During the 1960's, as more of our resources were committed to Vietnam, our modernization of weapons systems was curtailed in order to pay the cost of the war. Our spending was for attrition rather than modernization. During the past 15 years, while the Soviets have developed 12 new fighter prototypes—at least 3 of them now operational—we have only developed the F-14 and F-15. In the strategic bomber field, our current bread-and-butter is the B-52, designed in the late 1940's and built in the 1950's and early 1960's. The Soviets have built a new generation bomber called the Backfire, a product of current technology. It is time now to catch up, but this effort is significantly influenced by a combination of factors to include reduced defense spending, increased manpower costs and inflated weapon cost.

Events since the end of World War II should have sensitized the need for a strong defense establishment. The painful experience of the isolationists wave before World War II is well established and need not be recounted here.

Immediately after the war, the calls went up, metaphorically and physically, to "bring our boys home," "demobilize," "disarm," and get on with the business of building a better place in which to live. While we were still busy disarming, we were told that access to Berlin was cut off. This resulted in our reliance on a poorly manned armed forces to replenish and bring substance to the beleaguered citizens of Berlin by air. This we did, to be awakened again almost immediately to the news that the Communist forces of Mao Tse-tung had driven our old war ally, Chiang Kai-shek, and his Nationalist party, the Kuomintang, from mainland China. We worried and wrung our hands, but did little. About this same time, however, we

established formal ties with our European allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—NATO—a formidable alliance set up to counter the Communist bloc in Eastern Europe.

Soon thereafter we were surprised by the invasion by North Korea of the South. Again we began mobilizing, and in a united front fought with our allies to an accommodation, although not conclusive. In this war we not only fought the North Koreans but got a taste of the Chinese Red army as well. Following Korea, we again demobilized, but not so drastically as we did after World War II. Hungary was next on the menu. As James A. Michener described in "The Bridge at Andau:"

Russian communism showed its true character to the world. With a ferocity and barbarism unmatched in recent history, it moved its brutal tanks against a defenseless population seeking escape from the terrors of communism, and destroyed it.

The Cuban missile crisis was the first real litmus-paper test of the muscle of our military forces. Backed to the wall, the U.S. alerted its nuclear forces and proclaimed an ultimatum. A threat to use force is a mighty deterrent in itself if you have the military muscle to back it up should it become necessary.

Following this tense microsecond in the clock of history, direct confrontation between the United States and the U.S.S.R. relaxed somewhat. The Soviets, suffering a loss of prestige by the affair, regrouped. They began to build military forces with a momentum unparalleled in peacetime. This momentum continues today.

And then comes Vietnam. The Vietnam war extracted from the United States the most damning and damaging experience. It brought out the worst in us. All the ills of the present were blamed on Vietnam, and much of that blame was laid to the Pentagon. Defense critics found a windfall of specific targets to aim their blasts, and they lost little time pulling the trigger.

Adm. Thomas Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently stated, and I totally agree, that the military was fighting a war less than half dressed. Policy formulation which drove the rules of engagement was so restricted that the application of military force was piecemeal and thus ineffective. Not until the 1972 bombing, culminating in the so-called Christmas bombing, was the force applied in such a way as to force at least some accommodations at the tables in Paris.

More recently the Middle East problem exploded once again, but with a flurry and with intensities never before observed. We witnessed once again an alert of our Armed Forces in direct confrontation with the Soviet Union over the possibility of intervention in the Middle East. Once again the Soviets backed down.

As we attempt to bring peace to the area, it is necessary to remember that there is a fundamental ideological difference between the Soviet Union and

the United States, notwithstanding short-term objectives manifested by an agreement to talk. The Middle East remains the most potentially explosive contemporary issue.

What is next on the menu of East-West confrontation? As the intoxication of détente turns into a slight hangover the morning after, our clear-eyed good sense tells us we must proceed with some caution. Sobering thoughts are screaming like voices in the wilderness to exercise some constraint in our rush to extend open invitations to the Communist world. Some of the most sobering thoughts are coming from—of all places—within the Soviet Union, witness testimony of Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Andrei Sakharov. As I have said, their methods of achieving these objectives may change, but their ultimate, long-range objectives remain fixed in the ideology of Communist doctrine.

Certainly we should not see a "Red under every bed," nor should we worry excessively that the "Red Hordes" will begin a race to the Rhine at any given moment, nor should we live in constant fear that the Soviets will salvo nuclear weapons aimed at the heart of the United States. Why? We need not worry excessively because we have built a credible military deterrent over the years and have demonstrated our willingness to use this force if necessary. Under this deterrent, the initiatives of this administration have gone far in establishing the necessary framework for peaceful coexistence, recognizing the difference in ideology. Some of these initiatives are those carefully conceived negotiations called CSCE, SALT, and MBFR. Others include making difficult decisions, left untouched by previous administrations as too controversial, such as permitting the Peoples' Republic of China—PRC—in the United Nations and clearing roadblocks that permit closer relations with the PRC. None of these initiatives can be fulfilled without a strong military force. You simply cannot negotiate without a strong hand.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies' Auxiliary sponsor a nationwide Voice of Democracy Contest in our secondary schools. I have the great pleasure to announce that the winner for our State of Nebraska is Mr. Raymond Christian Bentzen, Jr., of Naper, Nebr., which is in my congressional district.

Raymond is 18 and a senior in the Naper Public High School. His winning speech, entitled "My Responsibility as a Citizen," provides much food for thought and is a tribute to the fine youth

of our country. I commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

I ask that the text of Raymond Bentzen's speech be included in the RECORD:

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

(By Raymond C. Bentzen)

With the advent of the two-hundredth anniversary of our nation rapidly approaching, now is a good time to take stock of what has happened, and what will happen in the future. In general, our nation's history has been good, and of more than a little benefit to the world. In the future, it can and should be of even more benefit.

More important is the fact that now is the time for each of us, as citizens of the United States of America to come to terms with ourselves, and our role in our government. Many of us now feel shocked, appalled, and disillusioned by the current political scandal. We feel that in some way our government has let us down. Nothing could be more untrue. Our government has not failed us, we have failed ourselves.

As citizens, we must realize that our government is merely a reflection of the citizenry which it governs. When that citizenry fails to live up to its responsibilities, a republican nation such as ours, founded on democratic principles cannot long survive. The French political philosopher, Rousseau, probably summed it up best when he said, "As soon as any man says of the affairs of the State, 'What does it matter to me?' the state may then be given up for lost."

But before we can live up to our responsibilities we must realize just what they entail. Basically, our responsibilities fall into two categories. They are: believing in our nation and principles upon which it is based, and finally the responsibility of participating in our system.

First, let me discuss what I mean by believing in our nation. There has never before been, and perhaps never again will there be a nation such as ours, founded upon the principles that all men are created equal, and that all men should enjoy almost unlimited freedom. We, as citizens, have the responsibility to believe in these principles, and by believing we ensure the continuation of democracy.

However, I am not advocating a flag-waving, "my country right or wrong" stance. Such a stand could prove to be immeasurably disastrous. Rather, we must realize that we will not always be right, and that we must then learn by our mistakes. For thereby can we prove the merits of democracy.

We must, everyone of us, be willing to actively participate in our system. The most obvious way in which we can do this is by voting. Anyone who is 18 years of age, or older, can do this; providing of course that he is a citizen. Voter registration is a simple process, one which is of little trouble to anyone. Yet with all of this, this making it so easy to vote, only one-half of all those eligible to vote in 1972 actually did so. When the irresponsibility of a nation's citizenry becomes so great that fully one half cease to care, can one then expect anymore from the government?

But how do we get people involved? How do we get them to vote, and get them interested in what's happening to their country? I, for one, am a staunch supporter of the political party system. It has many faults, agreed. But it still remains the best vehicle for getting people involved in the affairs of the state, and making them realize the true meaning of what it is to be a citizen.

We citizens should make frequent use of letters and petitions to our Senators and Representatives. This enables us to keep in touch with the reality of governmental hap-

penings. It also helps us keep much better control of our government.

In short, we, the citizens of the United States of America must never forget that a government of the people, for the people, and by the people cannot long survive without the people.

ULTIMATE IN BUSING

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, with the Detroit busing case now pending before the Supreme Court, it is terrifying to contemplate that the future of 780,000 children in the Detroit area may be adversely affected by this forthcoming decision. However, when one thinks of applying the same possibility of forced busing to the city of New York, the mind boggles. The Richmond Times-Dispatch, in an editorial on Thursday, March 7, 1974, pointed out that this could become a reality. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

ULTIMATE IN BUSING

The New York City public schools enroll more pupils than do 39 of the American states. There are member-nations of the United Nations that do not have as many citizens as New York City has schoolchildren. As the epitome of a coldly-impersonal system, New York's elementary schools are assigned numbers rather than names.

One would suppose that, for the sake of the children held within, custodians of this Leviathan of a school system would be seeking ways to break up the monster into smaller, more compact school districts drawn to a human scale. But, no, the Central Board of Education in New York is amusing itself these days by dreaming of expanding its empire by forcing in pupils from the area's suburban districts.

The purpose would be the oh, so benign one of achieving "meaningful integration." The result would no doubt be more heart-break, dislocation and bitterness, only on a more massive scale than ever.

The board declared in a report last week to the State Board of Regents that "state and national officials and lawmakers cannot ignore the fact that the correction of the growing isolation of our poor minority groups in urban schools is each year becoming less and less a condition which large city boards of education can deal with alone."

It's true that collaboration with city school boards would be required to try to force city-suburb busing, as well we know in Richmond. But what the would-be Rearrangers of Humanity ought to do is to cut the tearful rhetoric about the "growing isolation" of so-called minority groups in urban schools—yes, to "ignore" it, if you will. Alternatively, our esteemed educationists and overlords ought to try treating children as children rather than as manipulable statistics.

Instead of, for instance, bewailing the fact that New York presently has 731,302 children in the "minority" and 397,694 in the "other" category, the school board ought to consider that it has entrusted to it 1,128,996 children—each a different human being, but all having a common need to become literate so as to be able to rise as high in life as natural ability will permit.

CXX—407—Part 5

In short, the public schools ought to be places of education for the individual, not laboratories of mass social experimentation. When the schools are deflected from their main job of teaching necessary skills by bizarre schemes such as racial-balance busing, it is frequently the education of poor and minority-group children that suffers the most, thus actually impeding their progress.

Of course, a Southerner can derive perverse delight in the thought of Northern cities sampling some of the unwise humanity-juggling that has been routinely forced upon this region. Should the U.S. Supreme Court be willing to "buy" forced city-suburb busing in the Detroit area involving 780,000 children in 53 school districts, then New York's ultimate busing plan may not be far down the road. Why by then maybe even Sen. Jacob Javits will be ready to vote for antibusing legislation! But in consideration of the welfare of all those children, one can really not reveal in the prospect of such massive educational disruption.

MILITARY PRESENCE ON GUAM

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, the territory of Guam has been an important military outpost since the Spanish-American War of 1899 and has become increasingly important since World War II. During these times of stress and strain in our relations with many Asian nations, including a few who until recently were pleased to have the protection provided by U.S. military might, Guam stands as the one place where our armed forces can be assured of a safe haven and a friendly greeting.

As a member of this august body from Guam and as an American citizen, I am proud of the role Guam plays in this country's defense posture. Although we, on Guam, have had our differences with the local military policies, as has almost every other American community in the vicinity of a military post, we fully recognize the importance of the military to Guam as well as the legitimate aspirations of the civilians to be viable and autonomous.

Economic, political, and social growth and demands inevitably bring about changing attitudes on Guam, thus requiring mutual accommodation between the military and civilian communities. The local military commanders have wisely instituted a program to enhance the military's image among the civilian population as well as to orient military personnel to the ways of Guam.

A strong supporter of the civilian-military partnership program is the Navy League's Guam Council and the Air Force Advisory Council. Rear Adm. George S. Morrison, commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Marianas, is to be commended for his dedicated efforts to bring about better understanding between the civilian and military communities on Guam. As a member of the Navy League

of the United States and of the Air Force Association I am pleased with the role that these organizations are playing in making this cooperative effort a success.

A recent article in the magazine Sea Power outlined the role of the Guam Council, and I include the text of the article in the Record at this time.

COUNCIL OF THE MONTH—GUAM

During World War II Guam was the only inhabited U.S. possession to be occupied by the enemy. This experience left no doubt in the minds of most people on Guam as to the need for a strong U.S. Navy in order to retain a competitive edge on the world scene. Beyond this historical experience, the importance to the native economy of the many shore and fleet activities on Guam—headquarters of the Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Marianas—contributes to a community feeling among islanders and naval personnel and their dependents.

In 1958 some 45 charter members founded the Guam Council, which now numbers nearly 200 and looks forward to continuing growth. The council is aware it has an ever-expanding role to play on the island, particularly when Navy and community needs—for example, where land use is concerned—do not coincide.

In its earlier days the council's activities were on an essentially social level, but now it is turning to projects that contribute support to Navy goals and Navy people. This change of direction, or broadening of council objectives, as it were, has received the strongest support from Rear Admiral George S. Morrison, Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Marianas, who emphasized the oneness of Guam's civilian and naval communities in his address at the council's 1973 Navy Day banquet.

As a thank you from the Navy for a job well done, Admiral Morrison has initiated a year-round "Navy Day for Navy Leaguers" program. Commanding officers of the various shore and fleet activities on Guam invite council members to spend a day or part of a day touring their command. Navy Leaguers can observe firsthand the Navy in action.

A new project undertaken last year by the council was raising support for Guam's first Navy Junior ROTC program, now well established at Father Duenas School. Beyond the obvious benefits to the 50 participating cadets, the Guam Council hopes the young men will be encouraged to seek careers in the Navy. The council also sponsors an annual "Silver Plate Dinner" at which enlisted personnel and their wives are the invited guests of Navy Leaguers.

Through the forum provided by the council, Guam's civilian and naval communities better understand their interdependence and are able to work together to solve their common problems.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. HANSEN

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished Congresswoman from Washington, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN. JULIA's decision not to seek reelection is a great loss to this congressional body,

for we who have served with JULIA have come to have a deep appreciation for the keen insight and exceptional leadership abilities that she has so ably demonstrated. While we will be saddened by her absence, we will be pleased to know that JULIA will, at last, have the opportunity to enjoy the quiet solitude of her beloved West.

Now that it is more customary for women to participate equally with men in the day-to-day flurry of legislative matters, there is a tendency to overlook the unique accomplishment of her first election to public office. In the 1930's and in subsequent years, there were many hazards that a young woman or young mother faced in holding public office, but JULIA carefully overcame each stumbling block in the path to her success and blazed a historic trail for countless others to follow in public life. Consistently, she has demonstrated that she has the ability to be a leader among the Nation's leaders. Those who follow her footsteps in public service will find that many of the obstacles that previously blocked the participation of women in politics have been pushed aside by JULIA HANSEN's record during her 14 years on Capitol Hill.

JULIA was the first woman Democrat to be named to the Appropriations Committee, and later when she became chairman of the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee she was the first woman to chair a subcommittee in either House of Congress. She is also the first and only woman to serve on the House Democratic Steering Committee. The appropriations for 28 agencies fall under the jurisdiction of the Interior Subcommittee. These agencies include national parks, minerals, fossil energy resources, pollution abatement, Federal lands and roads, and timber rights. JULIA has labored diligently to help rescue the American Indian from his status as the "forgotten man" of American culture. During appropriations hearings, she has consistently sought increased funding for hospitals and schools and employment opportunities for American Indians. She has championed the panorama of natural resources while maintaining a balanced viewpoint between conservation and utilization. Frequently she has called for long range planning to determine the most efficient means to manage our recreation and energy resources. By establishing priorities and funding levels the subcommittee has helped promote research and development of our resources while observing the principles of sound fiscal management.

JULIA HANSEN is a woman of remarkable accomplishments and tastes. Her interests range from the history of the Pacific Northwest to a deep love for the fine arts. Her expertise and experience will be sorely missed during the next session of Congress, and those of us who served with her on committees will miss her friendship even more. I extend to her my sincere best wishes for many years of success and contentment in the years that lie ahead.

PRIDE IN AMERICA

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from the president of the U.S. Jaycees, Rick Clayton, Jr., regarding the attitude of America. I think the letter, and the open letter enclosed, merit the attention of this House. The Jaycees have long been favorably known for their willingness to speak out for this Nation and its institutions, and I am proud to be a Jaycee. I ask that I be allowed to make president Clayton's letter and his enclosed "open letter" a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that all those who read the RECORD might be aware of their firm pro-American attitude.

The material follows:

MARCH 1, 1974.

HON. DAWSON MATHIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MATHIS: I have enclosed an open letter unanimously adopted by the Executive Board of Directors of The United States Jaycees on February 16, 1974. The sentiments expressed are genuine and reflect a deep concern on the part of the 325,000 Jaycees throughout this nation for the cynicism and pessimism that is so prevalent and "popular" today. Regrettably, some of our elected leaders seem to be mental victims of these negative attitudes.

At the same meeting, The United States Jaycees adopted a program we call Pride in America. Through this program, Jaycees will rekindle and reestablish pride in the 6,600 communities that have Jaycee chapters. This pride will spread throughout the states, and throughout this nation. We will build an attitude of pride—pride in our country; our institutions; our leaders; pride in our people; pride that we are Americans.

Please feel free to use the enclosed open letter in any fashion you wish. The United States Jaycees will be the force which turns this country's attitude around and we will reestablish that patriotic spirit for which America was once famous.

Sincerely,

rick clayton, jr.,
President.

PRIDE IN AMERICA

It is becoming increasingly difficult to appreciate that our country offers more opportunity than any nation in the world . . . because—

Today this country's detractors show little regard for our institutions.

Most Americans have strong convictions in these institutions that are the cornerstones of our great country:

Faith in God
Brotherhood of Man
Free Enterprise
Government by the People
Individualism
Service to Humanity

Constantly it is repeated that Americans no longer enjoy individual expression.

The United States Jaycees know better because of their affiliations in 6,700 communities throughout this great country.

History has proven that the American people can unite when threatened! Once again we are threatened but not by outside forces.

Our new threat is one of self-doubt reinforced daily by the repetition of negative examples.

The United States Jaycees are tired of those who daily condemn our society as deteriorating!

The time is now for the sleeping giant of public "Pride" and positive individual participation to awaken.

Unite with the United States Jaycees in rekindling our "Pride in America"—the key is YOU!

FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT
WELCOMED IN MINNESOTA

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota's Commissioner of Economic Development, Mr. James Heltzer, today briefed the Minnesota congressional delegation and staffs on Minnesota's expanding role in the area of reverse investment.

Minnesota is a late comer in the field of trying to attract foreign capital investment to build jobs and prosperity. Foreign direct investment throughout the United States is small. In Minnesota it is miniscule. Nevertheless, Chairman Heltzer, building on Minnesota's existing assets, has assembled a special group within the State department of economic development. Under this group's leadership, Commissioner Heltzer and the department are aggressively seeking foreign direct capital investment within the State of Minnesota.

I personally am most enthusiastic about Minnesota's new efforts in this field. Foreign direct investment in our State means more jobs and more prosperity. It is consistent with our State's desire to fully develop all of its resources for the maximum benefit of all of its people. Our State is late in getting started in this activity, but we are becoming more aggressive and more willing to compete for foreign investment.

Commissioner Heltzer's remarks, with some editing for reason of space economy only, follow:

MINNESOTA'S EXPANDING ROLE IN THE AREA
OF REVERSE INVESTMENT

(By James R. Heltzer)

The Department of Economic Development's Division of Finance and International Trade has expanded to its current 3-man size in March, 1973. Prior to that time, the only international position was that of International Trade Representative, responsible mainly for export promotion and assisting Minnesota companies increase their markets by expanding overseas. Due to the increasing interest in attracting foreign capital into the United States, as well as greatly increased interest on the part of foreign companies in investment opportunities, we decided to incorporate reverse investment into the operations of the Department. The staff was increased to two at that time, and the responsibilities of the Director of Finance also increased to cover also international trade.

In late May and early June of last year, the Department participated in two reverse investment seminars in Tokyo and Osaka.

These conferences, sponsored by the National Association of State Development Agencies, in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Commerce, represented the largest effort ever launched to attract Japanese technology and capital to the United States.

The Minnesota delegation consisted of 4 members, 2 from the Department; Don Risk, President of the Minnesota Industrial Development Association, and Executive Director of the Minneapolis Industrial Commission; and James A. Weiler, former Department Director of Finance & Trade, organizer of the mission, and after April 28, Vice President of Miller and Schroeder Municipal, Inc.

Interest in the seminar was stimulated by the recent realignment of the yen and dollar, the growing U.S. consumer market, the fact that Japan is the largest capital surplus nation in the world. Investment in U.S. facilities has become more attractive and perhaps essential to many Japanese businessmen. The overall purpose of the conference was to induce Japanese investment in manufacturing and assembly facilities in the United States. Over 1400 Japanese companies were represented at the two conferences. These conferences gave Japanese business executives an opportunity to speak directly with State officials involved in economic development, who could answer questions in regard to State policies, general feeling of the public, etc.

The State of Minnesota participated in this conference to attract Japanese investments in industries complimenting or supporting our industry base. Our specific objectives were threefold: (1) Introduce and define the State of Minnesota as an area welcoming and offering Japanese investment opportunities. (2) Investigate in depth the Japanese business community to effectively target our marketing approach. (3) Observe the activities of other states and private efforts to perfect an effective marketing approach.

Having established the fact that reverse investment represents an opportunity for the State of Minnesota, the Department began the task of formulating a plan, consulting with international experts, writing and printing detailed factual information about the Minnesota economy.

We attempted to select only those Japanese industries which were capable of being supported by existing labor, support manufacturers, etc. These industries included the following: food processing and packaging, computer equipment and services, electronic assembly, medical-dental equipment and test apparatus, recreational vehicles, lumber, and mining and taconite processing.

We then personally contacted approximately 25 Minnesota multinational companies, with interests in Japan. These companies included the Donaldson Company, Munsingwear, Economics Laboratories, G. H. Tennant, Cargill, International Multifoods, Control Data, Honeywell, General Mills, 3M, and International Dairy Queen. The purpose of these interviews was to solicit the support of Minnesota business and gain insight into current workings of the Japanese economy, as the State of Minnesota does not have an office overseas. These Minnesota companies wrote letters of introduction to approximately 30 of their overseas staffs, attorneys, and bankers. In addition, banks in Minneapolis helped to arrange meetings for members of the commission with major Japanese banks which assist firms in expanding to the U.S.

Total foreign direct investment in industrial facilities at this time, is estimated to be approximately 5 million dollars. Since we began this program last spring, however, we have received a great deal of interest, not only from Japan, but from Canada and Western Europe as well. To date, we have

opened approximately 50 files on companies which we are communicating with and which have expressed a very real interest in setting up some sort of operation within the State.

Currently, we have been able to identify five noteworthy reverse investments. The eldest is Buhler-MIAG, Inc. headquartered on Wayzata Boulevard here in Minneapolis. On June 20, 1968 Baragens Vademecum, Incorporated, a Swedish based company, began manufacturing its internationally known dental care products from a site in the new community of Jonathan. On July 16 of this year, the Fromagerie Bongrain, a subsidiary of Bongrain-Gerard of Versailles, France began a joint venture with the Le Sueur Creamery Co. of Le Sueur to manufacture two "soft cheeses"—Camembert and Brie. In September, Monarch Machinery Ltd. a Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada-based manufacturer began the production of machine tools in Mountain Lake, Minnesota. Kawasaki Motors Corp. began construction in October of a \$2.5 million research and development center in Shakopee. The company's engine division will develop and test engines for exclusive distribution to Arctic Enterprises, Inc., our Thief River Falls snowmobile and leisure products manufacturer.

We are working with a major Japanese trading company with a possibility of joint ventures in electronics and in metal reclamation. We are very hopeful of a possibility of a joint venture with a Japanese steel company to construct an 80 million dollar direct-reduction steel facility in Duluth.

Our most recent joint venture involves the tourism industry. Carlson Companies and the Radisson Hotel Corp. recently announced that they would join the Japanese-owned MTK Corp. of America and the Toppan Printing Co. of Japan in the construction of a 152-room hotel in Plymouth. The Radisson Inn Plymouth is thought to be the first hotel in the United States to be owned jointly by Japanese and American corporations. The Inn is scheduled to open in late 1974. Add to this the Scorpion deal and the good possibility of a Japanese joint venture in Northern Minnesota to produce chopsticks, and other wood products for Minnesota Aspen.

Just prior to their separation from the parent company, Fuqua Industries, out of Atlanta, Scorpion executives contacted our department to see if we could assist them in finding additional uses for their facilities in Crosby, Minnesota. Their objectives were not only to expand their product line, but to attempt to find a way to keep their 300 employees working 12 months a year, rather than 6 or 7 for the snowmobile manufacturing. We are happy to say at this time that they are expected to sign an agreement with a German engine manufacturer for the assembly of approximately 5,000 engines in Crosby, initially, and with some plant expansion for several years to come.

We are extremely optimistic of our planned foreign investment program and are very fortunate to have such well-known multinational companies in the State backing our efforts. In September, 1973, we made a follow-up trip to Japan with Ole Olson, Gene Graves and myself, and were aided tremendously by the cooperation of Control Data Corporation. The results of this follow-up trip were even more impressive than the results of the first visit. We were well-received, had done a great deal of preparation in the way of putting together additional information and specific answers to previous questions. We again visited the Japanese banks, which resulted immediately in a joint investment seminar at the Northwestern National Bank in cooperation with our Department and the Sumitomo Bank of Osaka.

As a result I think we uncovered a poten-

tial relationship between the Japanese Chemical-Fertilizer Company, and a Minnesota peat supplier. We were very happy to be able to represent Minnesota companies, and I think it can accomplish a great deal of good in this area, as well.

Let me stress at this point, that while we have tended to focus primarily on direct foreign investment, we are continuously stressing the increasing importance of joint venture arrangements, particularly in light of the unknown fuel situation. This is one way whereby smaller companies can readily benefit from foreign resources, when they would not otherwise be able to directly generate those resources themselves.

I might point out at this point that we have a long way to go in our reverse investment program. Since 1960, South Carolina has attracted more than one billion dollars in international investments. And, the South Carolina Development Board has recently opened an office in Tokyo. Certainly an enviable record and a good target for Minnesota to attempt to exceed.

Last year our activity in promoting reverse investment was at an all-time high. In March, members of my staff were in Winnipeg prospecting for new companies. In late May and early June, my reverse investment task force was in Japan. In October, I joined my international trade and investment representatives on a second visit to Japan. And, recently, my Director of International Trade and Finance, Orvin Olson, spent four days in Winnipeg following up on the earlier visit and making new contacts.

I am pleased to report that within the next six to eight months, we hope to be jointly announcing the locating of additional international companies within our state.

Let me review the forms of assistance we can provide them. In order to assist in financing, our Industrial Revenue Bonding program is open to them. We have a close working relationship with our state's public and private industrial development parks. We are continually updating information on them and have it available for ready use.

We produce numerous Community Profiles which help site planners quickly and easily review what types of energy, work force, and other necessary information is available to them. Our staff also helps companies locate markets for their products.

Two other important areas where we are striving to make significant inroads are in the area of creating a climate of tax stability and providing the necessary liaison with regulatory agencies of local, state and the federal government. We feel it is extremely important for our business community to be able to plug directly in to its government. It is critical that problems be heard in a timely manner and acted upon honestly, systematically and promptly.

I would conclude with a quote from a recent Minneapolis Tribune citing the positive aspects of reverse investments.

"We hope Minnesota makes the Japanese and all other foreign investors welcome."

UKRAINIANS FIGHT FOR INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Ukrainian descent are once again asking the U.S. Government to address itself to the intolerable living conditions to

which Ukrainians in the Soviet Union are being subjected.

This latest attempt to alleviate the suffering of their friends and relatives takes the form of a petition to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, John Scali, and is prompted by a change in the Soviet Code of Rules toward political prisoners.

This change allows Soviet authorities to abolish the personal freedom of these prisoners; it permits them to use psychological methods to force political prisoners to spy on each other; and it allows mass arrests of Ukrainian farmers and youth and their deportation to the far east territories—Siberia—for slave labor.

The petition speaks for itself:

Hon. JOHN SCALI,
U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations,
United Nations Plaza,
New York, N.Y.:

In the Matter of Violations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations and the Persecution and Imprisonment of Innocent People in the Ukraine.

Because the nation of Ukraine is imprisoned and those who purport to represent Ukraine in the United Nations, in international, external and internal affairs and who wear its badges of civil authority are enemies of the people of Ukraine and cannot possibly represent their welfare or best interests, and,

Because of the long standing, continuous and present intolerable violations of the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights, including the current increased persecution and imprisonment by agents of the government of the USSR of innocent people, and,

Because of the eloquent silence of the leaders of all other nations effectively to speak in behalf of the people of Ukraine,

Now Therefore, I Ulana Celewycz, supported by the signatures of 5,000 Americans of Ukrainian background, and as president of Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., petition you, Mr. Ambassador, as follows:

1. Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., is a duly authorized non-profit corporation in the State of New York with more than 3,000 members in 30 branches in major cities of the United States. There are more than two million citizens of the United States of Ukrainian descent with strong ties of family and blood with the people of Ukraine.

2. Ukraine is the largest of the non-Russian nations of the USSR with a population of forty-eight million. Historically, Ukraine was a free state and played an important role in the life of Eastern Europe as early as the ninth century. Russia's desire for expansion and the invasion of Ukraine by the czar's armed forces was the cause of the Ukraine's downfall.

The Ukrainian people now, as in the past, are determined to be free, to guide their own destiny in their sovereign state.

In this spirit, in the year 1917, when the revolution broke out in Russia, Ukrainian leaders called a Ukrainian National Congress in March, 1917, in Kiev, the capitol of Ukraine, which elected a Ukrainian National Council (Ukrainian National Rada). The Ukrainian National Council was recognized as the Ukrainian government by a majority of the people of Ukraine (by the Congress of Ukrainian Armed Forces, by the Congress of the Ukrainian Peasant Party, and by the Congress of the Ukrainian Labor Party). On

January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Council proclaimed Ukraine as an Independent State.

Russia immediately thereupon sent her armies into Ukraine and the Ukrainian government faced a bloody war with Russia, completely unarmed and unprepared. At this time, the Ukrainian government was recognized by approximately thirty-five foreign powers, England and France being the first to grant recognition.

On February 9, 1918, a Peace Treaty of Brest Litovsk was signed between the Ukrainian government and the Central Powers. On September 10, 1918, in Kiev, the Russian government under Lenin's leadership recognized Ukraine as a Sovereign State and signed an Armistice. Under this document, Russia agreed to withdraw her armies from Ukrainian territory and further agreed to respect the right of Ukrainian sovereignty. As in the past, Russia did not respect the Kiev agreement. The war continued. After three years of fighting and subversive activities, Russia conquered the Ukrainian armies and occupied the territory of the Ukrainian State.

Against the will of the overwhelming majority of its people Ukraine was forcibly incorporated into the USSR as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic with a Soviet-type government and parliament. The Soviet Constitution gave Ukraine the right to withdraw from the "federation" upon its own volition. During the past fifty years the people of Ukraine have repeatedly made heroic efforts to be free and independent of the government of USSR.

These efforts were ruthlessly crushed by the USSR despite Article XVII of Chapter II of the Constitution of the USSR which gives the right "freely to secede" to any nation of the Soviet Union.

3. During the past fifty years millions of innocent people in Ukraine, for the "offense" of not accepting the Communist way of life, have been persecuted and imprisoned by the agents of the government of the USSR. Ukraine, a nation which accepted Christianity in the year 988 and with 1,000 years of a deep Christian tradition, opposed the forcible imposition of Atheism. Russia retaliated with mass arrests of Ukrainian Orthodox church hierarchy (28 archbishops and bishops) in the years 1926-1929. In the years 1945-46 the Ukrainian Catholic Church was liquidated and its hierarchy arrested (10 archbishops and bishops). Churches, monasteries, theological seminaries were closed and religious life suppressed.

In 1932-33, the Ukrainian farmers faced forced Collective Farming. When they protested, Russia retaliated confiscating most of the grain and imposing a famine which took the lives of seven million Ukrainians.

In 1937-38, Ukrainian intellectuals rejected the Russification of Ukraine and because of this thousands were arrested, persecuted and brutally murdered. Many were imprisoned for expressing their objections to injustice and to the ruthless destruction of human rights in Ukraine by the USSR despite the Soviet Constitution (Chapter X, Article 125) which guarantees every citizen "freedom of speech" and "of the press" and also Article 127 of the same chapter which states, "citizens of the USSR are guaranteed inviolability of their person."

The Ukrainian Insurgent Army and Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists opposing Russian domination, fought Russia during World War II and for five years thereafter. Here again, over three million Ukrainians were committed to concentration camps, murdered or deported to Siberia.

4. Although from 1963 to the present, alarming numbers of arrests were made, new waves of arrests in Ukraine by agents of the government of the USSR have been increas-

ing in this current year of 1973. Arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals, writers, literary critics, professors, students, scientists and representatives of every strata of society were made for "anti-soviet agitation and propaganda." In reality this "propaganda" consisted of petitions, appeals and letters submitted from concentration camps by prominent political prisoners and prominent Ukrainians at home to the Communist party and government officials of Ukraine and USSR bringing to their attention the question of terror, Russification and violation of constitutional and human rights. Since there is no free press in Ukraine, the above mentioned arrests and persecutions were published in the self-sponsored (samvydav) magazine, the Ukrainian Herald. The Ukrainian Herald can be compared to the Chronicle of Human Events published in Russia.

Among the victims of this new wave of arrests who have tried to live under Soviet law are Vyacheslav Chornovil, writer and author who protested to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of USSR against the barbarous desecration of cemeteries in Ukraine and in the city of Lviv (Western Ukraine) the demolition of military graves with a bulldozer (tried in February, 1973, sentenced to seven years at hard labor, five years of exile); Ivan Dziuba, author Internationalism or Russification (tried in March, 1973, sentenced to 5 years imprisonment); Ivan Switlychnyj, literary critic (tried in camera in April, 1973, sentenced to 7 years imprisonment and 5 years of exile); Wasyl Stus, poet (tried September, 1972, sentenced to 5 years hard regime labor camp and 3 years exile); Ihor Kalynech, poet (tried behind closed doors in November, 1972, sentenced to 9 years imprisonment and 3 years exile from Ukraine); Irene Stasiw-Kalynech, poetess (tried July, 1972, sentenced to 6 years imprisonment, 3 years exile); Stephany Shabatura, artist and designer (tried in July, 1972, sentenced to 5 years general regime labor camp and 3 years exile); Stephanie Hulyk, mother of an eight month old infant and member of the association to preserve historical documents; Nina A. Strokata-Karavanskyj, Mrs., arrested December 8, 1971, in Odessa for refusing to divorce her husband, Sviatoslav Karavanskyj, and for supporting him and refusing to condemn him (tried May, 1972, and was sentenced to 4 years hard regime labor camp); Yuriy Shukhevych, the son of the former commander-in-chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (APA), Roman Shukhevych-Taras Chuprynska, for not condemning his father in 1948, he was sentenced to 20 years of imprisonment at the age of 15. He was released and arrested again on January 11, 1972, tried September, 1972, and sentenced to 5 years in prison, five years regime labor camp, 5 years exile by the Soviet court; Dr. Leonid Plushch, Ukrainian mathematician and cyberneticist, arrested and sentenced to a psychiatric asylum in Dnipropetrovsk.

Among the practices of the agents of the USSR against innocent people in these various categories are the following:

(a) Soviet authorities are using torture and psychiatric methods of inhuman treatment to people of Ukraine who have been unjustly imprisoned such as poisoning their food and using other methods so that they will not survive the period of their sentence. Revolutionary Voices (pp. 168, 169-170) Press Bureau ABN, Munich, 1971.

(b) Secret trials are conducted of such innocent persons and not even members of the family are allowed to be present and the accused may not have the attorney of his choice;

The Trial of Valentyn Moroz, *idem*, pp. 1-21.

Idem Karavansky, pp. 186-195.

(c) Many such innocent persons are convicted of actions which are specifically permitted by the provisions of the constitution of the USSR;

As Lev Lukianenko, Ivan Kandyba, Stepan Virun, Oleksander Libovych, Vavil Lutskev, Yosyp Borovnytskyj, Ivan Kypys, idem pp. 151-170; Ferment in the Ukraine, pp. 56-93.

(d) After the sentences of such innocent persons who have been imprisoned have been served and completed they are not permitted to return to their homes to work. They are given no protection of the laws and they are rearrested for not working.

Case of Yuriy Shukhevych, idem pp. 236-39, 250.

(e) Not only are such persons prosecuted and persecuted but members of their family, and in many instances the whole family of such persecuted persons and also their relatives are prosecuted and imprisoned. When such innocent people are imprisoned, although prison rules allow only one letter per month, they are actually only permitted one or two letters per year;

Idem pp. 188-190.

(f) There have been many instances of completely normal persons who have been arrested by Soviet authorities and thereafter such Soviet authorities have contrived to produce a psychiatric evaluation of such normal persons as being "insane" and thereafter such normal and innocent person is incarcerated in an insane asylum and no trial of his is permitted.

Cases of Gen. Hrehorenko and Wasly Stus—pp. 127. Uncensored Russia by Peter Reddaway, American Heritage Press (1972).

Idem, pp. H9180-81, Congressional Record, 93rd Congress, First Session, Vol. 119, No. 156, October 16, 1973.

5. This petitioner avers that such wholesale denial by the government of the USSR of human rights of innocent people in Ukraine contravenes the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations, which reads in part:

"Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

"Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law."

6. From the facts set forth above it is clear that the present government of the so-called Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not truly represent the people of Ukraine but said government would in fact prevent them from appealing to the United Nations in behalf of their fundamental rights.

It is essential to the dignity of the human race that an oppressed nation of forty-eight million people such as Ukraine should have a voice in the United Nations.

Wherefore your petitioner as president of the Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., and on behalf of the signatories of this petition, prays that the United Nations take jurisdiction of the matter herein set forth and take such steps and measures which will bring the above facts to the attention of world opinion and to the Member Nations of the organization of the United Nations and do such other things and make such orders as it deems equitable and just to aid in the release of political prisoners from concentration camps, psychiatric institutions, mental wards and prisons.

MONTHLY CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD each month the monthly calendar of the Smithsonian Institution. The March calendar of events follows:

MARCH AT THE SMITHSONIAN

Friday, 1.—Exhibition: *Bhutan: The Land of Dragons*. Anthropological specimens depicting the diversity of the culture and way of life of Bhutan. Objects and photographs represent the religion, transportation, money, music, architecture and day-to-day utensils of the people of this small country in the heart of the eastern Himalays. Objects were selected from three private collections as well as from those of the Smithsonian. A slide presentation is included. Museum of Natural History.

Film festival. First day in a three-day festival that includes ten award-winning films by the greatest Czechoslovakian filmmakers, seminars and a reception with the artists. Friday's program: Introduction of artists and discussion, *Fireman's Ball* by Forman, and *Intimate Lighting*, by Passer. See also March 2 and 3. Series tickets \$10 general, \$8 Associates. Tickets are also available for one or multiple afternoon or evening sections. Reception is included for subscribers of three or more sections. Co-sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program. For ticket information call 381-5157. Showings will be at Marvin Theater, George Washington University.

Saturday, 2.—Ascent of man: *The long Childhood*. Hourly 12:30 through 3:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Czechoslovakian film festival. Afternoon: *Taking Off*, by Forman; Seminar with Milos Forman and Ivan Passer; *Closely Watched Trains*, by Menzel, 1 p.m. Evening: Seminar with Jiri Weiss, Jan Kadar; *Adrift*, by Kadar, and *Murder Czech Style*, by Weiss, 8 p.m. See March 1 for further details.

Music from Marlboro: Seven distinguished artists from the celebrated Marlboro Music Festival will perform *String Quintet in F Major* (1879) by Bruckner; *Contrasts for Clarinet, Violin and Piano* (1938) by Bartok; and *String Quintet in D Major, K. 593*, by Mozart. Performers are David Levine, piano, James Buswell and Eugene Drucker, violin, Nobuko Imai and Heilichiro Ohyama, viola; Madeline Foley, cello and Frank Cohen, clarinet. They will be directed by Rudolph Serkin. 5:30 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$5 general, \$4 students, senior citizens and Associates. For reservations, call 381-5395. Sponsored by the Divisions of Performing Arts and Musical Instruments.

Sunday, 3.—Czechoslovakian film festival. Afternoon: *Loves of a Blonde*, by Forman; Seminar with Milos Forman, Ivan Passer and Arnost Lustig, *Diamonds of the Night* by Nemec, 1 p.m. Reception: 6 p.m. Evening: Seminar with Arnost Lustig; *Premier: Dita Saxova*, by Moskalys; *All My Good Countrymen*, by Jasny, 7 p.m. See March 1 for further details.

Illustrated lecture: *American Self-Portraits*. Speaker: Ann Van Devanter, co-organizer of the exhibition currently on display, 3 p.m., National Portrait Gallery.

Monday, 4.—Fashion career seminar: *Fashion: The Sum Total*. Noted experts from the world of fashion discuss fashion's historical

evolution, current trends and future directions. 9 a.m. to noon, 2 to 4 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. \$10. For ticket information, call 381-5157. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program.

The citizen: Power and/or powerlessness. *The Citizen and His City*. Speaker: Thomas Bradley, Mayor of Los Angeles, and President, National League of Cities, 8:10 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program, \$7 general; \$5 Associates. For ticket information call 381-5157.

Tuesday, 5.—Film: *Introduction to Analog Computers*. Courtesy of the Atomic Energy Commission. Sponsored by the Section of Mathematics. 2:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Museum talk: *General James Wilkinson: Patriot in War, Traitor in Peace*. Speaker: Patricia Watlington, Post-Doctoral Research Fellow, 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Discovery room: An area where visitors of all ages can touch, handle and smell a wide variety of natural history specimens of all shapes and sizes ranging from whale fossils to petrified wood. Monday through Thursday, 12 noon-2:30 p.m.; Friday through Sunday, 11 a.m.-3 p.m. Museum of Natural History.

Giants of architecture: Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown will discuss their work. 8:10 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$8 general, \$6 Associates. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program. For ticket information call 381-5157.

Wednesday, 6.—Free film theatre: *The Mysterious Mr. Eliot*. A comprehensive film portrait of T. S. Eliot, one of the greatest poets of the modern age, including discussions with his wife and friends, and selections of poetry read by Eliot. 12:30 p.m. History and Technology Building auditorium.

Beyond the planets: Second series of Guggenheim Lectures in Astronomy presented by the Smithsonian Institution National Air and Space Museum and the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, with the support of the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation. The series offers a comprehensive summary of man's current knowledge of the creation, evolution, and extent of the physical universe. Lectures will be held eight consecutive Wednesday evenings at 7:30 p.m., in the Leonard Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Each program is followed by a question period. The first lecture is entitled *The Scale of the Universe*, with Dr. Myron Lecar, speaker.

Thursday, 7.—Free film theatre: *The Mysterious Mr. Eliot*. Repeat. See March 6 for details.

Lecture: *A Scientist's Responsibility Toward a Society in Crisis*. A public seminar, by Dr. Barry Commoner, educator and biologist, on energy conservation, cooperation between the scientific community and community-action groups. 8 p.m., Baird Auditorium, National History Building.—Free tickets are required. For information call 381-5157.

Sunday, 10.—Sunday shorts: *Liberty*. Laurel and Hardy; *The Dispossessed*, George Ballis; *Young Goodman Brown*, Donald Fox. A variety of short films selected for both adults and teenagers. 3 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. \$1.25 general, \$1 students, \$.75 Associates. For ticket information call 381-5157. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program.

Oriental rug lecture: *Introduction to Islamic Rug Weaving*, by Anthony Landreau, Director of The Textile Museum, and an expert in the fields of Turkish, Turkoman and Islamic rugs. First in a three-part lecture

series on the design characteristics, historical traditions, trends, and construction of the rugs, as well as the life styles of the tribesmen who weave them. 11 a.m., Place, The Textile Museum. Remaining lectures: March 17 and 31. Series tickets \$10 general, \$7.50 Associates. Individual lectures: \$4 general, \$2.75 Associates. For ticket information call 381-5157.

Music workshop: 18th century arrangements presented by the Smithsonian Social Orchestra and Quadrille Band and discussion of the historical background of the dances and music, by Shirley Wynne, dance historian. Ohio State University, and Cynthia Hoover, Division of Musical Instruments. 2:30 p.m., Grand Salon, Renwick Gallery. Free. Being held in conjunction with the special program March 11 entitled *There's a Good Time Coming! American Music and Ballroom Dance, 1840-1860*.

String bands old and new: Ralph Stanley and the Clinch Mountain Boys. 8 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$5.50 general, \$5 Associates, \$4 students and senior citizens. For reservations call 381-5395. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Division of Performing Arts. A free workshop/demonstration will also be held at 4:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, History and Technology Building. The evening program will be broadcast live over National Public Radio.

Monday, 11.—The citizen: Power and/or powerlessness: *The Citizen and the Labor Movement*, by Jerry Wurf, Vice President, AFL-CIO, and President, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Workers. 8:10 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. \$7 general, \$5 Associates. Call 381-5157 for further information.

Concert: *There's a Good Time Coming! American Music and Ballroom Dance, 1840-1860*. Mid-19th century American music and dance, arranged by leading 19th century bandsmen and played on original instruments from the Smithsonian collections. Under the direction of Shirley Wynne, choreographer and dance historian from Ohio State University. Dances include polka, mazurka, quadrille, contradance, Cachuca and Five Step Waltz, performed in period costume. Musicians include members of the National Symphony Orchestra and the Musical Instruments Division staff. Grand Salon, Renwick Gallery, \$3.50 general, \$3 Associates. For reservations call 381-5395.

Tuesday, 12.—Lunchtime talk: *The Job Jungle: How to Survive and Enjoy It as a Woman*, by Alexander Methven, Department of Agriculture Graduate School. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Women's Council. 12:30, Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Museum talk: *Life of Lincoln*, by Herbert Collins, Associate Curator of Political History. 12:30 p.m., Room B-1048, History and Technology Building.

Lecture: *Non-Euclidean Geometry*, by Dr. Elaine Koppelman, Research Fellow, Section of Mathematics. 2:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Oriental art lecture: *Ise-Shu, the Heian Perfection of Visual Poetry*. Speaker: Julia Meech-Pekarik, Metropolitan Museum of Art. 8:30 p.m., the Freer Gallery. Exhibition galleries open at 6:30 p.m. prior to the lecture.

Wednesday, 13.—Giants of architecture: The work of Buckminster Fuller, discussed by William Marlin, architect and urban design critic and Editor-in-Chief Architectural Forum. 8:10 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$8 general, \$6 Associates. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program. For ticket information call 381-5157.

American aviation historical society. 8 p.m., Conference Room, National Air and Space Museum. The public is welcome to attend.

Free film theatre: *Whoosh, An Outline of H. G. Wells*. Scenes from his life, interviews with his sons and friends depict this exuberant novelist, historian and utopian visionary. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Beyond the planets: *Galaxies*, by Morton Roberts, National Radio Astronomy Observatory. See March 6 for further details.

Thursday, 14.—Free film theatre: *Whoosh, An Outline of H. G. Wells*. Repeat. See March 13 for details.

Luncheon talk: Roy Slade, Director, Corcoran Gallery of Art, will discuss collections, history and activities of the Corcoran Gallery. Mr. Slade will be introduced by Harry Lowe, Assistant Director for operations, National Collection of Fine Arts. 12 noon. \$12.50 general, \$11.50 Associates. Cocktails and buffet are included in the admission price. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program. For ticket information call 381-5157.

Young people's festival of the arts: *American Black Comedy*, presented by the Shepherd Elementary School. 10 a.m., Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, 2405 Martin Luther King Jr., Ave., S.E. The Festival will continue through April 11.

Friday, 15.—Young people's festival of the arts: The Anacostia Senior High School Band in a special young people's concert, featuring a demonstration of all of the instruments used. 10 a.m., Anacostia Neighborhood Museum. See March 14 for further details.

Saturday, 16.—Exhibition: *Santos: Popular Forms of Faith in Latin America*. Fifty folk representations of religious personages carved of wood, painted on plaster, and printed. The santos are from the Smithsonian's collections of religious folk art from New Mexico, Puerto Rico, Guatemala, Ecuador, Bolivia and Brazil and range in date from late 18th century to the present. Different sections are devoted to the images of Jesus, St. Anthony of Padua, Mary and Women of Faith. The Renwick Gallery, through April 14.

Sunday, 17.—Traditional Irish festivities: Folk songs, ancient tales, poetry, music and dances of Ireland performed by members of the Irish-American community of Washington. Francis X. Gannon discusses the myths, legends, history and culture of Ireland. 11 a.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. \$2 general, \$1 Associates. Call 381-5157 for details. Planned for children.

Oriental rug lecture: *Turkish and Turkoman Rugs*, by Anthony Landreau, Director, Textile Museum. 11 a.m. See March 10 for series details.

Band concert: *Port Authority*, the nine-piece rock/soul band of the U.S. Navy Band. 3 p.m., Anacostia Neighborhood Museum.

Sunday shorts: *Fatal Glass of Beer*, W. C. Fields, *Chakra*, Jordan Belson; *French Lunch*, Nell Cox; *Running, Standing, and Jumping Film*, Richard Lester; *Entr'Acte*, Rene Clair; *Navaho Rain Chant*, Susan Dyal; *Captain Mom*, Chuck Menville and Les Jensen. Short films selected for both teenagers and adults. 3 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. \$1.25 general, \$1 students \$1.75 Associates. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associates Program. For ticket information call 381-5157.

Jazz heritage concert: Carmen McRae, one of the great women jazz vocalists, in concert. 8 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$4.50 general, \$3.50 students and senior citizens, \$4 Associates. Sponsored by the Divisions of Performing Arts and Musical Instruments. For reservations call 381-5395. A FREE workshop/demonstration is also scheduled for 4:30 p.m. The evening program will be broadcast live over National Public Radio.

Monday, 18.—London profile: A seminar on the diverse, historic architecture of London, with W. R. Dalzell, one of England's foremost architectural historians. Subjects are: *Roman Londinium and Medieval London to the Tudors; 17th century London, the London of Wren and Pepys; 18 century London; and Regency and Victorian London*. 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. \$20 general, \$5 Associates. For ticket information call 381-5157.

Tuesday, 19.—Giants of architecture: The works of Paul Rudolph, discussed by architect. 8:10 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$8 general, \$6 Associates. For ticket information call 381-5157. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program.

Illustrated lecture: *John Gellatly: The Collector and the Man of Mystery*, by Robert Tyler Davis, Special Assistant for the Collections at NCFA. Besides the man himself, Mr. Tyler will discuss the 1600-object collection presented to the Smithsonian by John Gellatly—including the fine glass, furniture, porcelains, Renaissance jewelry and outstanding American paintings. Free. 12:30 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

Museum talk: *Mythology on Stamps*, by Reidar Norby, Associate Curator, Postal History. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Film: *Introduction to Analog Computers*. See March 5.

Wednesday, 20.—Lunchbox forum: *The Art and Sport of Boomerangs*, by Benjamin Ruhe, Art Information Officer, Smithsonian Institution. 12 noon, Room 449, Smithsonian Institution Castle Building.

Young people's festival of the arts: Instrumental and gospel music presented by the Bruce-Monroe Community School. 10 a.m., Anacostia Neighborhood Museum.

Free film theatre: *The Life and Times of Bertrand Russell*. A film profile of the great 20th century philosopher, including interviews with his contemporaries in the worlds of science, art and literature. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Creative screen: *The Shakers* (35 min.)—directed by award-winning filmmaker Tom Davenport and depicting the two remaining Shaker communities at Sabbathday Lake, Maine, and Canterbury, New Hampshire. 8 p.m., Grand Salon, The Renwick Gallery.

Beyond the planets: *Interacting Galaxies*, by Alan Toomre, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. See March 6 for further details.

Thursday, 21.—Free film theatre: *The Life and Times of Bertrand Russell*. Repeat. See March 20 for details.

Creative screen: *The Shakers* (see March 20) and *Shaker Dance* (10 Min.)—a dance interpretation of an early meeting of Shakers. 11 a.m., 12 noon, 1 p.m., and 2 p.m. The Renwick Gallery. Tours of the Shaker exhibit will be conducted following each program.

The cosmic connection: Dr. Richard Bendzen, Department of Astronomy, Boston University, discusses provocative questions concerning the other civilizations in the universe. 8 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associates. \$3 general, \$2 members. Call 381-5157.

Friday, 22.—Young people's festival of the arts: *Hart Junior High School—Band, Gospel Choir and Dance Group*, 10 a.m., Johnson Junior High School—Band, Concert Choir and Gospel Choir, 1:30 p.m. Anacostia Neighborhood Museum.

Saturday, 23.—Kite carnival: 8th Annual Kite Flying Competition co-sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associates Program and the National Park Service. 12 noon to 2 p.m. Washington Monument grounds, west

side. Kites must be constructed by entrants and must fly to be eligible. Awards will be given at 2:30 p.m. Raindate March 30—call 381-5157.

Sunday, 24—Young people's festival of the arts: Dance Program by local teenagers enrolled in Georgetown University's Upward Bound program. 3 p.m., Anacostia Neighborhood Museum.

An evening of baroque music and dance: Presented by the *Baroque Ensemble* of the Julliard School, directed by Albert Fuller, and the *Baroque Dance Ensemble* directed by Shirley Wynne. Program includes Scarlatti's *Salve Regina* and the final entree of Rameau's *Les Indes Galantes*. 8:30 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$3.50 general, \$1 students and senior citizens, \$3 Associates. Sponsored by the Division of Performing Arts and Musical Instruments. For reservations call 381-5395.

Monday, 25—Audubon lecture: *The Living Jungle*. Greg McMillan, Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, will present his film showing the cycle of survival and death, continuation and growth of the tropical wilderness. Co-sponsored by the Audubon Naturalist Society and the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program. 5:30 and 8:30 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$2.50 general, \$1.50 members; children \$1.50 and \$1. For ticket information call 381-5157.

Tuesday, 26—Museum talk: *Rebuilding an Early American Printing Press in the Smithsonian*. Speaker: Elizabeth M. Harris, Associate Curator, Printing and Graphic Arts. 12:30 p.m., Room B-1048 History and Technology Building.

Giants of architecture: The work of Moshe Safdie discussed by the architect. 8:10 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$8 general, \$6 Associates. Call 381-5157 for further information.

Wednesday, 27—Free film theatre: *Shaw and Women*—George Bernard Shaw as seen through one of his favorite themes—in his life and in his plays. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Beyond the planets: *The Local Group*—a lecture by Vera Rubin, Carnegie Institute of Washington. 7:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. See March 6 for further details.

Thursday, 28—Free film theatre: *Shaw and Women*. Repeat. See March 27 for details.

National Capital Shell Club: Monthly meeting and program. 8 p.m. Room 43, Natural History Building. The public is invited to attend.

Young people's festival of the arts: *We Shall Overcome*. Presented by Draper Elementary School. 10 a.m., Anacostia Neighborhood Museum.

Luncheon talk: *Michael Collins*, Director, National Air and Space Museum, will discuss the collections, history and activity of the museum. Introduction by David Chalmers, Smithsonian Assistant Secretary for Science. Sponsored by the Resident Associate Program. \$12.50 general, \$11.50 members. Cocktails and buffet included. Call 381-5157 for ticket information.

Film: *Introduction to Analog Computers*. Repeat. See March 5 for details.

Sunday, 31—Concert: American Music performed by pianist Michael Boriskin. Program includes selections of nearly a 100-year period. Among the diverse styles represented are those of George Gershwin, Scott Joplin, Roy Harris, and Louis Moreau Gottschalk, America's first prominent composer for piano. 2 p.m. Lincoln Gallery, National Collection of Fine Arts.

Oriental rug lecture: *Caucasian and Persian Rugs*. Speaker, Harold Keshishian, distinguished Oriental rug merchant. His talk will include how to recognize designs from

specific areas and how to distinguish quality. 11 a.m. See March 10 for details.

Young people's festival of the arts: *The Young, Gifted and Black*—a program of poetry, dance and gospel singing presented by Mrs. Ambrosia Shepherd of the People's Poets, Mrs. Joan Hillsman and Mrs. Doris Thomas. 4 p.m. Anacostia Neighborhood Museum.

Sunday shorts: *Let There Be Light*, light and sound presentation by the Lumia Company. 3 p.m. Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Resident Associates. \$1.25 general, \$1 students, \$.75 members. Call 381-5157 for information.

PINOCCHIO

Smithsonian Puppet Theatre

The popular fantasy performed with music in commedia style by Allan Stevens and Company, using 15 rod puppets and four puppeteers. The new production was created by Allan Stevens and Vera Hughes, and is presented by the Division of Performing Arts. Wednesday through Friday, 10:30 and 11:30; Saturday and Sunday, 11 a.m., 12:30 and 2:30 p.m. Admission—\$1.25. Discounts are available for groups or members of the Smithsonian Associates. Arts and Industries Building. Call 381-5395 for reservations.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Museum of History and Technology

Spinning and Weaving—Tuesday through Thursday, 10 a.m.—2 p.m. 1st floor, and Sunday, Feb. 10 and 24, 1—4 p.m.

Printing and Typefounding: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, 2—4 p.m., 3rd floor.

Musical Instruments. A selection of 18th and 19th century instruments, and American folk instruments, Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor, 1:30 p.m., Mondays and Fridays—keyboard; Wednesdays—lute and guitar; Thursdays—folk.

RADIO SMITHSONIAN

Radio Smithsonian, a program of music and conversation growing out of the Institution's many activities, is broadcast every Sunday on WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9—9:30 p.m. The program schedule for March:

3rd—*String Bands: Two Traditions*. Old-time mountain music, performed by Creed, Cockerham, and Patterson, and Louisiana Cajun music, played by the Balfa Brothers.

10th—*Anthropology for Today*. Dr. Sam Stanley, Program Coordinator for the Smithsonian's Center for the Study of Man, describes how the Center works on current human problems. *Pacific Northwest Art*. A lively and diverse art scene, explored by Rachael Griffin of the Portland Art Museum and Dr. Martha Kingsbury of the University of Washington.

17th—*Concert*, featuring harpsichord and organ works of Bach, performed by James Weaver.

24th—*A Conversation with Barry Commoner*.

31st—*Looking at Television*. A British perspective on the uses of television, with Huw Wheldon, Managing Director of the BBC.

MUSEUM TOURS

Museum of History and Technology

Highlights: Weekdays, 10:30 and 11:30 a.m., 1:30 p.m. Weekends, 10:30 a.m., 12 noon, 1:30 and 3 p.m.

First Ladies' Gowns: Monday—Friday, 10:30 and 11:30 a.m.

200 Years of Needlework: Tuesdays only, 10:15 a.m. Begins at the Star Spangled Banner exhibit.

Ceramics and Glass: Highlights of the Smithsonian collections. 3rd floor, Ceramics Hall entrance. Tuesdays and Fridays 10:15 a.m. Other days by appointment—call 381-5030.

Museum of Natural History

Highlights: Weekdays, 10:30 a.m., 12 noon (noon tour may be delayed)

Renwick Gallery

The Smithsonian's design and crafts museum: Shaker furniture exhibition—tours for groups of 10 or more, on a pre-arranged basis. Through April 7. Call 381-6541 for scheduling.

HOURS

Open 7 days a week

Arts and Industries Building, Freer Gallery of Art, National Collection of Fine Arts, National Air and Space Museum, National Museum of History and Technology, National Museum of Natural History, National Portrait Gallery, The Renwick Gallery, Smithsonian Institution Building—10 a.m.—5:30 p.m.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum—10 a.m.—6 p.m. Monday through Friday; 1—6 p.m. weekends.

National Zoo Buildings—9 a.m.—4:30 p.m. Dial-A-Museum—737-8811 for daily announcements on new exhibits and special events.

Dial-A-Phenomenon—737-8855 for weekly announcements on stars, planets and worldwide occurrences of short-lived natural phenomena.

EXPERIMENTARIUM

National Air and Space Museum

New Born Babe—a demonstration show that introduces the spacearium concept. Included in the program is a simulated Apollo launch, a look at the different colors of stars, a description of pulsars and an imaginary closeup look at a quasar on the edge of the universe. Tuesdays through Fridays 4:30 p.m.; Saturdays and Sundays, 11 a.m., 12 noon, 2:30, 3:30 and 4:30 p.m.

REHABILITATION MEDICINE FILMS & LECTURE

Shown each Friday at 12:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium, in connection with the current exhibition: *Triumphing Over Disability*—200 years of Rehabilitation Medicine in the United States.

March 1—*Second Chance*, Washington Heart; *Harlem Hospital Center*, Columbia University; and *Lights Out—No Sound*, Schmidler.

March 8—*Wonder Engine of the Body*, Washington Heart; *Heart to Heart*, Washington Heart; and *The Person Within*, Clark School for the Deaf.

March 15—*Modern Medicine Looks at the Heart*, Washington Heart; *Day Hospital (Home for Supper)*, Burke Rehabilitation; and *Everything but Hear*, Clark School for the Deaf.

March 22—*Within Our Grasp*, Veterans Administration; *What Goes Up . . .*, Washington Heart; and *Smoking and Heart Disease*, Washington Heart.

March 29—*Arteriosclerosis*, Washington Heart; *Smokescreen*, Washington Heart; *Kevin is Four*, Ohio State; and *So They May Walk*, by Sister Kenny Institute.

RENEWAL OF SCHOOL OPERATING MILLAGE PROPOSITION

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, this year, perhaps more than most, the individual participation of voters in questions of local, State, and Federal government is

crucial. Apathy on the part of citizens can only mean a less representative, less accountable government. For this reason, I am urging my constituents to participate in the vote in Detroit on March 19 on renewal of school operating millage proposition. The text of my message follows:

Your vote is your direct weapon of control over matters of the highest importance to you and your family.

Too often, many people overlook a special election, even though it involves questions which are critical. On March 19th, Detroiters have an opportunity to vote on a key tax question, shown as Proposition A at the top of your ballot.

This vote has a direct effect on about one-third of your present city school taxes.

Use your voter power. Make your own decision on the method of financing Detroit schools. Be sure you vote on Tuesday, March 19 on Proposition A at the top of your ballot.

POST PINPOINTS PRIVACY PROBLEM

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, in recent years governmental encroachment on the individual's right of privacy has increasingly concerned all who value personal freedom. Although President Nixon has called personal privacy a "cardinal principle of American liberty," his administration has been guilty of numerous actions calculated to undermine that principle.

One of the most serious of these was Executive Order 11697. Issued early in 1973 by President Nixon, it authorized the Agriculture Department to examine the tax returns of America's 3 million farmers. Moreover, according to a Justice Department opinion, it was to serve as a model for future Executive orders opening up the tax returns of whole groups of citizens for inspection by other Federal agencies.

Congressman WILLIAM MOORHEAD, chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, which held hearings on this matter, and Congressman BILL ALEXANDER, a member of that subcommittee, both deserve commendation for pursuing this matter with diligence and perseverance during the congressional inquiry.

Considering the enormous potential for abuse of individual tax return information, I would like to commend Alan Emory for focusing public attention on the problem in his excellent article in yesterday's Washington Post. Mr. Emory is an outstanding reporter, and I believe that his coverage of this blatant Executive invasion of privacy ought to receive the widest possible circulation. I am therefore submitting it for publication in the RECORD along with a related editorial from the March 7 edition of the Watertown, N.Y., Daily Times.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1974] ADMINISTRATION ORDER PERILS PRIVACY OF TAX RETURNS

The Nixon administration has laid down a policy that could open the individual tax returns of almost every citizen to a broad range of federal departments. It runs contrary to the President's own policy of confidentiality of certain White House documents and conflicts with his new program designed to protect individual privacy.

The policy centers on an executive order, once modified, which President Nixon issued early in 1973, allowing the Agriculture Department to examine the tax returns of the country's 3 million farmers. At the time, there was no press announcement from the White House or the Agriculture Department. The order was published in the Federal Register, which, as one farm spokesman has observed, "is not everyday reading for the average farm family."

Don Paarlberg, director of agricultural economics for the department, says the order is "inoperative" but it is still in effect.

Mr. Nixon told a questioner at his Feb. 25 news conference that he thought the order should be considered by a new privacy committee headed by Vice President Ford.

Rep. Jerry Litton (D-Mo.), who discovered the order and held hearings on it, called it "strange" that Ford should be assigned to determine whether Mr. Nixon's action had been proper.

The real impact of the Nixon order is contained in an advisory opinion written by Assistant Attorney General Robert G. Dixon Jr., who says it was drawn up as a model so that tax returns could be used for statistical purposes by other federal agencies.

The order was "prepared by the Department of the Treasury . . . as a prototype for future tax-return inspection orders," Dixon said. This comment prompted Rep. Bill Alexander (D-Ark.) to observe that it constitutes a "frightening prospect that the administration is attempting to begin the process of making personal income information of whole classes of people available to various departments and agencies without regard to the private nature of the information."

Litton recalled that former Nixon aide John D. Ehrlichman had promoted a policy of making the Internal Revenue Service "more politically responsive" and wondered if the administration favored the order on farmers' returns because "if they could get away with that they could try another field later."

Actually, the IRS was dead set against the Nixon order all the way.

In a recent letter to Rep. William S. Moorhead (D-Pa.), chairman of a House Government Operations subcommittee that looked into the order, IRS Commissioner Donald C. Alexander declared that he insists his agency "guard the taxpayer's right of privacy."

He says he will not allow the Agriculture Department to obtain anything more than "a mailing list of names and addresses of farmers." The commissioner says he supports legislation to make tax returns "explicitly confidential" except for tax administration and enforcement.

Alexander says tax returns should be "confidential and private" unless Congress "clearly specifies" to the contrary.

The House Ways and Means Committee is preparing to hold hearings on legislation, sponsored by Reps. Litton, Alexander, Jack F. Kemp (R-N.Y.), and Barber B. Conable, Jr. (R., N.Y.), and others, designed to tighten the rules of privacy on individual tax returns.

The stand of IRS' Alexander puts him at odds with Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz, who twice rebuffed congressional requests to put the Nixon executive order in deep storage.

Butz says it is "essentially a matter of

judgment" whether his department's inspection of individual farmers' tax returns amounts to an "invasion of privacy."

"The list development procedure we have in mind is clearly in the public interest," he told Moorhead.

Coincidentally, when former Agriculture Secretary Clifford M. Hardin originally requested, in 1970, certain farm data that could be matched with the names of farm operators obtained from sources outside the IRS he said he specifically was not seeking an examination of individual tax records.

Butz told Moorhead last year "no employee" of his department would examine an individual return under the Nixon order's authority, but he refused to ask that the order be scrapped. He said, instead, that the "effectiveness of the security handling of data" by the staff of his Statistical Reporting Service "has not been challenged."

Paarlberg maintains the department never sought the tax-return inspection authority, but that Treasury and Justice Department reviews had broadened it.

"We understand the first order was designed as a model to be used by other departments," he said.

When Rep. Charles Thone, (R-Neb.), asked why the Agriculture Department could not obtain its statistics from the Census Bureau as authorized by the White House, Paarlberg replied, "We do not care which department they come from."

"I do very much," Thone snapped back.

Paarlberg said he was not sure whether the decision not to announce the order publicly had come in a phone call from the Treasury Department "or whether it came from the President's staff men." He had been in touch with both, but he did say he had not talked to indicted Nixon aides Ehrlichman and H. R. Haldeman.

When John W. Dean III was Mr. Nixon's counsel he recommended that the IRS zero in on political targets by making a requested audit "of a group of individuals having the same occupation."

Congressman Alexander says blanket authority to inspect individual tax returns of any group "clearly constitutes an invasion of the right of privacy of that group."

He raises the possibility that the Commerce Department might inspect returns of businessmen it deals with; those of homeowners getting Federal Housing Administration-insured loans; union members dealing with the Labor Department, and those of individuals receiving grants or aid from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In fact, in the first half of 1970 the IRS made available 14,000 tax returns to the Justice and Labor departments. Federal Communications and Securities and Exchange commissions, Federal Home Loan Bank, Renegotiation and National Labor Relations boards, Small Business and Social Security administrations and the old Post Office Department.

At one point Litton sponsored a bill to kill the Nixon order and allow the Agriculture Department just farmers' names and addresses. The department cold-shouldered the measure and refused comment.

After Litton introduced another bill to tighten IRS rules about who could see the returns, the department indicated an interest in the earlier legislation.

The congressman said he had asked why farm census funds were stricken from last year's budget and "I have yet to get an answer. The census form goes to every farmer. A tax return sampling would not be as complete. Either they need the information or they don't."

According to Litton, the question of farm information came up when George P. Shultz

was budget director in 1970, but nothing happened. Three years later the order was drafted at the Treasury Department, where Shultz was secretary.

Former IRS disclosure staff chief Donald O. Virdin, says there would be no problem giving Agriculture the names and addresses of farmers quickly "if that is all Agriculture wants."

Assistant Attorney General Dixon says the Justice Department was never asked to express a "policy judgment" on the Nixon order so it didn't.

IRS Commissioner Alexander says his agency is working toward a goal of "ensuring the confidentiality of federal tax return data."

Against a backdrop of IRS investigations of tax returns of White House "enemies" and the President's strong defense of confidentiality on White House documents and tapes, the continued existence of his 1973 executive order has Congress and the IRS worried.

The Paarlberg "inoperative" comment does not satisfy them.

Litton says he listened to President Nixon's State of the Union message and was surprised to hear "a man who proposed opening up 3 million tax returns talking about privacy."

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Mar. 7, 1974]

INVADING FARMERS' PRIVACY

More than a year ago, President Nixon issued an order, reportedly at the request of the Department of Agriculture, permitting the department to inspect the individual income tax returns of 3,000,000 farmers. Fortunately, reaction was so sharp that the department last fall temporarily abandoned its plan. Now into the picture enters Secretary Earl Butz. In his typically insensitive way, the secretary says that whether or not his department's inspection of returns is an invasion of privacy is "essentially a matter of judgment."

Americans who have always assumed that their income tax returns were matters between them and the Internal Revenue Service, and no one else, are learning from this governmental effort that such is not the case. Indeed, conflicting reports on how the executive order came about raises questions of intent and purpose. Furthermore, by the time the final draft of the order was ready, the Departments of Treasury and Justice had also played a role.

Apparently the Agriculture Department's Statistical Reporting Service wanted the names, address and gross income or product sales of farmers from the Internal Revenue Service in order to obtain better data. The order, it turns out, was to serve as a model for other agencies. Puzzling, however, is the statement by an Agriculture Department official that the department had never sought the authority to inspect income tax returns.

The author of a bill to tighten procedures to safeguard the privacy of income tax returns is right when he says that the Nixon order leaves a farmer's return an open book. Other peculiarities about this long episode relate to the way the order was presented and whose judgment was the more understanding and sympathetic.

Anything as important as the examination of 3,000,000 tax returns should be cause for complete and candid announcement where the public could see it. Official compliance came through publication in the Federal Register. But how many farmers have access to the Register? In fact, how many who are supposed to even read the Register?

As for genuine sensitivity, the one agency which has conducted itself with understanding has been the Internal Revenue Service. The Department has said it will not enforce the executive order. On the other hand, Sec-

retary Butz insists on infuriating and alienating the farmers by refusing to comply with a congressional request that the orders be shelved until a House Government Operations subcommittee completes its inquiry into this issue.

Finally, why would not the Census Bureau be the more appropriate agency to approach in obtaining the data the Agriculture Department wants? And if the statistics are so terribly vital, why shouldn't the administration support funds for a special farm census from which the desired information could be derived?

From inspecting farmers' returns, it is a short step to inspecting the tax details of businessmen and anyone else, no matter how he earns a living. This executive order should be scrapped immediately and legislation passed assuring that income tax returns are as confidential as Americans have been led to believe.

ARTICLE BY FORMER CONGRESSMAN HALE

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Robert Hale, a Member of this body from my State from 1943 to 1958, has written a lucid article for the January issue of the American Bar Association Journal on the problems encountered by foundations because of some of the provisions of the 1969 Tax Reform Act.

Mr. Hale, a distinguished member of the bar since 1914, argues that trying to understand the laws governing foundations is a bit like trying to fight one's way out of a jungle. Compliance, he says, represents a herculean task. Indeed, for some foundations, the struggle to comply may prove fatal.

In order to bring Mr. Hale's observations to the attention of my colleagues, I am inserting the full text of his article, "How Firm a Foundation?", in the Record at this point:

HOW FIRM A FOUNDATION?

(By Robert Hale)

John D. Hypothetical lived in the middle and latter part of the nineteenth century. He was a highly successful manufacturer and the founder of Hypothetical Corporation, whose principal plant and still is in the small city of Eastchester, population 15,000.

John died, leaving a widow, Mary, a benevolent lady concerned for the people in the city where her husband built his mill and his fortune. She in turn died in the 1890s, leaving an elaborate will that, among other things, established a trust fund "as a permanent foundation for educational purposes, including therein the fine arts, preferably but not necessarily in the City of Eastchester," the foundation to be a memorial to her late husband, the source of her fortune. The will also provided, wisely as it then seemed, that the trustees named thereunder might pay over any principal or income of the trust fund "to any corporation or persons organized or associated, to carry out the purposes of the trust."

So, in November, 1929, "the trustees, perhaps rather belatedly, organized Hypothetical Foundation under the applicable laws of the state relating to charitable corporations

and turned over to it the corpus of the trust fund then invested entirely in bonds having a face value of about \$130,000. By that time the trustees had admitted their trust to running a small public library in a large, ungainly frame building they had acquired on Eastchester's Main Street.

November, 1929, was not an easy time to start a new foundation, or anything else for that matter. The crash had come the previous month. The depression, which gave signs of slackening in the spring of 1930, got worse. It didn't really end until World War II pushed industry back into profitable activity. The foundation, like everyone else, had losses, but it pulled through. By 1944 it had about \$110,000 in bonds (almost as much as in 1929), and it had \$100,000 in stocks—quite a few of which were very blue, blue chips. By July, 1945, the assets were worth well over \$225,000. The increase in value was caused mostly by appreciation of the stocks but was also furthered by savings of \$5,000 to \$10,000 in good years. In 1950 and 1951 the directors, as they then were, spent \$80,000 remodeling the library building, now a distinguished structure. The assets reached \$880,000 by mid-1968. Since then they have gone off slightly, but the appraisal shows around \$840,000 at the end of 1972.

Up to this point we seem to have a success story. The trustees were not molested by anyone. There was at one time a question of taxation of the land by the city of Eastchester, but this was resolved in the foundation's favor. There was, of course, no federal taxation of any kind, and the trustees, up to 1939, could legally save and set aside as much money as they wished. Since World War II, under the influence of economic trends familiar to everyone, the trustees gave frequent salary increases to the staff of four women and a janitor. They also found enough extra money to make donations to local charitable organizations. They bought a house for the District Nursing Association. They built bleachers in the school gymnasium. They helped the Boy Scouts. They contributed to the local society of art, the local symphony orchestra, and the local children's theater. They contributed heavily to an educational television station. These donations were welcomed and encouraged other charities to solicit aid.

Is there anything wrong with this picture? John D. Hypothetical's industrial achievement was a source of pride to everyone. He created thousands of jobs. His name is honored by his descendants and by generations of his successors in the industry. And Mary was a worthy helpmate.

The foundation solicited no contributions and received none, not wishing to mingle its testatrix's money with that of others. It abstained from any participation in politics. It loaned money to no one, engaged in no "deal-dealing." It behaved in all respects as a good foundation should. No one could accuse Mary Hypothetical of setting up a trust to evade federal income taxes. There were none at the time of her death and for some twenty years thereafter.

But in the 1950s Congress began to get jittery about foundations. Stories were circulated about the misdeeds of this one and that one. By this time, of course, there were foundation giants—Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Kresge, and many more—with assets aggregating billions and a potential to do almost unlimited good and obviously a corresponding potential to do great harm.

The Revenue Code of 1939 provided that foundations should be taxed on their "unrelated" business income (now Section 511) as defined in Sections 512 and 513. Section 501 and the notes thereto take up forty-four pages in one of the red books that comprise the United States Code Annotated. Any or-

ganization described in Section 501 (c) or (d) is tax exempt unless exemption is denied in Sections 502 or 503, which exclude from exemption "feeder organizations" and organizations that engage in prohibited transactions—of which there are many.

Section 504 of the 1939 code provided that exemption under 501 might be denied for the taxable year if "the amounts accumulated out of income during the taxable year or any prior taxable year and not paid out by the end of the taxable year" were (1) unreasonable in amount or duration to carry out the purpose which is the basis for exemption, or (2) were used to a substantial degree for purposes alien to those for which the foundation was created, or (3) were invested in such a manner as to jeopardize its purposes.

CONGRESS OVERHAULS FOUNDATION LEGISLATION

Under the 1939 code, it was held that a foundation might accumulate to pay a debt, *Akron Clinic Foundation v. United States*, 226 F.Supp. 515 (N. D. Ohio 1964), but might not accumulate to increase its capital to an arbitrary figure of \$10 million, *Erie Endowment v. United States*, 202 F.Supp. 580 (W. D. Pa. 1961), affirmed 316 F.2d 151 (3d Cir. 1963), and that the test was whether the foundation had a concrete program for which it was accumulating, *Danforth Foundation v. United States*, 347 F.2d 673 (8th Cir. 1965). These decisions are now out of date. Anyone who wants to indulge his taste in this field of judicial literature may read *Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association v. United States*, 310 F.Supp. 320 (W. D. Okla. 1969), *Thompson v. United States*, 430 F.2d 388 (5th Cir. 1970), *Fides Publishers Association v. United States*, 263 F.Supp. 924 (N. D. Ind. 1967) and *United States v. Myra Foundation*, 382 F.2d 107 (8th Cir. 1967).

In 1969 Congress did a major overhaul of the foundation legislation, amending Sections 501, 502, and 503 and repealing Section 504. Section 501 now starts out blithely:

(a) An organization described in subsection (c) or (d) or section 401(a) shall be exempt from taxation under this subtitle unless such exemption is denied under section 502, or 503.

(b) An organization exempt from taxation under subsection (a) shall be subject to tax to the extent provided in parts II and III of this subchapter, but (notwithstanding Parts II and III of this subchapter) shall be considered an organization exempt from income taxes for the purpose of any law which refers to organizations exempt from income taxes.

All just as jolly as can be. But, when you plunge into the rain forest to find out what your tax position is, scarcely a ray of sunlight pierces the tropical verbiage. First it must be determined whether the foundation is a public foundation, a private foundation, or a private operating foundation. Section 509 defines a private foundation in about three hundred and fifty carefully, but not well-chosen words that principally explain what a private foundation is not.

Almost as succinctly the section defines "support" and "gross investment income." Section 512 defines "unrelated business taxable income", and Section 514 defines "debt financed property," "acquisition indebtedness," and so on.

Subsection 507(c) provides that the tax on a private foundation that has lost its status as a private foundation is the lower of: "(1) the amount which the private foundation substantiates by adequate records or other corroborating evidence as the aggregate tax benefit resulting from the section 501(c)(3) status of such foundation, or (2) the value of the net assets of such foundation." Is that clear?

After romping about in Sections 501 through 514 you should be strong enough to plunge ahead into Sections 4940 through 4948, which constitute Chapter 42, "Private Foundations." It is painfully clear from 4940 that the private foundation exempt from taxation under 501(a) has to pay a tax of 4 per cent on its net investment income. Private foundations not so exempt pay a tax equal to—

(1) the amount (if any) by which the sum of (A) the tax imposed under subsection (a) (computed as if such subsection applied to such private foundation for the taxable year) plus (B) the amount of the tax which would have been imposed under Section 511 for the taxable year if such private foundation had been exempt from tax under Section 501(a), exceeds (2) the tax imposed under subtitle A on such private foundation for the taxable year.

This language may prove readily intelligible to some readers, but it's not particularly lucid to this writer, who has met up with quite a few statutes in nearly sixty years of practice.

Under Section 4942, there is also a 15 per cent tax on "the undistributed income of a private foundation for any taxable year, which has not been distributed before the first day of the second (or any succeeding) taxable year following such taxable year." If this income isn't paid out at the close of the "correction period," there is a tax of 100 per cent on the undistributed income. Severe penalties attach to all violations of these statutes.

These provisions against accumulation manifest a hostility and an apprehension not displayed in the earlier enactments.

Getting back to Hypothetical Foundation, this writer questions whether, if the 1969 law had been in effect in 1929 and in subsequent years, the foundation could have run its library or survived at all. Certainly the possibility of running the library in the indefinite future is, to say the least, clouded. To be sure, if Hypothetical is determined to be a private operating foundation, instead of merely a private foundation, then the prospect brightens since the "operating" foundation is exempted from the Section 4942 tax. But to date, it has not been determined to be a private operating foundation and, particularly because it does not limit its charitable activity exclusively to the library, it cannot count on this determination. Furthermore, the distinction between a private foundation and private operating foundation is too finespun for a practical world. The Internal Revenue Service agents often confess themselves bewildered in making the distinction.

This is only a short sightseeing tour of the statutory foundation forest. It doesn't attempt to describe the strange, protectively colored beasts that hide in dark subsections everywhere.

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS SHOULD STICK TO CHARITY

Presumably the tax provisions above mentioned are not primarily for revenue but to make private foundations behave. Private foundations should stick to their charitable purposes and the government might well keep a stick in the closet for those who don't. But the highly punitive, not to say sadistic provisions against accumulations seems to me against the public interest if private charities are to be encouraged as used to be universally conceded.

It also seems to me that private foundations with an annual income of under, say, \$50,000, shouldn't have to file the burdensome disclosures exacted of foundation giants. The Form 990 family of returns that private foundations are required to file is so big, so diverse, and so complicated that only the most

highly initiated and sophisticated lawyers and accountants can hope to cope with them. Hypothetical's treasurer worked quite happily for years on a \$500 salary. He wouldn't be overpaid today at \$5,000 a year. In fact, he is now paying out thousands of Mary Hypothetical's money to hire accountants.

Behind the lush verbiage of the statutes, and the seven pages of Form 990FF may we not try to catch a glimpse of that benevolent nineteenth century testatrix and of scores of little children reading books in the library which her beneficence made possible? This country is deeply committed to the policy of having an educated citizenry. And a library has almost universally been regarded, both here and abroad, as an instrument of education. Would it not be well to preserve the libraries even if some foundations are now known or hereafter determined to be sinners? Surely after nearly two hundred years of encouraging philanthropy, we ought to turn against it.

The Forty-First American Assembly met at Harriman, New York, in November, 1972, to consider the future of foundations. Seventy-two participants, including many of great eminence and from all sections of the country, discussed "the rationale for foundations, their structure and operation." They produced a report containing seventeen recommendations of which I quote, in part, the twelfth and the fifteenth. The former recites:

"We question the soundness of the differences in tax incentives between foundations and other charities established by the 1969 tax legislation. The Treasury Department should collect data to permit an evaluation of the 1969 amendments on total philanthropic giving and on gifts to foundations as compared with gifts to other types of charitable organizations."

The fifteenth recommendation reads:

"The tax on foundation income reduces the flow of funds for charitable programs and represents an inappropriate diversion of philanthropic funds to the Government (over \$50 million in fiscal year 1972). The tax is unsound in principal and should be repealed."

These recommendations also embody the thinking of many excellent and knowledgeable citizens who testified at the Congressional hearings while the 1969 law was in committee.

I heartily endorse both these recommendations and respectfully suggest redrafts in other statutory areas to clarify the government's policy and the obligations of the foundations. Someone on the staff of the Ways and Means Committee should be able to do a little better. Verbosity is generally the enemy of lucidity. It scarcely seems cynical to say that the obscurity of some of the 1969 sections represents a calculated attempt to drive private foundations out of business from the almost insuperable difficulty of ascertaining what the law means, or what its effect is on any particular foundation.

CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 9

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1974, in Extensions of Remarks discussing the proposed Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, I outlined a few of the

corporate interlocks existing among directors of major domestic oil firms, other industrial entities, and financial institutions. I said that these numerous interlocks clearly suggest that these oil companies work cooperatively together, frustrating hopes of a genuinely competitive market system.

Today, an article appeared in the New York Times citing additional evidence of direct and indirect ties among the large petroleum corporations. The Times analysis makes clear the need for creation of a competitive impetus in the oil industry.

With this goal in mind, I have introduced legislation to establish a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. The legislation provides that no member of the board of directors of the Corporation would be allowed to participate in any types of direct or indirect interlocks, engage in any other business, have any financial interest in any business entity involved in the transportation of oil or natural gas, and avoid all contacts which may create an apparent or actual conflict of interest with its intended goals.

These provisions insure that the Oil and Gas Corporation would not become involved in interlocking and anticompetitive corporate relationships.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert as a part of the RECORD the article which appeared in today's issue of the New York Times:

TWENTY-FIVE ON BOARDS OF OIL COMPANIES ARE SCRUTINIZED IN FEDERAL ANTITRUST INQUIRIES

(By Richard D. Lyons)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—Federal officials and members of Congress have for the last three months been quietly investigating possible antitrust violations by business executives who simultaneously sit on the boards of directors of several oil companies.

The Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission are scrutinizing the directorship activities of at least 25 executives * * * have been identified as having contributed about a total of \$300,000 to President Nixon's re-election campaign.

Among the directors of two or more oil companies under scrutiny are John L. Loeb, Sr., New York investment banker; John D. Murchison, Houston oilman; Adm. Arleigh A. Burke of Washington, retired Chief of Naval Operations; Louis Marx Jr., New York businessman, and Benno C. Schmidt, managing partner of J. H. Whitney & Co., Wall Street investment firm.

At issue is whether the executives could possibly be violating part of the Clayton Act prohibiting interlocking corporate directorships. The point is that through such links behind-the-scenes deals might be made between the companies that could lessen competition and thus possibly increase prices of fuel to consumers.

The law states in part that no person at the same time shall be a director in any two or more corporations . . . so that the elimination of competition by agreement between them would constitute a violation of any of the provisions of any of the antitrust laws."

Federal officials say the * * * that they must allow interlocking directorships if the companies seat directors who are not United States citizens or residents, if the companies are not in direct geographic competition, and if the companies compete outside the United States but not in it.

For example, while it is obvious that two

gasoline stations next to each other are in competition, Federal law is not clear about two companies seeking the same oil lease in an area 5,000 miles from American territory two companies seeking the same oil lease in Gulf of Mexico but planning to market their refined products hundreds if not thousands of miles from each other.

CHARTERED IN CANADA

Many interlocks under investigation involve Americans sitting on the boards of directors of companies chartered in Canada, where antitrust laws are considerably looser than they are in the United States.

Aside from direct interlocks, a survey made public here this year found that the directors of the 18 largest American oil companies interlocked 132 times with the boards of banks and other financial institutions.

A direct interlock is one in which a person sits on the boards of two companies in the same industry. An indirect interlock is one in which a company, such as a bank, has on its board two persons who sit on the boards of companies in the same industry.

Proposals to tighten Federal law to prohibit both direct and indirect interlocks were made by the Department of Justice in the Johnson Administration. But these efforts have been stalled, according to department officials, by "a political climate favorable to big oil."

OVERHAUL OF ACT URGED

"Clayton needs an overhaul to determine what is permissible, but Justice has neither had the staff capability nor the clout with the White House to get the legislation to Congress," said one former departmental attorney.

Some of the executives whose activities are being examined have firmly denied possible violations of the antitrust laws, although one resigned one directorship when members of Congress questioned the propriety of his sitting on the boards of two oil companies.

He is George R. Brown of Houston, chairman of the board of Brown and Root, Inc., the huge engineering and construction company. Mr. Brown is a director of the Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, which controls the La Gloria Oil Company, and until November was a director of the Louisiana Land and Exploration Corporation, which is the 20th largest oil producing company in the United States.

In a letter to the special Senate Subcommittee on Integrated Oil Operations, Mr. Brown said, "I do not view L.L. & E. and Texas Eastern as being true competitors in the petroleum industry," and asserted that he was resigning his directorship of the former "to avoid any misunderstanding of my actions by anyone."

Mr. Schmidt, the J. H. Whitney partner, is a director of three oil and gas groups: Transco Companies, Inc., which is conducting exploration in the Gulf of Mexico; Global Marine, which has exploration properties in the Arctic, and the Freeport Minerals Company, which owns the Freeport Oil Company, which itself has production on the Gulf Coast and in Oklahoma.

CANADIAN ON THREE BOARDS

In testimony before the Senate subcommittee, Mr. Schmidt said, "There is no conflict between any of the above companies of which I am a director, and the impact of my 'interlocking directorates' on actual or potential restraint of competition in the petroleum industry is zero."

Marsh A. Cooper, a Toronto entrepreneur, sits on the boards of directors of the Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation (La Gloria Oil), the Home Oil Company, Ltd., and Canadian Superior Oil.

Asked in a telephone interview how many directorships he held in oil companies, Mr. Cooper said: "I don't know, I haven't counted lately." Asked if he considered it ethical to sit on more than one, he answered: "I have no comment whatsoever."

Mr. Marx, who helped found Pan Ocean Oil, sits on the boards of both that company and the Marline Oil Corporation. Mr. Marx declined comment on whether a conflict of interest was involved but said in a telephone interview that Pan Ocean was "primarily a global operation" while Marline operated mainly in the United States and Canada.

Vernon F. Neuhaus of Mission, Tex., sits on the boards of both Kirby Industries, which controls Kirby Petroleum and the Houston Natural Gas Corporation. Mr. Neuhaus said the two companies operated in different oil and gas fields, but added that "they are in competition for offshore leases" in the Gulf of Mexico.

F. Allen Calvert Jr. of Tulsa, Okla., directs the Calvert Exploration Company and is also a board member of Mapco, Inc. "I don't think we've ever run into one another on a deal," Mr. Calvert said. "Once or twice we've taken a deal too big for us to handle to Mapco, and if anything [between the two companies] comes up I don't vote."

A "WHISPERING INTEREST"

Willard M. Johnson of Houston is a director of the Austral Oil Company, which operates in eight states and Australia, and the Dixilyn Corporation, which has, as he put it, a "whispering interest" in production in the Gulf of Mexico.

Asked about dual directorships, Mr. Johnson said, "I think there may have been some abuse in the past, but if there is I don't see how it could apply to me." He explained that Dixilyn was primarily a drilling company and that the petroleum production it did have came as a result of drilling for other companies.

Mr. Loeb, the investment banker, sits on the boards of Dome Petroleum, Ltd., a Canadian company, and Distillers Corporation-Seagrams, Ltd., another Canadian company, which owns the Texas Pacific Oil Company.

Asked in a telephone interview if he thought the dual directorships might be either a violation of the Clayton Act or unethical, Mr. Loeb said, "No it never occurred to me."

John A. Crichton of Dallas sits on the boards of four petroleum companies: Dorchester Gas Producing, Clark Oil and Refining, Inlet Oil and Dallas Resources. He said in a telephone interview that he did not consider them to be in competition, and that he would resign "if they were in competition."

OWNER OF THREE COMPANIES

Franz Schneider of New York is a director of two companies mainly in the pipeline business, the El Paso Natural Gas Corporation and the Transco Corporation, but which also have subsidiaries that produce oil, as well as of Canadian export Oil and Gas, Ltd. He said in a telephone interview that since the three companies were geographically separated he considered his serving as a director neither illegal nor unethical.

H. Neil Mallon of Dallas serves on the boards of the Dorchester Gas Corporation and Scurry-Rainbow, Ltd., a Canadian company. Asked about the potential anticompetitive aspects of dual directorships, he said, "I haven't given it a thought, but I do not think it is unethical."

Perry R. Bass of Fort Worth owns three small oil companies and is a director of the Delhi International Oil Corporation. He said Delhi did business in Australia "and since I personally don't do business there there's no conflict of interest."

The head of Delhi is Mr. Murchison, the

Houston oilman, who is also a director of Hamilton Brothers Petroleum and Kirby Industries, which has as a subsidiary Kirby Petroleum.

Mr. Murchison said that he had heard that his dual directorships had come under scrutiny and that "it really tickled me." He said the companies had "a very small area of overlap, if any," because while Hamilton bids on offshore leases in the Gulf of Mexico, Kirby does not, and Delhi operates in Australia.

Alfred C. Glassel Jr. of Houston is president of an oil producing company and sits on the boards of the Transco Corporation and the El Paso Natural Gas Company, both of which have subsidiaries that produce oil.

Through his attorney, Mr. Glassel said he thought it perfectly legal and ethical to sit on the boards of directors of the companies.

T. B. Pickens Jr. of Amarillo, Tex., is chairman and a director of Mesa Petroleum and a director of Wainoco Oil, Ltd., of Calgary, Alberta. Mr. Pickens said, "I don't see any conflict of interest at all."

Clifford W. Michel of New York is a director of both the Cities Service Company and Dome Petroleum, Ltd., which, he said, "compete like hell in seeking leases." Mr. Michel said in a telephone interview that he saw no conflict of interest because, "in the case of Cities, I'm just one of 16 directors."

Dean A. McGee of Oklahoma City is chairman and a director of the Kerr-McGee Corporation, a major independent oil and gas company, and a director of the Oklahoma Natural Gas Company. Mr. McGee said through a corporation spokesman that he considered it "entirely legitimate and ethical" to serve on the boards of the two companies, since they are not in competition.

ADMIRAL BURKE'S VIEW

Admiral Burke sits on the boards of both Texaco and the Freeport Minerals Company, which controls the Freeport Oil Company. Admiral Burke said he has abstained from voting "on the few occasions when something comes up" that might involve both companies.

He said he would retire next month from the Texaco board and observed that "it's very difficult to get good people to become board members because they're catching hell all the time."

"If you're going to be investigated it's just no fun," he said.

Eight other executives who apparently sit on the boards of directors of more than one oil or gas company could not be reached for comment. They are included in lists of names compiled either by the Securities and Exchange Commission, Senator Adlai E. Stevenson, 3d, Democrat of Illinois, or Representative Bill Gunter, Democrat of Florida.

Four of these eight were out of the country on business or otherwise unreachable by telephone. Four others declined to return telephone inquiries regarding their directorships. They are:

Paul A. Conley of New York: the General American Oil Company of Texas and Pauley Petroleum, Inc.

Toddie Lee Wynne Jr. of Dallas: American Liberty Oil and the New Zealand Petroleum Company.

Horance A. Shepard of Cleveland: the Standard Oil Company of Ohio and the Diamond Shamrock Corporation.

Harry C. Hagerty of New York: the Amerada Hess Corporation and the W. R. Grace Company, which has two petroleum subsidiaries.

In discussing the problems of interlocking directorates, Representative Gunter said he was curious as to why there had been so little opposition from the stockholders of the companies involved.

"If I were a stockholder I would want to know how a director is fighting for my interest, but sitting on the board of another company," he said in an interview.

"A larger question that bothers me is whether or not in fact interlocking directorates stifle competition to one degree or another," Mr. Gunter continued. "If there is no meaningful competition in the oil and gas industry, then it follows there is inadequate incentive to provide the nation with the needed energy resources."

In a letter to Mr. Gunter last December, Thomas E. Kauper, Assistant Attorney general in charge of the Antitrust Division, said an investigation of interlocking directorates "is underway."

Yet sources here knowledgeable in antitrust matters said the Department of Justice had been making inquiries of only a few persons and had turned most of the investigation over to the Federal Trade Commission, which is expected to make public its findings this month.

In January the F.T.C. forced the Chrysler Corporation and the General Electric Company, which compete in the manufacture and sale of air conditioners, to remove Edmund W. Littlefield, who was a director of both companies. Mr. Littlefield is chairman of Utah International, Inc., of San Francisco.

The F.T.C. refused comment on its current efforts, but Lewis A. Engman, the commission's chairman, has said it is conducting a general investigation of interlocking directorates in several industries as well as oil.

Lawyers familiar with antitrust matters here say that in the last two decades there has been relatively little impetus to stimulate competition in the oil industry, in part because of the large numbers of Congressmen who come from oil-producing states and because of campaign contributions.

Representative Les Aspin, Democrat of Wisconsin, compiled a list this year showing that, as he put it, "413 individuals directly involved in the oil industry contributed over \$5.7-million to the President's war chest."

CONTRIBUTIONS LISTED

"People who give that kind of money to someone's political campaign are not doing it because they think he's a great guy—they want something, maybe personal, maybe something for their business," Mr. Aspin said. "The obvious implication here is that they want the President to be favorable toward the oil industry."

Those named by Mr. Aspin included Mr. Michel, said to have given \$2,000; Mr. McGee, \$4,000; Mr. Glassel, \$1,000; Mr. Loeb, \$109,000; Mr. Murchison, \$52,000; Mr. Bass, \$30,000; Mr. Wynne, \$50,000; Mr. Marx, \$8,000; Mr. Conley, \$1,000; Mr. Calvert, \$1,500; Mr. Pickens, \$1,000, and Mr. Shepard, \$550.

Common Cause, the self-styled citizens' lobby, has identified Mr. Brown of Brown & Root as having contributed \$9,889 to Mr. Nixon's campaign.

In addition to looking into direct interlocks, the Justice Department is also investigating the indirect interlock between oil companies and banks.

Earlier this year Angus McDonald, working for the Center for Science in the Public Interest here, published a report titled "Interlocking Oil: Big Oil Ties With Other Corporations," which said that banks and other financial concerns had 132 indirect interlocks with oil companies. In addition, there were 31 indirect interlocks with insurance companies. The center recommended that this be made illegal.

Dr. John W. Wilson, formerly chief of the Division of Economic Studies at the Federal Power Commission, said of the links to banks

that "this situation is a threat to effective competition among these petroleum companies not only because the interlocks create a commonality between their boards, but even more so because of the critical role of the financial community in providing the capital which will be needed to expand energy production to meet future needs."

"Simply put," he added, "vigorous economic competition would be better served if the same banks were not represented on the boards of rival oil companies."

LOSING A LOT OF FRIENDS

Proposals to stop both direct and indirect interlocks are coming at a time of increasing public and political pressure to reduce the economic power to the oil companies.

"When John Mitchell was Attorney General it was well understood that oil was not a highly favored subject for litigation," said one former lawyer at the Justice Department.

But he and other lawyers say the times may be changing as a reflection of the public mood. Said one: "The oil lobby is the largest and most powerful in Washington, but tighter legislation really has a chance because oil is losing a lot of friends on Capitol Hill."

A TRIBUTE TO JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, for 14 years, the congressional district across the Columbia River from my own Oregon district has been most ably represented by Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN of Cathlamet, Wash.

When I arrived in Washington in January 1965, I met Mrs. Hansen and soon found that her help and cooperation were invaluable.

She first added money to her Interior budget to start work on the Willamette Falls fish ladder. Each year thereafter until it was completed, she added necessary funds to the appropriations bill to permit continuation of the work. Today, we have an entire new supply of salmon and steelhead in the Willamette River system by reason of the passage now available at Willamette Falls.

This is just one of the specific contributions made by JULIA HANSEN to Oregon and to America in her 14 years in Congress.

She has actively promoted the construction of the Forest Sciences Laboratory at Oregon State University, the resurrection of Timberline Lodge, and numerous other people-oriented projects throughout Oregon.

Her devotion to the cause of reforestation and the wise management of our woods fiber resource has been a real beacon light in her career, and her dedication to necessary research is widely acknowledged by everyone.

Mrs. HANSEN had a total grasp of every small detail of every agency she funded. She has been relentless in ferreting out waste and mismanagement, and in in-

sisting on properly funding the necessities. She has had a particular interest and great knowledge of the problems of the American Indian, particularly in connection with their problems of health, education, and housing.

To say that her dedication and expertise will be missed is a real understatement.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN deserves the recognition of a grateful nation for her many accomplishments. She also richly deserves the comforts and rewards of a satisfying retirement.

As an Oregonian, I salute JULIA HANSEN and wish her well as she returns to her native Cathlamet.

KAKE IMPEACHMENT TELEVOTE

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, KAKE TV and Radio, Inc., of Wichita, Kans., has just completed a televote study of sentiment of Kansans on the question of impeachment of the President. Significantly, it should be pointed out that the KAKE televote has a record of accuracy which has been singled out by Congressional Quarterly.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the KAKE impeachment televote:

IMPEACHMENT TELEVOTE—MARCH 7, 1974

Several thousand double postal cards were mailed throughout the state Tuesday, February 26 (several days before the announcement of the grand jury indictments), to randomly-selected Kansans. The return of 40% shows the composite state vote on impeachment:

For—42%.

Against—52%.

Undecided—6%.

The western areas of the state voted most heavily against impeachment:

Northwest—34% for, 60% against.

Southwest—39% for, 56% against.

Areas of the state with a majority of the respondents voting for impeachment are in the east:

Southeast—49% for, 45% against.

Topeka—48% for, 46% against.

Wichita and Kansas City residents voted as follows:

Wichita—44% for, 51% against.

Kansas City—41% for, 53% against.

The central area of Kansas (excluding Wichita) voted:

Central—41% for, 52% against.

Northeast Kansans (excluding those in Kansas City and Topeka) were against impeachment:

Northeast—42% for, 54% against.

The remainder of votes in each area (ranging from 4% to 7%) were undecided.

Over the twelve years of its use, the KAKE Televote has predicted all general election winners within two to three percent of the actual vote. The closer the race, the more precise is the Televote prediction; i.e., the

1970 0.3% prediction of Governor Docking's re-election in a very tight race.

"TRAMPING TOGETHER"—REAFFIRMATION OF SOLIDARITY

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, in response to the negative national publicity that has recently burdened the image of the Virgin Islands, I would like to share the following editorial with my colleagues.

Henry U. Wheatley describes the "Tramp Together," a simple but vital gesture by the citizens of St. Thomas to emphasize that they form a unified community. This act is an affirmation of community confidence that says:

We recognize our problems, but we are united to solve them.

The determination of such a citizenry cannot be deterred by individuals who wish to convince it that it is in the grasp of a divisive and debilitating crisis.

The article follows:

[From the Daily News of the Virgin Islands, Mar. 1, 1974]

OVERVIEW: TRAMPING TOGETHER IS FOR US
(By Henry U. Wheatley)

It might make a difference to people living on the Mainland and elsewhere that a whole lot of Virgin Islanders are going to get together and tramp up the streets of St. Thomas. At least some who learn of this display of community friendliness will re-evaluate what they have heard about the racial climate of the Virgin Islands. If the "Tramp Together" does not have a significant effect in this way, it will be primarily because the public is more interested in bad news than in finding out that something good is going on somewhere.

The most important benefit to be derived from tramping together is the reaffirmation to ourselves, those of us who live right here, that our very diverse community includes large numbers of people who are committed to living together in harmony. Whether or not this message gets through to anyone is not nearly as meaningful.

To many people of all backgrounds have become despondent about the state of race relations in these Islands over the last two years. They have been frightened by the actions of some people, mostly young people, whose inability to find constructive and rewarding roles in our community have led them to vent their frustration in the context of race and place of origin. Unfortunately, when we accept the idea that this is a community divided along the lines of what color your skin is, where you were born, what language group your parents belonged to, and other similar superficial distinctions, we are also inclined to react passively to what seems to be an inevitable degradation in the quality of our relations with each other. If tramping together shows us that there are many, many of us who share the desire for a happy multi-racial society, that the possibility of strengthening such a society has not as yet eluded our abilities, it will be the most important thing we will do this year.

We must not tolerate the destruction of our community values by a troubled minor-

ity. It will be useful to show that minority how unrepresentative it is of the peoples of the Virgin Islands. It will also be good for us to take heart from the realization that there are enough—more of us than there are of them—that we can insist on and work for a community where everyone is treated decently, fairly—and where we have an obligation to do all we can to improve the quality of life for all Virgin Islanders.

We are going to tramp together. After that, first on the list of priorities should be a more sincere effort than has been made to date to bring those Virgin Islanders who have been left behind in the development of our economy into the mainstream of the progress that can be ours for years to come. That is going to take a lot of dedication and a lot of unselfishness, but those are the minimum dues payable for membership in a good community.

FERTILIZER AND FOOD

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the critical shortage of fertilizer and feed phosphates threatens not only thousands of American farmers, but virtually every consumer who will soon be facing higher prices at the supermarket if action is not taken immediately to ease the crisis.

Although farmers have been given top priority by the Federal Energy Office, the fertilizer and feed phosphate industries have not been given that priority for all their energy needs. This is the major reason for the shortages of these vital farm needs.

For this reason, I have introduced a resolution calling on all Government agencies which are responsible for establishing priorities for fertilizer and feed phosphate materials and facilities to give top priority to these essentials.

Twenty-three Congressmen have joined me in cosponsoring the resolution, demonstrating Capitol Hill's appreciation for the severity of this problem. These men, some of them representing urban districts, have united with me in calling on the Federal Energy Office, Federal Power Commission, Departments of Agriculture and Commerce and similar Federal and State agencies to give the highest priority to the production of fertilizer and feed phosphates.

I hope that the House will expedite the passage of this resolution to demonstrate its desire to solve immediately the fertilizer shortage.

The text of the resolution follows:

H. RES. 967

Mr. Findley (for himself, Mr. Abdnor, Mr. Andrews of North Dakota, Mr. Arends, Mr. Bauman, Mr. Burlison of Missouri, Mr. Carter, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Guyer, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Hutchinson, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Litton, Mr. McKay, Mr. Madigan, Mr. Mayne, Mr. Quie, Mr. Railsback, Mr. Scherle, Mr. Sebelius, Mr. Shoup, Mr. Shuster, Mr. Taylor of North Carolina, and Mr. Thone)

submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

RESOLUTION

Whereas a substantial amount of the 1974-1975 food and fiber supply for the world and the United States is either planted or about to be planted; and

Whereas nearly 30 per centum of the production of food and fiber in the United States is directly attributable to the application of fertilizer; and

Whereas the 1974 agricultural production goals of the United States cannot be achieved unless sufficient quantities of fertilizer are made available; and

Whereas the current productive capacity of the Nation's fertilizer industry is insufficient to meet existing and future demands; and

Whereas some of the current productive capacity of the Nation's fertilizer industry is being unrealized due to limited availabilities of natural gas and other liquid- and middle-distillate fuels; and

Whereas these factors are contributing to a supply of fertilizers this year short of what farmers want and need for application on increased acreage; and

Whereas such shortages are not only limiting the farmers' ability to produce food and fiber in 1974 at maximum levels, but also are contributing to further escalation of prices paid by farmers for fertilizer; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the House that—

(1) all agencies of the Federal Government, which have any responsibility for establishing priorities for the allocation of materials and facilities utilized in the production or distribution of fertilizer, give the highest priority to the fertilizer industry regarding the allocation of such materials and facilities. The fertilizer industry, in turn, is urged to do its utmost in making these essential fertilizer supplies available to farmers in a timely and equitable manner, and at reasonable price levels;

(2) the Federal Power Commission and appropriate State regulatory agencies do everything within their power, in the establishment of priorities for the allocation of natural gas (including gas sold under interruptible contracts) to insure producers of "synthetic anhydrous ammonia and defluorated phosphate" with supplies of natural gas sufficient to maintain maximum production levels;

(3) the Federal Energy Office include all of the energy and fuel requirements of the fertilizer industry—including local dealer requirements—in its highest priority category regarding allocation of gasoline, middle-distillates, and other liquid fuels utilized by this industry in the production, distribution, and application of fertilizer supplies;

(4) the Cost of Living Council and the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce continue their monitoring and reporting of fertilizer supply availabilities, wholesale and retail prices, and export shipments;

(5) the Cost of Living Council establish an investigatory program through the field offices of the Internal Revenue Service to monitor and analyze any reports of fertilizer price gouging at either wholesale or retail levels, and any changes in manufacturer marketing operations or relationships between manufacturers and local dealers and between local dealers and their customers which may affect continued availability or pricing of fertilizer supplies to farmers; and

(6) the manufacturers of phosphate acid give the highest priority to supplying such material to producers and users of feed phosphate, which is essential to livestock and poultry and to the production of meat, milk, and eggs.

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the names of a number of citizens of the Fifth District of Tennessee who have expressed their support for the President of the United States. As participants in the activities of the National Citizens' Committee for Fairness to the Presidency, they are exercising their right, indeed their duty, to speak out, to voice their views on the issues of concern to all of us.

I therefore submit for the RECORD the following: Mrs. Doug Underwood, Mrs. Jack K. Reese, Mrs. James A. Medley, Mrs. John W. Kendle, Mrs. Edwin B. Davie, Mrs. Edward L. Thackston, Mrs. L. D. Simms, Mrs. Elvin Woodroof, Mrs. Carl D. Prentice, Mrs. Ann R. Tuck, Mrs. Virginia Anderson, Mrs. Lew Crow, Mrs. R. J. Phillips, Mrs. James McLean, Mrs. Richard J. Martin, Mr. and Mrs. William H. Jarrett, Mr. and Mrs. Garrett Brundige, Lyla Mackey, Mr. and Mrs. S. Briggs Burkhalter, Beatrice Dale, Lucille Vickers, Frances S. Gunn, Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Bynum, Mrs. Wilma Inman, Mr. and Mrs. Lonzo Byars.

THE DEATH OF MR. BILLY DEWOLFE

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I join with the citizens of Quincy, Mass., in mourning the death of Mr. Billy DeWolfe. A man of immense talent in the area of entertainment, Mr. DeWolfe was born in Quincy and rose to international fame as a dancer, mimic, comic, and actor.

A man like Billy DeWolfe, who brought happiness to all of those who enjoyed his talents, will certainly be missed. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to submit for my distinguished colleagues, an article taken from the Quincy Patriot Ledger, a daily newspaper, which so aptly describes the sentiments of all those who experienced the warmth of Billy DeWolfe:

BILLY DEWOLFE

Each community takes a certain amount of pride in its home-grown celebrities, and so Quincy followed the wide-ranging career of comedian-entertainer Billy DeWolfe with more than casual interest.

William Andrew Jones grew up and went to school here, and began his climb in show business on a Quincy stage. As a high school boy he worked as an usher at the old Quincy Theater on Hancock Street, where his gifts for mimicry were discovered, and within eight months he was on the stage. He took the stage name Billy DeWolfe from the manager of the Quincy Theater and began his

career as a dancer in vaudeville, later turning to comedy.

He appeared in all the entertainment media—theaters and night clubs, films, radio, TV and recordings—and in several big-time hits. Mr. DeWolfe was a natural comedian with a gift for characterization drawn from his observations of persons he encountered, caricaturing without meanness the foibles of real people—like Mrs. Murgatroyd, his best-known character.

Mr. DeWolfe returned often to his native city and his friends here. To them, Mr. DeWolfe was agreeable and modest, always appreciative of the attention and kindnesses of others.

Billy DeWolfe died Tuesday in California, at the age of 67, and he will be coming home to be buried in Mt. Wollaston Cemetery.

OUR COOPERATIVE PRESIDENT

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to read in last week's Chicago Tribune that the President is anxious for "the cloud over the White House" to be removed, concerning the Watergate affair. I think my colleagues may be interested in the editorial from that newspaper:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 8, 1974]

OUR COOPERATIVE PRESIDENT

"At all times it had been my goal to have a complete disclosure of this whole situation," President Nixon told a press conference Wednesday evening, speaking of the durable Watergate scandals. "There can be no cloud over the White House. I want that cloud removed; that's one of the reasons we have cooperated as we have with the special prosecutor. We will also cooperate with the Rodino committee [the House Judiciary Committee]. The facts will come out."

The country can rejoice to hear these words from President Nixon. In response to earlier, lesser challenges, the President claimed executive privilege and separation of powers as a basis for being uncooperative with investigators. He said he was "going to fight like hell." He appeared determined to "tough it out." But now, faced with the Constitutionally defined processes for the consideration of impeachment, he acknowledges that even his high office is accountable in this ultimate forum.

More than that, he states that he wants "complete disclosure." In unequivocal terms, he says that in his earliest discussion of the Watergate scandals with his aides he took the position that the coverup was "wrong," and that at no time did he authorize clemency for or payment of money to any of the persons who committed Watergate crimes.

President Nixon's present course meets a long-standing need in the country for an accommodation among the different branches of the federal government on the Watergate issues and for Presidential action for disclosure of what occurred. At this most recent press conference, the President's more conciliatory approach was matched by his questioners. The questioning was vigorous and incisive, the rancorous disrespect painfully evident at some earlier meetings between the President and the press was mercifully absent.

The possibility of conflict between Congress and the executive is not wholly removed. President Nixon still seeks to define the nature of his responsiveness to the House Judiciary Committee, which may well seek more evidence than he has yet shown willingness to provide. But whether out of deference to the Constitutional processes involving consideration of impeachment, or out of recognition that defiance in the present context would increase his vulnerability to those who want to see him out of office before the end of his term, or both, President Nixon has moved a long way towards accommodation with Congress and the public.

Everyone who values public confidence in our national leadership and orderly teamwork between the different branches of government can only rejoice that this is so. There has been a cloud over the White House. Every patriot wants that cloud removed, tho not all patriots will agree on what is needed to do it. By stating and demonstrating a desire for cooperation with Congress and for disclosure of the facts, the President can help as no one else can.

VOTERS' ANGER

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, we are all amply aware of the generally low esteem with which the American people view their Government. Prices are rising, real income is declining, unemployment is increasing, there is an energy shortage, an environmental crisis, and a constitutional imbroglio. In all of these cases the Government has demonstrated a seeming inability to cope with the problem, and this has engendered in the people a crisis of confidence in the country's leadership.

I have received many letters from constituents enunciating this pervasive lack of confidence in the Government, and emphasizing that this extends to a complete dissatisfaction with the Congress.

The following letter, from Mr. and Mrs. Allan Martin of El Cerrito, Calif., is an example of the current voter anger at the seeming indecisiveness and weakness of the Congress. It is an anger which will evidence itself at the polls this fall.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. LEGISLATOR: As one of your constituents, and as one who has written to you previously I want to take this time to express my feelings about the actions of all of you, collectively, and individually.

First off, so you won't feel the need of reading further, My wife and I do not intend to vote for one single Incumbent. Now, I realize that this is not going to send fear through your veins, but I do intend to throw my support financially, and otherwise, to any one of the good individuals who will be running.

My dear Mother, God rest her Soul, had the habit of saying when she was frustrated, "I just feel like saying Damn!" I feel like saying much worse.

I hope that this will be some indication of the under current of sickening distrust surfacing among the great masses of the people.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. ALLAN A. MARTIN.

NORTH VIETNAM SHOULD ACCOUNT FOR AMERICANS STILL MISSING

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, with all the recent turmoil in the Middle East, it would seem that other world matters have taken precedence over the MIA's plight. The families of these men are desperately awaiting action by our Government to provide them with the news of their loved ones. It has been over a year since the prisoners of war started to return, and it seems long overdue that definitive action be taken to compel North Vietnam to comply with the agreement. Although this article from the Rapid City Journal is a few months old, I feel that it raises some very significant points:

[From the Rapid City Journal, Dec. 10, 1973]

NORTH VIETNAM SHOULD ACCOUNT FOR AMERICANS STILL MISSING

It has been almost 11 months since the United States signed the Paris Peace Conference agreement.

When the agreement was signed on Jan. 27, 1973, almost 2,000 Americans were missing in action or were being held as prisoners of war in Southeast Asia. Today more than two-thirds of these men are still missing and there has been no information of any kind concerning their fate.

Wives, parents and children of these men continue to be plagued with the question of whether any of these men are alive and in Communist hands.

Some of the men who are missing were known to be alive and in enemy hands at one time. Some were even photographed in captivity. Names of others who were captured were used in propaganda broadcasts. Yet when lists of those POW's who were to be repatriated and those who died in captivity were furnished to our government, more than 50 men previously identified as prisoners of war did not appear on either list. No information has since been provided about any of them.

In fact, less than four per cent of the 1,334 men listed as missing in action and never classified as POW's have been accounted for.

These men are either alive or dead. If alive they are still being held captive. If dead, why were they not among the 60 Americans Hanoi admitted died in captivity?

In the Paris Agreement, North Vietnam agreed to assume responsibility for the release and accounting of all missing and captured Americans. The agreement also stipulated that all parties would help each other to obtain information about the missing, determine location of graves of the dead and facilitate the exhumation and repatriation of remains of the dead. To date, no information about the missing men has been provided and not one body has been returned.

The return of American prisoners of war was one of the bright spots of the past year. But those who came home were few compared to those whose fate remains a mystery.

As the anniversary date of the Paris Conference nears, it is time for the American government to firmly demand an accounting from North Vietnam.

The 1,200 families who live in doubt deserve to have those doubts resolved.

After talking with the State Department about the status of the Joint

Casualty Resolution Center, I was informed that although the teams are in full readiness they have not conducted any missions since the December 15 ambush in which one American was killed. Currently the State Department is seeking through diplomatic channels to acquire permission for further missions and assurances of the safety of these men. I am encouraged that the North Vietnamese have allowed the recovery of 12 men who died in captivity and are planning to allow the recovery of another 11. However, much needs to be done.

Many Congressman, including myself, have introduced legislation that will prevent aid or accommodation with the North Vietnamese or Vietcong until all of the Paris Agreements have been fulfilled. Henry Kissinger has also stated that because of their noncompliance with the agreement the administration is not seeking aid for North Vietnam. I currently feel, however, that a new diplomatic initiative should be instigated to resolve the issue and answer questions of all Americans concerning the fate of our valient missing in action.

WOULD AFFECT US ALL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from a Maryland newspaper, the Towson Jeffersonian, accurately describes the difficult decisions facing Members serving in the 93d Congress. I hereby submit the article for the RECORD:

WOULD AFFECT US ALL

Your Congressman faces some tough decision making in the next few months when he will need to come to grips with the energy crisis, burgeoning inflation, and higher federal spending.

Key issues before Congress include wage-price controls, metric conversion, budgets and foreign trade.

One of the first items to be considered should be the immediate end to the wage-price straitjacket. Controls have failed to halt inflation. Instead, they have caused shortages and disruptions of industrial production. They have hindered foreign trade. They have lowered corporate spending for new manufacturing facilities, making business operations more expensive, which in turn costs people jobs and keeps prices high.

If Congress would lift certain price controls such as the ones on natural gas, industry could function better in finding the answers to the energy shortage in this nation. Industry could then explore new ways to find additional energy sources.

Congress should also pass the Budget Control Bill, which will provide better control of federal spending. The proposed bill would set firm and enforceable spending ceilings that will not be subject to haphazard or easy adjustment by big spenders.

Amendments should be made to the Occupational Safety Act so that certain restrictions are no longer such a burden to the small businessmen who are the bulwark of our economy and provide many jobs.

By acting now, Congress could provide the atmosphere in which industry could continue to provide the nation with the best possible standard of living.

THE MEDICARE AMENDMENTS OF 1974

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will fulfill a promise that Congress made to elderly and disabled Americans when it passed Medicare in 1965, the promise of comprehensive and coordinated health care services.

The Medicare program, as presently constituted, involves the payment of ever-increasing premiums, deductibles, and incomplete coverage. The result is that Medicare only pays 42 cents out of every dollar of health care expenses incurred by the elderly. In order to remedy these grave defects, I offer the "Medicare Amendments of 1974" for consideration.

Although this bill is long and complex, I would like to point out what I feel are its most vital provisions. First, the bill broadens the benefit package to meet the full range of medical services needed by older Americans. This includes such vital needs as hospital and nursing home care as well as eyeglasses, hearing aids, and dental care. Second, the bill extends the duration of those benefits which are limited under the present program. Third, the bill will reduce out-of-pocket personal health care expenditures and will do away entirely with premiums and deductibles. Catastrophic coverage is also included to prevent serious economic hardship if modest copayments rise to a significant level.

Mr. Speaker, a serious health care problem exists now for the Nation's older and disabled citizens. During fiscal 1972, 27 percent of the Nation's total health care expenditure of nearly \$72 billion was spent on the elderly, who represent only 10 percent of the population. And despite the fact that two-thirds of all personal health care spending for the elderly came from public funds, the total average out-of-pocket health care expenditure by those over age 65 was still more than twice that of persons under 65.

This situation is aggravated by the generally low incomes that the elderly and disabled receive. Thus, the rapid inflation in health costs during the past decade has hit hardest at those with the greatest need for health care and the least ability to pay.

The elderly and disabled need help now, not 10 years from now. The Medicare Amendments of 1974 provide the immediate help which is needed to those who need it most. It is a realistic step toward the objective of adequate health care for all, regardless of age or the ability to pay.

I include a detailed summary of the provisions of this bill in the RECORD:

MAJOR FEATURES OF THE MEDICARE AMENDMENTS OF 1974

I. PURPOSE

To improve and restructure the Medicare program so as to:

Provide health care benefits to all older Americans as a matter of entitlement;
Broaden the benefit package to meet the full range of medical services needed by older Americans;

Extend the duration of those benefits which are limited under the present program;

Reduce the out-of-pocket personal health care expenditures of those eligible for Medicare coverage;

Establish a program of income-related catastrophic protection;

Improve the administration of Medicare; and

Control increases in health care costs.

II. STRUCTURE

A single, integrated program of comprehensive health insurance for the aged and disabled, fully financed through social insurance taxes, comparable taxes on unearned income, and general revenues.

A single, expanded benefit structure (combining Parts A and B of Medicare) with a single trust fund. Requirements for premium payments and deductibles are eliminated. Co-insurance provisions are adjusted so that while persons who can afford to pay will do so up to a predetermined maximum level, cost will not be a deterrent to quality health care.

Provision under the expanded Medicare program of all care and services for the aged presently covered by the Medicaid program.

III. ENTITLEMENT

Extended to all persons 65 years of age or older regardless of insured status under the Social Security or Railroad Retirement cash benefit programs, so long as the individual is a citizen (or national) of the United States or a legal resident alien.

Allows all individuals presently covered under Medicare because of special circumstances (such as disability) the full benefits of the expanded program.

IV. REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Unlimited inpatient hospital coverage:

Includes pathology and radiology services;
Includes 150 days of care during a benefit period for a psychiatric inpatient undergoing active diagnosis or treatment of an emotional or mental disorder.

Unlimited outpatient hospital coverage.

Unlimited skilled nursing facility services with no requirement for prior hospitalization.

Unlimited intermediate care facility services, effective July 1, 1978.

Unlimited home health services with no requirement for prior hospitalization.

Certain services offered by public or non-profit private rehabilitation agencies or cen-

ters and public or non-profit private health agencies.

Unlimited physicians' services, including major surgery by a qualified specialist and certain psychiatric services.

Unlimited dental services.

Outpatient prescription drugs—including biologicals such as blood, immunizing agents, etc.—subject to certain limitations to insure quality control.

Medically necessary devices, appliances, equipment and supplies, such as: eyeglasses, hearing aids, prosthetic devices, walking aids. Also included are any items covered under present law.

Services of optometrists, podiatrists and chiropractors.

Diagnostic services of independent pathology laboratories and diagnostic and therapeutic radiology by independent radiology services.

Certain mental health day care services.

Ambulance and other emergency transportation services as well as non-emergency transportation services where essential because of difficulty of access.

Psychological services; physical, occupational or speech therapy; nutrition, health education and social services; and other supportive services.

Cost sharing

No periodic premium payments.
No deductibles.

Initial co-insurance payments (based upon type of service) are as follows:

Type of Service¹ and Co-insurance Payments²

1. Inpatient hospital services; \$5 per day.
2. Skilled nursing facility; \$2.50 per day.
3. Home health services; \$2. per visit.
4. Physicians' services; \$2. per visit.³
5. Dentist services; 20% of approved charge.⁴
6. Mental health day care; \$2. per day.
7. Diagnostic out-patient services of independent laboratory or of independent radiology services; 20% of approved charges.
8. Devices, appliances, equipment and supplies; 20% of approved charges.
9. Drugs; \$1 per each filling or refilling.
10. Ambulance services; 20% of approved charges.

VI. CATASTROPHIC PROTECTION

The co-insurance payments are subject to a catastrophic protection feature related to family income categories. Initial income ranges are as follows:

¹ Subject to statutory definition.

² Recomputed each year on formula cited in section 1824.

³ Payment for combined multivitamin in the case of surgery or obstetrical care would be 10% of approved charge.

⁴ No payment for oral examination and prophylaxis including fluoride application, X-rays and other preventive procedures.

Income class	Single individual	Family of 2	Family of 3	Family of 4 or more
1 ¹	0 to \$2,110	0 to \$2,730	0 to \$3,340	0 to \$4,280
2 ²	\$2,111 to \$3,160	\$2,731 to \$4,080	\$3,341 to \$4,460	\$4,281 to \$5,340
3	\$3,161 to \$4,740	\$4,081 to \$5,450	\$4,461 to \$5,570	\$5,341 to \$6,410
4	\$4,741 to \$6,330	\$5,451 to \$6,810	\$5,571 to \$6,980	\$6,411 to \$7,480
5	Above \$6,330	Above \$6,810	Above \$6,980	Above \$7,480

¹ Persons in income class 1 not subject to coinsurance.

² Persons in income classes 2 through 5 subject to nominal coinsurance payments (based on type of covered service) up to determined out-of-pocket expenditure limit for each income class.

Initial maximum liability limits are as follows:

Income class and out-of-pocket expenditure limit

1—no payment.

2—\$125.

3—\$250.

4—\$375.

5—6% of annual income or \$750 whichever is less.

Individual can claim out-of-pocket payments for the last quarter of the preceding year in calculating the annual out-of-pocket expenditure limit for the current year.

Any expenditures incurred for services furnished in excess of the coverage limit for certain psychiatric and skilled nursing facility services can be credited, along with coinsurance payments, in determining an individual's out-of-pocket expenditures.

NOTE.—Income ranges for the different income classes and out-of-pocket expenditure limits are subject to annual revision in accordance with the Consumer Price Index.

VII. REIMBURSEMENT POLICIES

Payments are made only to a "participating provider" (one that has filed a participation agreement with the Secretary of HEW) except for emergency services.

"Providers" include not only institutions but also independent practitioners and suppliers of drugs or medical appliances.

An institutional provider is treated as the provider of all institutional services to its patients.

Reimbursement to a participation institutional provider based upon a predetermined schedule of patient care charges.

Schedule of charges must be based on a system of accounting and cost analysis in conformity with prescribed standards.

Periodic interim payments will be made to institutions during the accounting year on the basis of cost projections, with final adjustments based on the approved schedule of charges.

Reimbursement for services of physicians, dentists, optometrists, podiatrists, chiropractors and other non-institutional services of licensed professional practitioners will be paid in accordance with annually predetermined fee schedules for their local areas.

Fee schedules will be established through negotiating among representatives of government, providers and consumer interests.

Final fee schedules to be established only after hearings.

Participating providers must agree to accept the Medicare payment (plus any co-insurance payment) as the full charge for their service.

The Secretary of HEW is required to make public for each local area the established fee schedules and the names, professional fields and business addresses of participating practitioners.

Payments to health maintenance organizations are retained as provided for in the 1972 Social Security Amendments.

The definition of HMO is broadened to include medical foundations.

VIII. FINANCING

A single trust fund will be established by merging the two trust funds under the present program.

A government contribution is authorized for whatever amount necessary to keep the Trust Fund solvent.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XXX

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a common and deadly misconception that the injuries and deaths attributable to handguns are chiefly the result of activity by criminals. In 1972, for example, two-thirds of all handgun shootings occurred during squabbles between close friends or family members. One such tragic example was reported in the March 11 edition of the Washington Post and is reprinted herewith:

WIFE CHARGED IN MAN'S DEATH

Thomas Edward Powell, a 24-year-old construction worker, was fatally shot yesterday during an argument at his home, 12605 Toby-

town Dr., Potomac, Montgomery County police said.

Police said that Powell apparently was shot during an argument with his wife, Pearl Augustus Powell. Mrs. Powell, 21, has been charged with murder.

During the argument, police said, Powell is alleged to have pulled a gun from under a bed and pointed it at his wife. Police said that according to accounts available a struggle followed and Powell was shot in the shoulder with the bullet entering the chest.

LINDA MILLINER GETS OVATION AT RECITAL

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article describing soprano Linda Milliner's debut recital.

Miss Milliner is a study in determination and courage: she has responded to her blindness by beautifully developing her vocal sense. She graduated from the New York Institute for the Blind, and subsequently attended Oberlin College and Howard University. During the past 7 years, this 24-year-old St. Thomian has studied voice with Mr. Emmory K. McIvor. The ovation at her recital is both an acknowledgment of her talent and the harbinger of a promising musical career. The article follows:

[From the Virgin Islands Post, Mar. 5, 1974]

LINDA MILLINER GETS OVATION AT RECITAL

Soprano Linda Milliner received an enthusiastic reception as she appeared in her debut recital Saturday night at the Charlotte Amalie High School auditorium under the sponsorship of the School of Creative Learning and the Volunteers for the Visually Handicapped.

Miss Milliner displayed her vocal talents in a varied and intricate program which ranged from selections by Bach, Handel, Schumann, Debussy, Strauss, and Verdi to Spirituals. In every selection she captivated the audience with her rich voice which has delighted teachers and critics and led to the prediction that she has a brilliant future as a soprano ahead of her.

Enthusiastic applause greeted every number and at the conclusion of the program the audience refused to end its ovation until Miss Milliner provided an encore. After the program she was congratulated by scores who went backstage to greet her.

The 24-year-old St. Thomas soprano who was graduated from the New York Institute for the Blind in 1968, attended Oberlin College and Howard University. She is also an accomplished pianist and organist. She has been studying voice for the past seven years and is currently being taught by Mr. Emmory K. McIvor, of the faculty of the School of Music of Howard University.

Miss Milliner was accompanied by Miss Carole Coles, a music teacher at Lockhart Elementary School. Miss Coles, who was also applauded for her superb performance on the piano, has a B.A. Degree in Music Education and taught music in Washington, D.C. before accepting a position here.

Proceeds from the concert will be used for the scholarship fund of the School of Creative Learning to provide instruction in the arts to underprivileged children, and for programs of the Volunteers for the Visually Handicapped.

THE BUYING PUBLIC NEEDS A FEDERAL CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in the March 4, 1974, issue of the Wall Street Journal, the Council on Economic Priorities endorsed the establishment of a Consumer Protection Agency. Citing its recent study on retailing, the council concluded that "Government agencies are not successfully protecting consumers." Consequently, the consumer is being shortchanged.

In examining the procedures of the FTC and the Consumer Product Safety Commission in relation to five chain stores, the council found:

Not only did Federal regulations cover only a narrow range of goods, but Federal enforcement of those regulations wasn't stringent.

Out of 214 cases initiated against these chains, only 32 were concluded by the FTC; 15 of these 32 cases were resolved in assurances of voluntary compliance. The remaining 182 cases were closed investigations which never resulted in a decision.

Referring to the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the council stated that:

Even though the agency can threaten violators with penalties of up to a year in jail and a \$50,000 fine, so far it has done little more than threaten.

The council's conclusions are further evidence of the crucial need for an agency which will truly have the interests of the consumer at heart. The Legislation and Military Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee has just reported a bill which would create such a Consumer Protection Agency. I am inserting this article as further documentation of the failure of existing Government agencies to properly protect the interests of the buying public:

PRIVATE STUDY OF FIVE RETAIL CHAINS CONCLUDES FTC, SAFETY PANEL DON'T PROTECT CONSUMERS

NEW YORK.—A study of retailing has concluded that government agencies aren't successfully protecting consumers and has thrown its support behind creating a new consumer protection agency.

The study was made by the Council on Economic Priorities, a private nonprofit watchdog group that tries to assess business response to broad social issues.

Its latest 35-page study covers such categories as children's sleepwear that aren't labeled flame-retardant, hazardous lawn mowers, power tools without double insulation, mattresses that aren't labeled flame-retardant, and dangerous toys. It also discussed computing finance charges for credit.

The five chains studied are Sears, Roebuck & Co., J. C. Penney Co., Marcor Inc.'s Montgomery Ward & Co. division, S. S. Kresge Co.'s K-mart division, and W. T. Grant Co.

The council study charged that the Federal Trade Commission has ineffectively enforced regulations against the five chains studied.

In 1973, it said, the FTC disclosed that of 214 cases initiated against the five chains, only 32 were concluded. "Fifteen of those 32 resulted in assurances of voluntary compliances. The other 182 cases were closed investigations, which never resulted in a decision," the study said.

"Not only did federal regulations of consumer products cover only a narrow range of goods," it said, "but federal enforcement of those regulations wasn't stringent."

The study treats the Consumer Product Safety Commission, created by Congress in 1972, in much the same fashion.

It says that even though the agency can threaten violators with penalties of up to a year in jail and a \$50,000 fine, "so far it has done little more than threaten." The study notes that the commission can enforce its standards by banning products that don't meet them.

In advocating a new consumer protection agency, the study says that of the five chains surveyed, only Montgomery Ward has supported both the concept of such an agency and congressional bills that might create one.

Spokesmen for the FTC and Consumer Product Safety Commission said they couldn't comment on the charges until they have seen the council's report.

The FTC spokesman said that in the past when it conducted investigations and didn't find any wrongdoing, it didn't make any public announcement. However, under new public information guidelines the FTC will reveal any investigation after they are completed.

A Consumer Product Safety Commission spokesman noted the agency has banned several products from the market including bicycles, ovens, and butane lighters that were deemed hazardous.

"Of course, we wouldn't be in a position to directly react to the report without having seen it," said Ronald A. Eisenberg, the commission's public affairs director. He added that the commission encourages the public to "follow our actions and criticize us if it disagrees with us."

In the study, Penney's led in both product safety and overall consumer-oriented lending practices. Sears Roebuck came in a close second in product safety.

The study said that K-mart had the weakest product-safety record, Grant had the next worst, and Montgomery Ward ranked in the middle.

It said, however, that Ward had the best record for labeling mattresses as flame-retardant and had the clearest credit agreement. It was in the middle range in safe toys and flame-retardant labeling of children's sleepwear.

It said Penney's was most cognizant of its responsibility to offer safe products in the lines surveyed, leading in offering the most children's sleepwear labeled flame-retardant, predominantly safe toys, and power lawn mowers with the most safety features. Penney's power tool selection was largely double insulated, the study said.

However, on mattress labeling for flame-retardancy, Penney's and Sears ranked worst.

A Penney's spokesman said that while labeling perhaps didn't pass, the quality of the mattresses wasn't questioned. It declined to label the flame-retardancy of the mattresses, he said, because when a law to that regard took effect, several bedding manufacturers had filed suit involving such information. It hasn't been resolved, he said.

The K-mart stores surveyed by the council didn't offer mattresses, but in each of the four other product categories this chain ranked worst.

A Kresge spokeswoman retorted that Kresge has been a leader in toy-safety improvements and that much of its children's

sleepwear is flame retardant, with required labels that meet government regulations.

Further, she said, lawn mowers sold in K-mart stores comply with the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute and American National Standard Institute's standards.

She added that in K-mart's private-label power tools, half the circular saws and all of the sander buffers, drills and saber saws are double insulated.

The study said Grant's offered a relatively safe selection of toys and that half its mattresses were inconspicuously labeled flame-retardant. In children's sleepwear, power lawn mowers and power tools, it ranked fourth.

A Grant's spokesman replied that the chain had anticipated the sleepwear-labeling law months before it took effect. On those items that weren't flame-retardant, a negative label was used, but all future purchases were labeled as flame-retardant according to regulations, he said.

Concerning the poor showing of power lawn mowers and power tools, the spokesman said Grant's quality control practices were good.

Sears Roebuck offered only double-insulated power tools, the report said. It ranked best in power tools and a close second in flame-retardant labeled children's sleepwear and offerings of power lawn mowers with many safety features.

NORRIS GREGORY NAMED BLACK MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Precinct Reporter, a weekly newspaper serving many of my constituents, announced the choice of San Bernardino City Councilman Norris P. Gregory, Jr., as Black Man of the Year. I congratulate Mr. Gregory on this latest honor in his already distinguished career, and I will be happy to convey to Mr. Gregory the congratulations and best wishes of our colleagues. The article in the Precinct Reporter reads as follows:

BLACK MAN-OF-THE-YEAR:

NORRIS P. GREGORY, JR.

The overwhelming choice for Black Man-of-the-Year from public poll results is Sixth Ward Councilman Norris P. Gregory, Jr. He is currently an announced candidate for the new 66th Assembly District Seat. A seven year veteran on the city council, Gregory left his position as an educator and administrator with the San Bernardino Unified School District to better serve his constituents and to devote time to his own business. He has consistently been an advocate for community, social and legislative progress within his area of influence.

Born on the army post at Fort Riley, Kansas, Gregory used a combination of part-time jobs and the G.I. Bill to graduate from Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas with a B.A. Degree in Sociology and minor course work in Education and Psychology. Gregory's post-graduate work has included completion of master's degree courses in Educational Psychology and additional studies at the University of California, Riverside and California State College at Los Angeles.

Gregory, in his councilmanic duties, serves upon the Ways and Means Committee and the Legislative Review Committee, in addition to his role as Chairman of the Council Personnel Committee. He is a mem-

ber of many civic clubs and serves upon the boards of directors of some of the most active organizations within the San Bernardino area.

Gregory, and his wife, Salena, reside at 1540 West Sixteenth Street in San Bernardino. The Gregorys' son, Norris III graduated from Harvard University and is currently employed in San Francisco.

Citizens of the inland empire congratulate Mr. Gregory and wish for him continued success.

JOHN D. WORTHINGTON ELECTED TO NEWSPAPER HALL OF FAME

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most prominent and civic minded families in Harford County, Md., which I have the honor to represent, is the Worthington family.

I am pleased to see that the Maryland-Delaware-D.C. Press Association at its recent winter convention has elected the late John D. Worthington to its "Newspaper Hall of Fame." Mr. Worthington served for 51 years as editor of the Aegis in Bel Air, Md., and was one of the most respected journalists in our State.

I am pleased to share the news of this well deserved recognition with the House, and I include at this point an article detailing the many accomplishments of this outstanding Maryland leader of journalism:

JOHN D. WORTHINGTON ELECTED TO MARYLAND NEWSPAPER HALL OF FAME

The late John D. Worthington, who for 51 years was editor and owner of The Aegis, was among four new journalists elected to the "Maryland Newspaper Hall of Fame" at last weekend's 65th winter convention of the Maryland-Delaware-D.C. Press Association held in Baltimore.

The induction ceremony will be held later this year at the University of Maryland's College of Journalism at a luncheon to be attended by Gov. Marvin Mandel and members of the inductees' families. Pictures of the four deceased newspaper men will be officially hung at the time.

Only nine journalists have been chosen for the honor in previous years and association rules require that in order to be eligible for consideration, a nominee must be deceased for a minimum of three years. A three member committee makes the selections and recommendations for approval by the association's membership.

Mr. Worthington was born in Bel Air on June 21, 1893 and died on Sept. 14, 1964.

In making the selection for the Hall of Fame, the committee released the following information on Mr. Worthington as reasons for their choice:

After attending Washington and Lee University, he became associated with his father in the publication of The Aegis in 1913 and remained owner and editor for 51 years except for a two year period of service in the U.S. Army during World War I.

Mr. Worthington was one of the pillars in the formation of the Md.-Del.-D.C. Press Association and served as its 12th president from 1932-34, before the president's term was limited to one year. At the March 10, 1962 winter convention in Annapolis he was presented an engraved plaque by association members which reads "Among Maryland's

Most Influential Publishers" and "Presented by his colleagues in commemoration of more than a half century's service."

When he began his newspaper career in 1913, he was a typical rural editor with a paper of less than 1,500 circulation; a plant with poor equipment; a handful of employees and financial troubles. At his death in 1964, he had provided those to follow with a great community institution; an ultra-modern offset printing plant; the latest and finest equipment available and a solid financial position with an ABC circulation of 14,500.

On Sept. 24, 1964 Md. Senate President William James said, "Harford County has lost a good citizen, but his legacy of good works is a foundation upon which we can build a better community to which he was completely dedicated."

His efforts and support of honest and progressive government in Harford county, through The Aegis, are still legendary and he editorially supported only those candidates of the utmost ability and integrity. He attracted the attention of numerous Md. governors and was asked and did serve, without pay, on many special commissions over the years. In political affairs he never sought a favor or gave one in his newspaper.

His support of finer public education was superb and twice he was asked to address the Maryland State Teachers convention because of his strong stands on education matters. He was devoted to better medical care for citizens of his native county and gave freely of his time and money to the expansion of Harford Memorial Hospital and served for years as its president.

Mr. Worthington was an authority and spoke out on agriculture matters of Maryland and was awarded the University of Maryland's outstanding man of agriculture award at the 1947 commencement. He was a national figure in the dairy industry.

He was a great American patriot and during his lifetime assisted in the promotion of those things which make for an informed and progressive people by his ardent work in the newspaper field. A man of firm convictions, he weighed carefully the facts and arguments on both sides of every controversial question and after making a decision, he stood firmly for what he believed to be right.

Many of his knowledgeable writings on government, politics, education, health and agriculture were reprinted in national publications.

His wife continues to reside in Bel Air, and The Aegis is now operated by his sons, Richard and John. His grandson John IV, has now become associated with the newspaper and represents the fourth generation of the family to be in the business.

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11500 is a crazy mixed up bill in which environmental extremists run wild at the expense of the energy this country needs. It seeks to abolish surface coal mining under the pretext of regulating it. In the process it swings a haymaker at farmers.

Example: H.R. 11500 requires mined land be returned to approximate original contour; the only exceptions are if it is to be used for industrial, commercial, residential or public facility purposes.

Agricultural use is not an exception. Any farmer who owns a rocky and

unproductive hillside can be assured that a benevolent Congress will see to it that after his land is mined, he gets back a rocky and unproductive hillside. Hurrah.

The farmer might want level land for forage crops or alfalfa. But H.R. 11500 will effectively protect him from this benefit while it also makes it tough for him to get the energy he needs to run his farm.

This is as crazy as trying to grow bananas on Pike's Peak.

Let us dump H.R. 11500 and get us a strip mine regulation bill that makes sense.

LEASING FEDERAL OIL LAND

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by Mr. Oscar E. Kiessling to insert into the Record an article written by him which appeared in the Washington Post on February 24, 1974. I, therefore, insert these remarks into the Record:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 24, 1974]

LEASING FEDERAL OIL LAND

(By Oscar Kiessling)

Responding to the need for increased oil supplies, the government recently has announced a stepped-up program for leasing federal oil lands. These are mainly in the continental shelves of the East, West and Gulf coasts. They have enormous reserves, according to the U.S. Geological Survey.

Up to the present, the economic impact of the present leasing system has received little attention. The time has come, however, to determine whether it functions adequately in the light of changing conditions and probable future needs. If modification is in order, it should be made before extensive new leases are negotiated for lands that have the bulk of the nation's total petroleum reserves.

The present leasing procedure is basically an auction in which potential developers submit cash bids for the right to explore and develop limited tracts. Developers pay hundreds of millions of dollars for this privilege without assurance of adequate return or, possibly, any at all. In addition to meeting high initial lease expense, they must finance deep-water drilling rigs which may cost up to \$50 million or more each, plus large capital outlays for operating expenses.

This arrangement generates a huge front-end financial load for what is a high-risk operation. Obviously, to survive, developers confine bids to tracts where success is most likely. Less attractive areas may not be explored owing to the great financial hazard although such areas ultimately might contribute substantial production if developed.

The present procedure does produce a one-shot surge of cash for the Treasury where it disappears quickly and forever into the giant maw of the current annual budget.

The serious business of obtaining much-needed oil production is not an area where we should continue big time roulette. The method of leasing should now be changed to reduce initial exploration costs, encourage maximum development, and produce longer-term and greater benefits for the nation. This can be done by eliminating cash-cost leases and substituting compensation on the basis of attained production. Thus, developers

would pay nothing down for the right to explore and develop, but would obtain this privilege through competitive bids on the percentage of attained output they would turn over to the government.

Oil delivered to the government can be handled readily in the public interest. Part of it (received at virtually no cost) could be refined into products needed by defense agencies—a big saving in what is now a sizable factor in all annual budgets. The remainder could be sold in the open market under a program aimed at stabilizing prices and keeping them at reasonable levels, thus benefiting consumers.

It is also likely that the aggregate return to the government under the proposed change would be materially greater than under the cash-lease method. This is because production from developed fields is generally much larger than the initial estimates of geologists, which are the basis for cash-lease bids under the present system.

Since oil development is a moderately long-term operation, benefits under the changed procedure would flow annually over a long period—possibly indefinitely as new areas on public lands are developed. This, by itself, gives the government an inflation hedge with regard to compensation ultimately received from leases. With inflation expected to continue indefinitely, for example, a barrel of oil delivered to the government in 1984 or 1994 should be much more valuable than cash paid to the Treasury in 1974, even if we kept it.

Clearly, the bonus cash-lease method is archaic and no longer compatible with current realities and future national needs. Delay in making the needed change would seriously impair our ability to win the struggle to become fully self-sufficient in oil.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 5, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to join my colleagues in expressing our respect, admiration, and warm feelings for our retiring colleague, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.

Congresswoman HANSEN has dedicated 37 years of service to the public, 14 in this Chamber. She has compiled an enviable record.

She has employed maximum effort on such national problems as transportation, energy conservation, and natural resource preservation. And this body will forever be in her debt for her concentrated efforts seeking equal rights for the American Indian.

Given these laudable activities, I want to single out JULIA HANSEN's work on House internal reform for special mention. It was the Hansen committee which reported recommendations that resulted in dozens of subcommittee chairmanships being opened to younger House Members.

The retirement of JULIA BUTLER HANSEN will cost the House one of its most valuable Members.

But I believe that we can look past our own feelings of loss to those hopes for a little rest and relaxation that JULIA expressed when she announced her retirement.

I am sure that each and every Member of the House wishes JULIA not only her well-deserved solitude but in addition we also hope her impending "civilian" life will be as productive as her many years of service to the American people.

THE DOORS SWING WIDE AT
PARK MANOR

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, Christmas is long since past but there is one event that occurred during the last holiday season that the people of Stamford, Conn., are still talking about and they will probably continue to do so for a long time to come.

Actually, I think it best I relate this event to my colleagues at this time long after the best aspects of the spirit of good fellowship have faded for its telling has that kind of quality which can rekindle that feeling, a feeling of brotherhood which should last all year around.

On the night of December 16, the State of Connecticut was hit by a severe snow and ice storm, the worst in many, many years. The resultant damage—especially as it related to utilities—left many people without heat, light, and running water. As is usually the case in instances of this nature, our elderly citizens are those hardest hit and this was the thought uppermost in the minds of Joan and Bill Fitzpatrick.

The Fitzpatricks operate Park Manor, a downtown Stamford hotel which specializes in the care of the elderly. Fortunately, the Park Manor and its 43 regular occupants were spared the worst effects of the storm and the Fitzpatricks decided to share this blessing with others. The word was passed to the residents of Stamford Manor, Pilgrim Towers, and the Quintard Center—all housing for the elderly—that the Park Manor would open its doors to those in need. As you can well imagine, Mr. Speaker, the response was overwhelming and within the next few days, more than 200 elderly residents were being housed at Park Manor.

Undaunted, the Fitzpatricks saw to it that everyone was well fed, made warm, provided with proper bedding and if that was not enough—entertainment was on hand.

The entire story is best told in a moving account written by Felicity Hoeffcker for the Stamford Weekly Mail and Shopper which I include in its entirety in the RECORD.

Before that, however, I would like to single out for special commendation some of those who were instrumental in making this act of charity the meaningful event it was.

First, of course, Joan and Bill Fitzpatrick and their children, Allison and Scott. Also, Margery Green, who was described as "invaluable" by someone who should know—Bill Fitzpatrick; and Nat Wasserman, Helen Ryba, Joan Scutelli,

former Mayor Julius Wilensky, Wilbur Parham, the Girl Scouts, and a singing group from New Canaan, the Lavender Blues.

All these people—and more—are worthy of the highest commendation for they not only know the true spirit of humanity but they put it into practice. Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

A CHRISTMAS CAROL 1973
(By Felicity Hoeffcker)

The true spirit of Christmas came through this past week in Stamford when two people opened up a shelter for two hundred refugees from the storm and showed others a wonderful example of human love and concern.

As everyone remembers only too well, the storm descended on Stamford Sunday night, December 16, and most people in Connecticut woke next morning to cold houses, no electricity, warmth, or water. On that dark Monday morning, when so many were filled with despair and were hanging over their transistor radios trying to get any word they could on the progress of the men working on the lines, a message came through from Stamford, from Joan and Bill Fitzpatrick who, together, run a hotel for the elderly, Park Manor, in the downtown area. The message informed all the elderly in the area that a warm place, with beds and food, was waiting for them if they could manage transportation to get there. On a cold bleak day, it was a very moving message. Someone obviously cared . . .

The big influx, according to Bill Fitzpatrick, came on Tuesday. It was Tuesday when the cars began to arrive. Stamford Manor and Pilgrim Towers, the Quintard Center, all housing for the elderly, were all without electricity and the police and the housing people started bringing in the residents.

"It was lucky Joanie had just been to the store," observes Bill, "We had enough food for everyone. Most of the rooms needed a little refreshing but that didn't take long. Our kids were wonderful. Allison, aged 12 and Scott, aged 11, made up 80 beds. As soon as anyone vacated a room, they were up there remaking the beds for the next occupants. We have 43 people here living regularly, but we had 200 extras all told. As soon as some people got up from the table, others sat down in their places. We had people doubled and tripled in rooms, many on couches and chairs. We cleared out the chapel and put mattresses down on the floor. It was nice and warm in there."

"Fortunately," breaks in Joan, "We had nice new clean sheets and pillowcases—flowered, too! One man said he wanted red, white and blue stripes! We borrowed 14 cots. We didn't have time to get to sleep ourselves, just lay on the floor for a few hours. We really didn't get any sleep for 40 hours."

"We had entertainment during the storm. Pilgrim Manor sent over a 20-piece orchestra they had scheduled for their place and they gave a two hour concert. There wasn't a night or day that something wasn't happening. We were really having a gay old time!"

"The Lavender Blues came over from New Canaan," adds Bill, "They are a singing group of young girls from New Canaan and they are really good!"

"The Mayor was fabulous. What a man! He is a really compassionate man. He came in on Wednesday and offered to help. I was so busy, I took him up on it and set him to stirring the soup and he went right to work—he had really meant it! He came back for the party Sunday and spoke to everyone individually. You would think it was before elections, not after!"

Perhaps the funniest story of the whole adventure and one which Bill enjoys telling, was the room mixup.

"I did my best to keep all the rooms straight," he says with a twinkle in his eye. "It was like a hotel though we really didn't have time to register them all. Two women from Pilgrim were in adjoining rooms, an open door between, left over from the days when this was a real hotel and parents wanted to be in touch with their children. Well, we thought one had moved out and we forgot the one left was a female, but anyway we moved a man into the other, and he was so delighted he went right up and went to bed. One woman went up later and found him and came rushing down the stairs calling "There is a man in my room!" The comments below were wonderful. Everyone was laughing. Some remarked "She's bundling again," and others "Get in there fast and lock the door before he escapes!" In any case, the man refused to budge and other rooms had to be found for the ladies."

"Bill was worried about the Christmas party," says Joan, "But he needn't have. It was a great success. We baked over three thousand cookies and people came in and offered to wait on tables. We had Nat Wasserman, Helen Ryba, and the Girl Scouts and Joan Scutelli and my parents, too. Bill did some entertaining by reading an account of the Twelve Days of Christmas in the form of pretended letters between us when we were courting."

"It wasn't original," says Bill quickly. "I had seen it in a magazine and then lost the copy so I wrote one out just like it only making the couple into us to make it more fun. I kept sending her all the presents listed and her final letter to me is from an attorney . . . Anyway the folks all loved it."

"Someone sent us a bottle of liquor but we gave it to our handyman, Wilbur Parham. He had been so wonderful all during the storm and he wasn't feeling too well himself, either."

By Friday the couches in the halls were vacated and Monday the last refugee had left. Many wanted to pay the Fitzpatricks for their time and trouble as well as the food and shelter but the couple would take nothing. Eventually they talked about the idea of putting money into a fund to help those who have trouble paying the very small amount charged at the Park Manor. And when were they going to get some rest themselves?

"Perhaps now," smiles Joan, red-eyed and pale. "But you know you don't really get tired when something like this happens. You just keep going. It seems God gives you strength when you need it."

Bill agrees, and adds: "It is just afterwards that the slump comes."

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON
THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OP-
PORTUNITY PROGRAM OF THE
DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINIS-
TRATION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled civil rights oversight hearings on March 18, 1974, room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building, at 10 a.m. in order to review the equal employment opportunity program of the Drug Enforcement Administration—DEA—of the Department of Justice.

Prior to implementation of the Reorganization Plan No. 2, the subcommittee received testimony on this subject from the various Federal drug agencies including the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the Bureau of Customs, and the Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement. Presently, the subcommittee wishes to review the equal employment opportunity program of the new agency to determine if equal opportunity remains a priority.

Appearing as witnesses will be Mr. John Bartels, Director of DEA, and Mr. Vincent Oliver, Deputy Personnel Officer at DEA.

Persons wishing to submit a statement for the record should address their request to House Judiciary Committee, 2137 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND FOREIGN MEDICAL GRADUATES

HON. ROBERT McCLODY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, it is most fortunate that the Office of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs is held by Alan A. Reich. Mr. Reich is a graduate of Dartmouth College, and exceedingly knowledgeable on the subject of educational and cultural exchange programs. Like many of my colleagues here in the Congress, and as is the case with every student who has enjoyed an overseas educational experience, the opportunity for learning and appreciating the language and culture of those from other parts of the world is most vital to the long-range goal of human understanding.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Reich delivered remarks recently before the 70th Annual Convention on Medical Education of the American Medical Association in Chicago. His talk entitled, "International Understanding and Foreign Medical Graduates," throws much-needed light on this particular area of educational interchange—and is backed up by factual information and some sound advice of significant value to all Americans.

In addition to congratulating Mr. Reich, I am attaching hereto the text of his remarks:

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING AND FOREIGN MEDICAL GRADUATES INTRODUCTION

International understanding is everybody's business. Foreign medical graduates in the United States, some 70,000 strong, are a potent force for furthering international understanding. The Department of State has a direct concern for FMG's and therefore I welcome the opportunity to speak to you on this important subject.

My remarks today will concern people-to-people communication in furthering international mutual understanding, the interest of the State Department, and the relevant problems of foreign medical graduates in the

United States. I shall offer several suggestions for further action.

Technological advances have made nuclear war a threat to mankind's existence. Fortunately, new initiatives and agreements in the disarmament field offer hope that the deadly cycle of weapons build-up may be broken. Prospects for increased government-to-government cooperation look better now than at any time since World War II. The great powers are now focusing not only on their differences but also on areas of common concern.

While technology has made nuclear annihilation possible, it also has sparked a revolution in communication and transportation which brings increasing numbers of people in all walks of life into direct, open, and immediate contact. International diplomacy, traditionally the task of men behind closed doors, has gone public. Many foreign offices no longer confine themselves to speaking with other foreign offices for peoples; they help and encourage their peoples to speak for themselves across national boundaries. People-to-people communication has become a dominant force in international relations throughout the world.

THE RELEVANCE OF NONOFFICIAL CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

The geometric increase in citizen involvement in world affairs has special significance for the diplomat. When people-to-people bonds and communications networks are fully developed, there will be a greater readiness to seek accommodation, and to negotiate. When people know and understand each other and appreciate their differences, the likelihood of confrontation diminishes, and prospects for peaceful solutions are enhanced. This rationale governs the interest of the State Department in the furtherance of meaningful people-to-people interchange.

In the past few years, social scientists have increasingly studied the relevance of informal non-governmental communications activities to matters of war and peace. Research scholars, such as Dr. Herbert Kelman at Harvard University, are developing a more scientific base for these transnational cross-cultural communications activities. Their research suggests that existence of informal communications tends to reduce the level of tension when conflicts of interest occur; they contribute to a climate of opinion in which conflicts may be negotiated more effectively. Second, their research indicates that informal relationships create a greater openness in individual attitudes toward other nations, peoples, and cultures; these predispositions lead to greater readiness to communicate and to resolve differences peaceably. Third, social scientists tell us that international cooperation and exchange contribute to world-mindedness and to an internationalist or global perspective on what otherwise might be viewed either as purely national or essentially alien problems. Finally, international people-to-people relationships help develop enduring networks of communication which cut across boundaries and reduce the likelihood of polarization along purely political or nationalist lines.

DEPARTMENT-SPONSORED EXCHANGES

When you think of the State Department's conduct of our international affairs, the exchange-of-persons program and people-to-people diplomacy do not come immediately to mind. It is, however, a significant activity of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs which works constantly to improve the climate for diplomacy and international cooperation. The exciting, challenging job of the Bureau is to utilize its modest funds and manpower to reinforce the work of American individuals and organizations who want to help construct, a little at a time, the foundation of better relationships with the rest of the world. It

also provides policy guidance, as necessary, for other government agencies with international exchange programs in substantive fields such as health, education, social welfare, transportation, agriculture, military training, and urban planning. The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs:

1. Helps present and potential opinion leaders and decision-makers to gain through first-hand experience more accurate perceptions and a deeper understanding of political, economic and cultural realities in each others' societies.

2. Encourages a wide variety of institutions, including the mass and specialized media, to strengthen their capacity to cultivate both an understanding of cultural, social, economic, and ideological differences and an awareness of similarities and interdependencies.

3. Helps develop transnational linkages based on shared intellectual, artistic, social, humanitarian, professional and economic concerns.

4. Helps to increase the quality and efficiency of intercultural dialogue by various means including strengthening the role of English as an international language.

The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs seeks through its own program to demonstrate the Department of State commitment to two-way communication and people-to-people diplomacy. This funded program includes the Fulbright-Hays academic exchange to and from the United States, bringing some 1,500 international visitors to the United States for orientation visits of several weeks duration, sending performing arts and athletic groups abroad, and sending professionals and scholars abroad for short lecture tours each year. The Bureau also seeks to stimulate and encourage non-governmental activities which further constructive people-to-people dialogue as a means of improving the climate for international understanding.

The interchange of doctors to and from the United States makes an important contribution. Foreign medical graduates in the United States are influential interpreters of our society and our way of life and help strengthen ties with their respective countries.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN MEDICAL GRADUATES

There are at present approximately 70,000 foreign medical graduates in the United States. They represent about one-fifth of all physician manpower in our country. Many Americans owe their lives and good health to foreign medical graduates. In some specialties the doctors from abroad represent more than half the total number. Roughly three-quarters of the total number are doctors who have immigrated to the United States. The remainder includes 8,000 exchange visitor physicians providing patient care, exchange visitors carrying out research or teaching, persons of distinguished merit or temporary workers, and American doctors who have trained abroad and returned to the United States to practice.

The exchange visitor physicians, including both those providing patient care and those conducting research or teaching, currently are coming to the United States at the rate of about 5,000 per year. They are admitted under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 for the purpose of furthering mutual understanding between the United States and their home countries. By returning to their homelands they enhance the appreciation and comprehension of American values and the American way of life as a means of improving the overall climate for cooperation between nations. This Act requires, with some exceptions, the physicians, along with the approximately 50,000 other "exchange visitors" coming to the

United States annually, to return to their home countries for a period of at least two years before applying for immigration to the United States. Waivers to permit them to remain in this country are granted only if the exchange visitor meets certain statutory requirements. The word "exchange" in the title of this program is not meant to imply equality of numbers of participants to and from the United States. It should connote the two-way exchange of ideas, impressions, sharing of experiences, and two-way communication between participants, whether American or foreign, and counterparts in the host countries.

There are three major problems relating to foreign medical graduates in the United States and the possible impact on international understanding. They are the so-called "brain drain" or loss of much-needed medical manpower in other countries to the United States; the failure of exchange visitor physicians to return to their home countries in fulfillment of the purpose of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act; and our failure to provide many foreign medical graduates in the United States with proper orientation, exposure to the American way of life, and meaningful cross-cultural experiences with Americans. I shall comment briefly on each of these problems.

As Dr. Thomas Dublin has pointed out, as many as 40,000 physicians may now be migrating annually from one country to another, and primarily from the less-developed to the more affluent countries. He further states the responsibility for this movement of physicians internationally must be borne both by the donor countries as well as by the recipient countries. Although they are aware of the problem, many countries of origin fail to provide adequate incentives to retain their doctors or to have them return following training abroad. We do not seek to entice medical manpower from other countries or to deprive them of this much-needed human resource. However, the United States, as well as some other advanced countries which have medical training facilities, pursues the policy of freedom of movement across national borders and therefore does not discriminate against doctors or any other groups who may choose to leave their countries. Countries of origin frequently do not prevent their doctors from leaving. In this situation, then, with the receiving country not opposing the entry of doctors and their own countries not providing adequate encouragement for them to practice at home, it is difficult to reduce the number of foreign physicians taking up attractive positions in the United States and other developed nations. I cannot deny that at times this problem creates embarrassment for the United States Government. We are cooperating with other concerned governments in an attempt to alleviate the problem.

The second problem concerns the exchange visitor program, which was not designed to fill the staffing needs of U.S. institutions. Nor was it intended to be used as a springboard for immigration to the United States. The program was designed to improve and strengthen the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding and two-way communication between Americans and other peoples of the world. During the four-year period, 1967-1970, approximately 20,000 physicians were admitted to the United States under this program. Roughly 2,300 physicians in this period obtained waivers of the two-year foreign residence requirement. This represents an 11% fallout among physicians as compared with only 3% of all exchange visitors. We consider the 11% rate high but not alarming.

In April 1970, however, the foreign residence requirement for non-government sponsored exchange visitors was relaxed and the fallout rate, especially among physicians,

increased dramatically. In 1972, in cooperation with other nations, we put into effect a "skills list," specifying skills critical to each country. Cooperative efforts between the United States and other nations in adhering to the "skills lists" requirements are expected to result in a sharp reduction in the number of adjustment cases. Hence, in the future most FMG's will be subject to the two-year foreign residence requirement upon completion of their programs.

The Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates should be commended for their work to help solve this problem. Their continuing efforts with the concerned medical organizations and hospital administrators and their computerized information program on the foreign medical exchange visitors are important elements in this process. The CFMG now maintains a continuing review of all exchange visitor physicians providing patient care in the United States. Prior to the development of this computerized program, very little hard statistical data was available.

The third problem affecting our relations with other countries has to do with the cross-cultural experience of the foreign medical graduates in the United States and their exposure to the American way of life and the American people. As important foreign nationals in our midst, doctors from other nations influence the ways in which we and other nations understand each other and relate to each other. I regret to say many foreign doctors in the United States are not receiving what we like to consider traditional American hospitality and friendly exposure to our way of life. Many of them never meet Americans outside the hospitals. Many of them never have an opportunity to visit in an American home and meet an American family in an informal setting. Many of them are not afforded the opportunity to participate in their respective professional conferences and meetings with American colleagues. Many of them do not have the opportunity to learn the English language as they would like and as they should. Frequently their wives receive little or no friendly attention from their American counterparts; many wives do not speak English and are bound to small, uncomfortable apartments day after day while their husbands are serving long hours in their hospitals. These doctors are serving Americans and, indeed, keeping them alive.

Yet, we show very little gratitude in many cases and the foreign medical graduates frequently feel alienated. This is a problem for which we all are accountable and which we all can help correct.

If they are not already doing so, I would urge concerned American organizations and individuals, in cooperation with the Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates, to undertake the following 10-point program:

1. Provide FMG's with opportunities for English-language training upon arrival in the United States.
2. Provide continuing English-language training opportunities for FMG's.
3. Provide orientations for FMG's on the hospital and the community.
4. Provide home hospitality and family stays for FMG's.
5. Invite FMG's to participate in cultural and educational activities in the local community.
6. Assist FMG's with administrative matters with which they may not be familiar, such as immigration and visa details, financial matters, and housing.
7. Invite FMG's to meetings and conferences of professional societies and ensure they receive appropriate medical journals.
8. Arrange for FMG's, as appropriate, to enrich the lives of American individuals and organizations who might benefit from the cross-cultural interchange and experiences these educated foreign nationals can offer.

9. Invite wives of FMG's to participate in the above opportunities as appropriate.
10. Provide for or arrange individual counseling services as necessary.

I realize in a number of communities such programs for foreign medical graduates are now underway. The Philadelphia Interned city-wide program and the St. John's Hospital program in Detroit are models for the nation. The National Council for Service to International Visitors (COSERV) in Baltimore and Cleveland have outstanding programs of this kind. In some communities YMCA's, Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs and women's groups have active programs. The Experiment in International Living has initiated English-language training and orientation activities for FMG's; the Institute of International Education has assisted with orientation programs; professional societies in a number of communities have shown leadership in these areas.

However, these efforts are not being carried out nationwide and are reaching only a small portion of these important individuals who are doing so much for us. Many other organizations could take an active role, both at the national and local levels, in carrying out such a program; they would include the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, national, state, and local medical society members and their wives, the binational societies headquartered in the United States, people-to-people organizations, the Association of Hospitals Directors of Medical Education, the American Association of Foreign Medical Graduates, the Student American Medical Association, the Physicians National House Staff Association, and the National Association of Residents and Interns.

There has been insufficient research and study of the FMG problems. More research should be directed to the international and cross-cultural implications of the problems of the foreign medical graduates. It would be of great benefit to the private and government organizations concerned.

We recognize there has been a lack of effective coordination between interested U.S. Government agencies and the medical community in identifying and coming to grips with the key problems affecting the foreign medical graduates. In an endeavor to improve government coordination on these matters, the relevant federal agencies (HEW, VA, INS, Department of Labor and the Department of State) should work more closely together. We are convening the first in a series of such meetings of these agencies next month.

I hope the American medical community, and especially the Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates will provide leadership in a coordinated private-public effort to resolve the FMG problems. The Department of State stands ready to cooperate.

I realize a number of these suggestions go beyond exchange visitors and physicians returning to their own countries. Nevertheless, all foreign medical graduates retain their ties to their home countries, and, aside from the consideration we owe these people who are serving us so well, they all are important to us in helping to build the human foundations of the structure of peace.

Thank you.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it was with sincere regret that I learned of my

friend and colleague, JULIA BUTLER HANSEN's decision to retire from Congress after having served an illustrious 37-year career in elected offices. I am especially grateful to JULIA for her years of helpful support and friendship to Hale, and I am personally indebted to her for the wise counsel and thoughtful consideration she has offered during my freshman year in Congress. I feel that her previous years of leadership and ability are certainly a model any Congressperson would do well following.

Having served her State and the Nation with dedication and sincerity, JULIA has compiled to her credit an outstanding list of legislative innovations. She was the first woman to hold a subcommittee chairmanship in either the House or Senate when she was selected in 1967 to head the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. In that capacity, she vigorously demonstrated her concern for the environment and emerged as an effective voice in establishing environmental protection safeguards and natural resources conservation measures.

Being both friend and colleague to JULIA has been a rewarding experience, and I know her presence will be greatly missed in the Halls of Congress. I want to wish her much happiness and success in any endeavor she chooses to pursue when she resumes her role as a private citizen.

TRIBUTE TO CHET HOLIFIELD—
CHAMPION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the retirement of our colleague, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD of the 19th District of California, is a great loss to the Congress, his district, State, and the Nation.

CHET HOLIFIELD is a giant among men, an able Congressman, a great chairman, a skilled legislator, and indeed, a statesman whose services in the Congress and to the Nation will be greatly missed.

CHET HOLIFIELD has served in the Congress for 32 years. He has served as chairman and is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and is a recognized authority on atomic energy and nuclear power—and he is the present chairman of the highly active and important Committee on Government Operations.

The able leadership which Congressman HOLIFIELD has provided in the application of nuclear energy, both for defense and for peacetime purposes, has resulted in significant advances in the development of nuclear power too numerous to be listed. For example, he is generally regarded as the father of the fast breeder reactor concept, including the liquid metal fast breeder reactor, among others, which is regarded currently by scientists as the best source of fuel for nuclear power because of the high efficiency this technology promises in the production of enriched uranium.

Congressman HOLIFIELD has authored much legislation in this general field, and as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, has been concerned with improving the efficiency of operation of our Federal Government.

He was a member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, often referred to as the Hoover Commission, and in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, put into effect numerous reorganizations recommended by the Commission to eliminate duplication and provide for more efficient career service in the Federal Government.

CHET HOLIFIELD, in addition to his great abilities and his brilliant mind, is also a wonderful person, a warm, genial individual with depth and understanding of people and of the Nation's problems, which is perhaps unparalleled in the House. He has consistently been a champion of the public interest, and in matters related to the development of atomic energy. He has worked to protect the public interest.

CHET has a wonderful family—his wife Cam serves as his efficient secretary and loyal companion.

CHET has often visited Oak Ridge, Tenn., where many of the Atomic Energy Commission facilities are located, in his capacity as chairman and member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He is highly regarded in Tennessee.

CHET HOLIFIELD will be missed in the House and certainly we all join in wishing for him and his family the very best of good luck and success as he contemplates his richly deserved retirement from the labors of Congress.

WLW-D TELEVISION: 25 YEARS
OF SERVICE

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note for the record that television station WLW-D in Dayton, Ohio, is now 25 years old.

The standard-bearer of Avco Broadcasting in our community, WLW-D has served the public well in presenting entertainment, sports, news, and public affairs programs. As the first licensed television station in Dayton, WLW-D is among the leaders in the Nation in the many other "firsts" it has achieved. It was, for example, the first television station in the country to sign a color telecasting agreement with the NBC television network, the first to televise live from a moving helicopter, and the first to present live telecasts of many kinds of sporting activities, including such unusual events as the National Air Show.

These are but a few of the commendable achievements of this highly responsible television station which means so much to the citizens of southwestern Ohio and the Dayton metropolitan area.

I am proud to number WLW-D as one of my constituents and extend my congratulations to the staff and management on this auspicious occasion.

WHY HERBERT O. REID DOESN'T
SERVE CHITLINS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, here in Washington, D.C., we have one of the Nation's outstanding law schools.

An existing new chapter to this law school's proud history is being written by its dynamic acting dean, Herbert O. Reid. Historically in the forefront of black legal education, Dean Reid is moving Howard Law School forcefully into the forefront of legal education in the United States, black or white. An interesting personality profile of Dean Reid appeared in a recent edition of *Judicature* magazine. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

WHY HERBERT O. REID DOESN'T SERVE
CHITLINS

(By Alice Lynn Booth)

"If we served chitlins every Saturday night, we'd offer our students something they couldn't get at Harvard," says Herbert O. Reid, the outspoken dean of Howard Law School in Washington, D.C. But he doesn't intend to do it.

"There is no black or white law," says Reid, a large, imposing man. "There is no chitlin law. There is one legal system. A lawyer is an advocate in that system and must train to articulate the needs and aspirations of a client of that system."

As acting dean of Howard, the only predominantly black law school that has won both approval from the American Bar Association and accreditation from the Association of American Law Schools, Reid has a philosophy that contrasts sharply with schools where courses on social problems are emphasized and where deans worry about the "cultural bias" of bar exams, Howard, says Herbert O. Reid, can't afford such luxuries.

I talked with Reid recently in his office in Washington, where he sat surrounded by stacks of papers and fidgeted with his Ben Franklin glasses. There is no room in Reid's life for the rhetoric so common today in discussions about the availability of a legal education to minority students. He insists that a classical, traditional legal education is best for his 470 students, roughly two-thirds of whom are black. He doesn't believe in coddling his students, excusing their failures, or offering a "black perspective" on the law.

"The black community needs an untrained lawyer like it needs a hole in the head," Reid told me. Black lawyers can't be merely qualified, he said; they must be more qualified. "It's still a reality of society that if you are black, you have to be better. The legal profession is highly competitive."

During the 1960s, Reid says, black students—like white ones—tended to be more interested in causes than courses. "The political mood of that decade taught blacks some hard lessons. Blacks suffered more than whites from the student militancy of those years. The 'do your own thing' sentiment left many black students blowing their education."

The 60s also created what Reid chidingly calls "the law school of social work," and the political mood caused doubts about the legal system. "People weren't motivated to practice in traditional ways. We began training policy makers and leaders rather than lawyers. But the bar is concerned with a cross section of knowledge. Blacks who lacked this background," said Reid with a

tone of obvious regret, "suffered more than whites." The scars of that chaotic decade showed up later in the number of black students, particularly those who attended black colleges, who failed to pass the bar (see "Taking the Bar Exam to Court" on page 27.)

Reid particularly disapproved of black students' demands for special grading systems. They were asking for compensation, he says, for cultural biases working against them at both black and white schools. "The result was disastrous. Now black students know they better go sit in a corner and study and get themselves ready."

Many of Howard's students seem to share his views. "The first thing I want to do is make sure I'm competent," John Landon, the student bar president, told me. "I must be very strong and equip myself with the skills necessary to deal with anything white society places before me. Once I satisfy myself that I am competent, I can deal with anything." A fellow student, Warren Young, said, "Being black means you have to know all there is to know and then some. You can't know less and make it. You must know all and then more." Their devotion to getting a solid legal education is almost evangelical.

Reid also thinks that black law students suffered when white law schools began accepting them in the late 1960s. While Reid understands why they went—"In our racially motivated society, the prestige of attending a white school has been far greater than attending Howard"—he also knows the difficulties they encountered. "The white schools showed little interest or sensitivity to the problems of these students," Reid contends. The combination of blacks asking for special treatment and a lack of interest in the black students produced an attitude of defeat. "White schools, such as Harvard, never displayed an awareness of the students' problems and never used their great resources to attack them. Blacks suffered less from poor academic achievement than from a lack of sociability and acceptance."

Today Reid thinks that black students are more wary of attending white law schools. They have learned that the prestige of graduating from a white school can't make up for their feeling of isolation.

This may partly explain why Howard's enrollment has doubled in the last 10 years, even though getting into Howard, like most law schools, is far more difficult today than it was a decade ago. This year the admissions committee began accepting only students with a 3.0 grade point average (out of 4.0). And next year, Howard will probably require the Law School Admission Test, which is now only recommended. "With 10 applicants for every spot, we have to have a means of screening people," Constance Rotan, the admissions committee head, explains.

With the intensification of competition for admission has also come an influx of white students at Howard. Ten years ago a white face was a rarity; today, nearly a third of the student body is white. Some people fear this trend, and although Reid is adamant that a black school can't and shouldn't discriminate, he admits a preference for Southern and inner-city students who lack traditional educational opportunities. And even these students must be qualified. "We're not going to lower our standards for someone who swears he's going back to Mississippi," Reid says.

Once accepted, students are kept busy. The school discourages students from all outside work, even part-time, so they can concentrate on their studies. (About 55 percent of the students are on scholarship.) Class attendance is compulsory and students receive special help in writing techniques.

Unlike other schools, Howard structures

its first year and a half solely with required courses. A more flexible curriculum, adopted this year, permits electives at the end of the second year. There are seven clinical courses, all closely supervised, offered in the third year, one of which entails working with the Black Caucus in Congress.

Despite Howard's more selective admissions policy, Reid doesn't think the school is difficult enough once people are accepted. "It's harder to get in but it's not harder to get out. We can't take high-risk students and graduate more lawyers than Yale," he says. The dean threatened to resign last year if the school didn't eliminate its policy of automatic reexamination of students who failed a course. The policy, which had been instituted in the late 60s, was eliminated. (Since then, for example, 37 students out of 188 in a second-year class have left the school.)

Students, however, feel that the school demands more work than white schools. "If you make it through Howard, you can make it through any school. The instructors want you to succeed, but the requirements are very stringent," says third-year student Edward Dixon.

Reid's emphasis on "training our students by the same standards and measurements as the best schools in the nation" raises a question about the role of a black law school in the 1970s. Will a Howard graduate view the law any differently than a Harvard graduate? Will he have a special "black perspective" on the law?

Reid insists that the study of law is a universal discipline. "Howard can create an awareness that the legal system doesn't afford full protection to blacks and other excluded persons. But most blacks who come here are familiar with the system. Our students know that the system doesn't work fairly. What they have to learn is how to get it to work fairly. They have to get qualified and fight."

Are black graduates having trouble getting jobs? Placement Director Lafrances Johnson says firms aren't "knocking down any doors or beating any paths looking for black lawyers." The largest percentage of Howard graduates take jobs with government agencies.

Many black students believe they can serve the black community and make money at the same time. Some students say that a black working on Wall Street or for General Motors has a greater challenge than a black working for neighborhood legal services. "But if a black lawyer is going to sit back and not influence the power structure, then he might as well be at legal services. A black in a white firm requires a stronger commitment and a lot more personal strength," says John Landon.

Professor Spencer H. Boyer, who has demonstrated his commitment to educating blacks by refusing offers for higher-paying positions at white law schools, argues that blacks should have the same equality of choice as whites. But he insists that attending Howard instills a "community of interest in its students and the common goal of advancing black America." "Our perspective isn't just limited to civil rights anymore," he says. "I believe black lawyers will continue to be the fulcrum for change in every area of our society."

Reid is a little more cynical, although he's pleased that blacks have more options. He hopes a black tax specialist working on Wall Street will someday be called upon to plan a new tax structure. "I believe he would be concerned about the fairness of the tax structure coming from a different background than a white lawyer," says Reid.

Still, these opportunities have drained black lawyers from the ghetto which is "more deprived as a result of this progress. Students

are less oriented to use the law as a tool for social change because they aren't fighting for their survival," he says.

"Our students still have a commitment, but like everyone else, they've been affected by our affluent society," Reid says. "They are lawyers of the people but they drive into the ghetto in Corvettes wearing \$200 suits. Their standard of living is kind of high these days."

S. W. MELIDOSIAN

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, S. W. Melidosian, Director of the Veterans' Administration Center has been awarded the VA's highest honor, the Administrator's Exceptional Service Award which was presented to him recently at the Administrator's Conference in Washington.

The veterans residing in the Philadelphia area are extremely fortunate to have S. W. Melidosian as the Director of the Veterans' Administration Center.

I can vouch personally for Mr. Melidosian's service to the veterans of Philadelphia. He is a man who is dedicated to his work and I have often reached him at his office on Saturdays and Sundays to discuss the problem of an individual veteran.

But, perhaps Mr. Melidosian's greatest asset is that he treats each case and each veteran as a person rather than as a number on a file jacket.

At this time, I enter into the RECORD an article published in the February 25 edition of the American Legion News lauding S. W. Melidosian for his many contributions to veterans and society as a whole.

PHILA. VA DIRECTOR RECEIVES HIGH HONOR

S. W. Melidosian, director of the Veterans Administration Center in Philadelphia, has received the VA's highest honor, the Administrator's Exceptional Service Award. VA Administrator Donald E. Johnson presented the coveted award at the annual Administrator's Conference in Washington, D.C.

Melidosian, head of the largest regional administrative office in VA, was recognized for his outstanding leadership, skill and capability in executing the responsibilities as director of the VA Center. Those responsibilities include the administration of VA compensation, pension, education and home loan programs for veterans who reside in 40 counties of Eastern Pennsylvania. He also oversees the operation of VA's GI Insurance program, maintaining more than 5,246,000 insurance accounts for veterans and beneficiaries residing both in the U.S. and other countries.

Melidosian has been with the Veterans Administration since 1946, serving both at the Central Office in Washington and in the field. He has been director of the Philadelphia Center since January 1961.

The director is a graduate of Temple University School of Business and Public Administration and is a veteran of World War II and the Korean Conflict.

Active in community affairs, Melidosian currently serves on the Board of Governors, Heart Association of South Eastern Pennsylvania; as chairman of the Standing Develop-

ment Committee and as member of the Executive Committee, Philadelphia Division of the American Cancer Society; Advisory Board of the Salvation Army of Greater Philadelphia; and the Board of Advisors, Medical College of Pennsylvania.

Melidosian served as chairman of the Philadelphia Federal Executive Board from June 1969 to June 1970, and earlier from June 1964 to June 1966. He also served two terms as president of the Philadelphia Federal Business Association, June 1967 to June 1969.

In 1966, he was nominated by the VA for the National Civil Service League Career Service Award. Among other awards, Melidosian has received Philadelphia's Distinguished Citizen Award.

Melidosian is a 27-year member of the

Russell C. Gross American Legion Post 562, Philadelphia.

THE POST CARD REGISTRATION BILL

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will be considering H.R. 8053, the post card registration bill. Under the

terms of that bill, post cards are required to be mailed out prior to all Federal elections, including primaries.

Assuming that States holding Presidential and congressional primaries and conventions will be about the same in 1976, and assuming there is a standard 30-day registration book closing procedure before the general election in 1976, the following table describes the general timetable for the mailing of post cards throughout the United States.

A quick glance at the table describes the chaos of the system. The fact that more Presidential primaries are expected by 1976 makes the post card bill even more ridiculous:

State	1st Federal election in 1976	Election type (Pres. Pref. or Cong)	Forms must be mailed between:	Time lag between last day for mailing of forms and November 1976 general election
New Hampshire	Mar. 7	Pres. Pref.	Oct. 7, 1975 and Dec. 7, 1975	11 mo.
Florida	Mar. 14	Pres. Pref.	Oct. 14, 1975 and Dec. 14, 1975	11 mo.
Illinois	Mar. 21	Pres. Pref./Cong.	Oct. 21, 1975 and Dec. 21, 1975	10½ mo.
Wisconsin	Apr. 4	Pres. Pref.	Nov. 4, 1975 and Jan. 4, 1976	10 mo.
Pennsylvania	Apr. 25	Pres. Pref./Cong.	Nov. 25, 1975 and Jan. 25, 1976	9½ mo.
Massachusetts	do	Pres. Pref.	do	9½ mo.
Alabama	May 2	Pres. Pref./Cong.	Dec. 2, 1975 and Feb. 2, 1976	9 mo.
Indiana	do	do	do	9 mo.
Ohio	do	do	do	9 mo.
District of Columbia	do	do	do	9 mo.
Tennessee	May 4	Pres. Pref.	Dec. 4, 1975 and Feb. 4, 1976	9 mo.
North Carolina	May 6	Pres. Pref./Cong.	Dec. 6, 1975 and Feb. 6, 1976	9 mo.
Texas	do	Cong.	do	9 mo.
West Virginia	May 9	Pres. Pref./Cong.	Dec. 9, 1975 and Feb. 9, 1976	9 mo.
Nebraska	do	do	do	9 mo.
Michigan	May 16	do	Dec. 16, 1975 and Feb. 16, 1976	9 mo.
Maryland	do	do	do	9 mo.
Rhode Island	May 23	Pres. Pref./Cong.	Dec. 23, 1975 and Feb. 23, 1976	8½ mo.
Oregon	do	do	do	9 mo.
Kentucky	May 23	Cong.	Dec. 23, 1975 and Feb. 23, 1976	8½ mo.
California	June 6	Pres. Pref./Cong.	Jan. 6, 1976 and Mar. 6, 1976	8 mo.
New Mexico	do	do	do	8 mo.
Iowa	do	Cong.	do	8 mo.
Mississippi	do	do	do	8 mo.
New Jersey	do	Pres. Pref./Cong.	do	8 mo.
South Dakota	do	do	do	8 mo.
Montana	do	Cong.	do	8 mo.
South Carolina	June 13	do	Jan. 13, 1976 and Mar. 13, 1976	8 mo.
Virginia	do	do	do	8 mo.
Maine	June 19	do	Jan. 19, 1976 and Mar. 19, 1976	8 mo.
New York	June 20	Pres. Pref./Cong.	Jan. 20, 1976 and Mar. 20, 1976	8 mo.
Arkansas	June 27	do	Jan. 27, 1976 and Mar. 27, 1976	7½ mo.
Kansas	Aug. 1	Cong.	Mar. 1, 1976 and May 1, 1976	6 mo.
Georgia	Aug. 8	do	Mar. 8, 1976 and May 8, 1976	6 mo.
Idaho	do	do	do	6 mo.
Missouri	do	do	do	6 mo.
Louisiana	Aug. 19	do	Mar. 19, 1976 and May 19, 1976	6 mo.
Alaska	Aug. 22	do	Mar. 22, 1976 and May 22, 1976	5½ mo.
Wyoming	do	do	do	9½ mo.
Oklahoma	do	do	do	5½ mo.
North Dakota	Sept. 5	Cong.	Apr. 5, 1976 and June 5, 1976	5 mo.
Nevada	do	do	do	5 mo.
Delaware	Sept. 9	do	Apr. 9, 1976 and June 9, 1976	5 mo.
Arizona	Sept. 12	do	Apr. 12, 1976 and June 12, 1976	5 mo.
Colorado	do	do	do	5 mo.
Minnesota	do	do	do	5 mo.
Utah	do	do	do	5 mo.
Washington	Sept. 19	do	Apr. 19, 1976 and June 19, 1976	5 mo.
Hawaii	Oct. 7	do	May 7, 1976 and July 7, 1976	4 mo.

THE HAZARD OF IMPEACHMENT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the February 17, 1974 edition of the Peoria Journal Star reflects upon what happened during the elections following the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson and I include the text of the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THE HAZARD OF IMPEACHMENT

Sen. Hudson Sours sent me some detailed records about the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, a subject on which he knows I had done some study over a year ago and written up a couple of times.

Doing some figures from those details makes it clear why some of the newsmen these days are a lot more eager to keep kicking around the subject of possible impeachment than are the sober, responsible members of the U.S. Senate.

Just the other day, the Democratic Leader of the U.S. Senate, Mike Mansfield, said flatly that Richard Nixon still "has the capacity to govern"—something a good many people have kept questioning for some time whenever they could find a peg to hang it on.

Mansfield isn't eager to be a juror at a presidential impeachment.

I don't blame him.

I find that more than two out of three of the senators who took part in the other presidential impeachment—regardless of how they voted—ended their senatorial careers very quickly one way or another.

Only 15 senators, total, survived to remain in the Senate for another term after the impeachment process, while 39 disappeared from the scene.

Three actually resigned before the end of their terms and a whopping 22 "retired" at the end of theirs. Of those left who ran again, 11 were beaten!

That alone would be a spectacular change even in today's 100-man Senate—if 11 incumbents were defeated! You don't have to even count the other 25 who quit while the quitting was good.

Note: Three others died.

In each of these categories there was no significant difference between the figures for those who voted "Yes" and those who voted "No."

This ultimate result after the whole thing was over—in the cold light of dawn, so to speak, suggests to us that no preliminaries can possibly attract the dramatic attention and intense spotlight examination that come to the nation if a President is actually put on trial before the Senate.

And it suggests to senators that such a spotlight is a killer for them, whether they vote Yea or Nay when the time comes.

That has to be a sobering demonstration from right out of our history. The lesson would seem to be: Either get the goods on a President cold, or don't fool around with conclusatory "proof."

Otherwise, the impeachment package is clearly labelled much like the present law on cigarette packages:

"Use may be hazardous to your (political) health."

With the usual line-up of senators with an eye on the White House, itself, as their own ultimate goal—the chilling political repercussions of the Andrew Johnson experience must blow even colder.

Anyone who doesn't perceive the hazard isn't smart enough to be President, anyway.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of Members of the House of Representatives to the outstanding accomplishment of a talented young lady from the 10th Congressional District of North Carolina, Miss Monta Mackie of Hickory.

Miss Mackie is the winner of the annual Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary. She has written an outstanding essay, entitled "My Responsibility As a Citizen," which I would like all Members to have the opportunity to read.

In addition to this achievement, Miss Mackie last year was selected as Miss North Carolina Teenager and was also named first runner-up in the Miss National Teenager Pageant. At that time, she authored another inspired essay, "What's Right About America."

I would like to insert both of Miss Mackie's essays in the RECORD at this point:

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

Young men dream dreams, old men see visions. Recently, I had the opportunity of meeting a W.W. I veteran. He had been gate keeper at a neighboring fair for sixteen years. Much to my surprise, he was wearing an old W.W. I medal of which he was extremely proud.

So old and bent, was this man of eighty-one. Gazing into his kind eyes convinced me of how proud he was for having fought for freedom, but of even greater importance, was the love he showed me for his America. What an impact he made upon my life, when I discovered that he had traced his heritage back to the earliest days of America, and within twenty-three years had built and hand carved, in wood, his family's history—log cabins, primitive plows, covered wagons—his reminiscence of an earlier America in simpler, less complicated times.

Old men see visions, and his vision has influenced me to examine my America—over-analyzed, over-criticized—and to realize, that I can carve in words my appreciation of America today. His vision has challenged me to accept my responsibility. Yet, I am awed by the responsibility I hold as an American citizen. I am no Pollyanna, for I realize that my responsibility goes deeper than standing up for our national anthem or pledging allegiance to the flag. All Americans have certain inherited obligations, but the concerned citizen welcomes a personal responsibility, if it is fighting for one's country or tracing his heritage.

Proclaiming to all people "what is right about America" and encouraging them to respond to what is right . . . *this is my innermost dream!!!* It is a difficult task for we live in a complicated and cynical time, a trying decade for democracy. The responsibility I accept, is to speak out against this cynicism. Yet, many of my fellow citizens are asking "just what is right with this country?"

"What's right about America?" How wonderful are the often forgotten, soft fragrances of freedom that mingle within our lives! To sleep in a safe, soft bed each evening rather than a rat-ridden bamboo cage; to awaken each dawn to the twitter of red-breasted robins rather than to the thunder of maiming mortars; to eat twenty-eight flavors of ice cream instead of weed rice soup; to speak without fear of persecuting punishment; to see the stars and stripes saddened, in the breeze by a long war, and then to swell to the glorious sound of marching footsteps from the hell our young men have endured; after all this—to hear them say "God Bless America!" This is what's right about America, so forgotten yet so free!

Remembering America's forgotten freedoms . . . this is my responsibility . . . and greater still, my dream!

America has weathered troubled times before. She has met and conquered corruption in her house and she has known lean times during the great depression. Responsible citizens will lead America through her current crisis and will rely upon their resourcefulness. I will try to teach others to remember the fragrance of America rather than the faults; . . . and maybe, with the help of God, I too will become a more responsible American!

Yes, America, I will dream my dreams and enact my visions . . . as one great dreamer did when he said "some men see things as they are, and ask why . . . I dream things that never were, and ask why not!"

WHAT'S RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA

(Dedicated to Captain Clack; Retired)

While serving in Vietnam Captain Clack was wounded, the results being the loss of his legs and right arm. Yet, after all his misfortune, Tommy's love for America was not lost. Having met Tommy at the Miss North Carolina Teen-ager Pageant, I understood why the everlasting love flourished between this bitterless man and his country. Thanks Tommy for helping me to remember the little things we Americans so often forget.

How wonderful are the often forgotten soft fragrances of freedom that mingle within our lives. To sleep in a safe, soft bed each evening rather than a rat-ridden bamboo cage; to awaken each dawn to the twitter of red-breasted robins rather than to the thunder of maiming mortars; to eat twenty-eight flavors of ice cream instead of weed rice soup; to speak without fear of persecuting punishment; to see the stars and stripes saddened in the breeze by a long war and then to swell to the glorious sound of marching footsteps from the hell our young men have endured; after all this—to hear them say, "God Bless America!"

This is what's right about America, so forgotten yet so free!

ON PUBLIC STREAKING

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in contrast to all the "heavy" issues we must discuss here daily, I would like to offer the following article from the Chicago Tribune for the amusement of my colleagues:

ON PUBLIC STREAKING

Boys will be boys, and this year you can tell they are that at a glance. They are racing around without a stitch in a procedure called streaking. Actually, in a few cases, the streakers are girls, and you can tell this, too, at a glance. Perhaps two glances.

The purpose of a "streak" is to proceed thru some public and reasonably respectable place like the campus library—slowly enough to wake everyone, yet fast enough to avoid capture. The thing has become a national craze, and the streakers have received extensive newspaper . . . exposure. Some fraternities have turned out every able-bodied member to gain exceptional journalistic display. It's a case of using all the nudes fit to sprint.

Actually, the practice of public nudity appears to be quite ancient. Remember Lady Godiva? One authority on the subject sniffs that some modern practitioners have debauched the art with compromises. For example, anyone who wears tennis shoes is a mere sneaker streaker. Classical streaking was practiced only in the dead of winter, as a test of hardihood while the limbs became varicolored with cold. The term "blue streak" fits such occasions.

Editorially, we must deplore public nudity, but the sport actually is not much zanier than swallowing goldfish or cramming 22 torsos into a telephone booth. And, as one streaker remarked [in passing], it's better than burning down the administration building.

OUTSTANDING CITIZEN AWARD

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was recently delighted to participate in a testimonial dinner honoring Russ Harmon of Fall River, Mass. The chamber of commerce of Fall River chose Mr. Harmon as the recipient of the group's "Outstanding Citizen Award." A more deserving beneficiary would be impossible to find. Russ Harmon's extensive community and charitable activities, his naval leadership as well as his position of importance within the business sector more than qualify him for this coveted honor.

It is my distinct privilege to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution presented to "Outstanding Citizen" Russ Harmon in behalf of the Massachusetts Senate.

The resolution is followed by a speech delivered to those attending the dinner by John G. Winters, president of the Fall River Chamber of Commerce. His remarks eloquently express the driving spirit of the citizens of Fall River, the largest city in the 10th Congressional District which I am privileged to represent. The vitality of the community, the strong chamber leadership and its desire for self-improvement are impressive indeed.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTIONS CONGRATULATING RUSSELL R. HARMON OF FALL RIVER UPON HIS SELECTION BY THE FALL RIVER AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AS RECIPIENT OF THE OUTSTANDING CITIZEN AWARD FOR 1974

Whereas, Russell R. Harmon, Senior Vice President of the Fall River National Bank, has been selected by the Fall River Area Chamber of Commerce as recipient of the Outstanding Citizen Award; and

Whereas, This great honor awarded to Mr. Harmon is in recognition of thirty years of unselfish involvement in community affairs and dedicated leadership for the good of the Greater Fall River area; and

Whereas, Mr. Harmon is Director of the Young Mens Christian Association, commonly known as the YMCA, for fifteen years after having served three years as Vice President and four years as President; and

Whereas, Among the many organizations and activities to which Mr. Harmon has contributed his time, energy, and leadership are not only the YMCA, but the Diman Regional Technical Vocational High School, of which he has been Chairman of the Board, the Fall River Development Corporation, of which he is Director, the Exchange Club, of which he is President, and the U.S.S. Massachusetts of which he is Director and Assistant Treasurer; and

Whereas, Mr. Harmon was Vice President and campaign chairman and is presently President of the United Fund of Greater Fall River, past Director of the Chamber of Commerce, Chairman, President and Vice President of the New England Association of Sales Finance Companies, Inc., and was a charter organizer in 1952 of the Fall River Twilight Junior Baseball League and is now Director; and

Whereas, Mr. Harmon has also served the City of Fall River as chief election officer and has served the nation as Commander in the United States Navy Reserve; and

Whereas, Mr. Harmon has not only been the recipient of numerous civic commendations and awards for his leadership and selflessness in community service, but was recommended in Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-Four for the Navy and Marine Corps medal for saving the lives of three fishermen adrift in a life boat one hundred miles at sea; and

Whereas, Mr. Russell R. Harmon, by his continued interest and activities on behalf of all the people of the Greater Fall River area is an example of what one outstanding citizen can contribute to the well-being of his fellow man; now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate hereby extends its heartiest congratulations and commendations to Russell R. Harmon and wishes him continuing success in his efforts to improve the community of Fall River; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to Russell R. Harmon of Fall River, congratulating Russell R. Harmon of Fall River upon his selection by the Fall River Area Chamber of Commerce as recipient of the Nineteen Hundred and Seventy-Four Outstanding Citizen Award.

REMARKS OF JOHN G. WINTERS

Distinguished guests at the head table—ladies and gentlemen:

Your presence here tonight . . . eleven hundred community leaders . . . is indeed a tribute to our "outstanding citizen" Russ Harmon . . . and evidence of the growth and influence of the chamber within the area.

I wish to take this opportunity to emphasize some of your chamber's programs for the current year.

The brochure placed at your table outlines the wide areas of involvement that your chamber intends to pursue. These programs will require the cooperation of all who are willing to contribute to the goals of community advancement.

Tonight, I would like to give special emphasis to two activities that your chamber board of directors has designated as high priority. They are: community attitude . . . and economic planning for development of the area, considered by the board to be necessary goals for the progression of greater Fall River.

Under the banner of "Think Proud", we shall accentuate the positive. The time has come when the community must be con-

vinced that the adversities of the past have, to a large degree, been overcome, that there exists today, a diversity of firms lending stability to the employment of thousands. That the area has resources for tremendous potential growth.

None will deny that the area has its problems . . . but they are not unique to Fall River alone. And, in contrast to many metropolitan cities throughout the country, we have much to be thankful for, much to be optimistic about and to be proud of.

But the story needs telling. Better than in the past . . . by all of us. To the people in the street . . . to the children in schools . . . to the business community . . . to government and to all outside our area who are looking for a community that is progressive, highly motivated . . . and . . . on the move.

And there's a lot of story to tell. We have several of the largest firms in the world located within our city limits. We have many other companies in the area whose names are household words throughout the country and who are noted for quality merchandise.

Fall River is no longer "just a textile mill town" but a burgeoning, diversified industrial city. We have a dedicated, conscientious labor force. We have a progressive municipal program underway with a new city hall, new high school, new incinerator, improved water system, expanded recreational facilities, an active redevelopment program. . . .

And from the private sector, construction of a multi-million dollar bank office building . . . newly constructed apartment units . . . and an active industrial park.

And there is a lot more to tell . . . but it's a big undertaking, and to have a successful impact, it will require an effort from more than the members of the chamber. Every resident who has a commitment in Greater Fall River needs to contribute to the effort. Let's have bumper stickers, signs, slogans, buttons, news editorials and public service announcements. And brochures and billboards too. . . . All proclaiming what is good about the area. That's what the community attitude program is all about. . . . Counting our blessings and letting everyone know about them.

Won't you please join with us in building a new sense of confidence . . . self assurance and pride? It's a great asset for a community to have.

Not far removed from community attitude, is the priority for community development . . . planning by objectives.

We must decide where the city is going and how we are going to get there. We are aware of much of the city's natural resources and potential. But how do we capitalize on these resources?

A planned strategy is needed to attract new capital, new industry, assist in the expansion and retention of existing business, provide for land development, create new housing, broaden the tax base, and ultimately . . . raise the standard of living within the community.

These and other objectives are recognized by most of this audience as obvious areas of concern that if solved would do much in furthering the development of the area's potential.

To accomplish these objectives, the chamber will provide the forum to harness the energy and brains throughout the community, including . . . but not limited to industry, finance, business, labor and government, assured that much more can be achieved faster through a combined effort of planning than we have been able to accomplish through singular, splintered groups.

The purpose of the Greater Fall River area chamber of commerce to advance the economic, industrial, professional, cultural and civic welfare of the Fall River area and is really in the self interest of every one of us here tonight. If we want our sons and daughters to have the opportunity to maintain a good standard of living within the area . . . if we don't want them forced to live in New

York . . . or Chicago . . . or the West Coast where we go to visit them once in a while . . . then we have to provide them with opportunity right here in Fall River.

If we don't get moving now . . . it's going to be too late for your children and mine . . . and we will have lost one of life's greatest pleasures . . . living our lives together as a family.

The chamber has adopted a program that has real merit . . . all it really needs to get moving is a lot more involvement from a lot more people.

There is an open invitation for all to join in the effort . . . but we can only invite . . . or attempt to persuade. We cannot coerce.

Progress is no accident. People involved make the difference. If we can get together this year . . . then next year, we can change the slogan of Fall River from: "We'll try" . . . to:

"We're doing it."

SECRECY, MONEY, AND POWER

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent statement I made on the topic "Secrecy, Money, and Power":

"SECRECY, MONEY AND POWER"

INTRODUCTION

In the 1972 elections, when both presidential candidates were saying the election presented the clearest ideological choice between candidates in history, 55 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls—the lowest percentage in a quarter of a century.

Pollster George Gallup says that "it is doubtful that at any time in this century politics has commanded so little respect." "Two persons out of three express the belief that there are elected federal officials who won election by using 'unethical and illegal procedures in their campaigns.'"

Only one adult in four, the lowest ratio in 20 years, would like to have a son go into politics as a career.

A Washington newspaper poll, taken nationwide in late 1971—pre-Watergate—reported that the political system faces a crisis in confidence with voters complaining that public officials are unresponsive, unpredictable and untrustworthy.

These surveys of American public opinion suggest that this loss of confidence may be the most serious problem facing government today. There is rising frustration with government as usual, and increasing disillusionment with the way in which the government functions.

You do not need a poll to tell you the mood of the public toward politics and government.

"I would not believe a politician if he told me the sun rose in the east," a man said to me recently.

Even the word "politician" is used by many people with a trace of scorn or derision in their voice.

The gravity of this deterioration in public trust is that our democratic system depends upon people who believe in it. Without an attitude of trust, a government based on the consent of the governed will not work. The danger signals are apparent, and no task is more urgent than to deal with the public distrust and cynicism which are eroding the democratic system.

I have thought much about what can be done to restore confidence in government. It is a complex subject, and solutions to it come hard. Most of us have at least a partial solution; none of us has the complete solution.

May I share with you today several suggestions I have to make things better. I don't present them as a panacea, or a sure-fire remedy for all that ails us.

I have concluded that most—not all, but most—of our difficulties in government and politics stem from three basic errors:

Secrecy in doing the people's business.
The inappropriate, even illegal, use of money in campaigns.

And the concentration of too much political power in too few hands.

Let me, then, submit to you several suggestions on how to correct these errors:

SECRECY

1. We must conduct the public's business in public.

One reason people do not have confidence in government today is because the government operates too secretly.

Any reasonable person recognizes the necessity of secrecy in government in a number of situations, including:

Intelligence information, diplomatic negotiations, military plans, and secret weapons.

But secrecy has become an accepted way of doing business in Washington, with a presumption of non-disclosure of government papers and an absurd classification system.

The people don't like secrecy or a government that practices it. A government that prefers to do its business in secret will not have the public's confidence. The public's business ought to be done in public.

The sad fact is that since World War II successive administrations have been addicted to secrecy:

President Roosevelt's secret Yalta agreements;

President Eisenhower's secret U-2 flights;

President Kennedy's secret invasion of Cuba; secret involvement in overthrow of Diem government;

President Johnson's secret moves at Gulf of Tonkin and in Vietnam;

President Nixon's secret bombing of Cambodia, and civilian areas in Hanoi—secret surveillance of civilian politics.

Somewhere along the line, recent Presidents have become entranced with what General deGaulle called the "mystique of high office," holding information from the people, treating them with condescension. One high official, when asked about secrets in government, responded by saying, "Those who needed to know were told." Such an attitude expresses contempt for the democratic process.

As former Attorney General Katzenbach has noted, secrecy has increasingly become a way "to avoid the difficulties inherent in our political system and hopefully to present the public with triumphant *faits accomplis*."

The Congress has had a long history of doing the public's business in secret—but some reforms are occurring. Congress is beginning to open up the legislative—and especially the appropriations—process to public examination, and to record publicly more of its floor votes.

But secrecy still cloaks too much of the decision-making processes in government.

I support legislation to require all meetings of Federal Government agencies at which official action is taken, considered or discussed to be open to the public, with few exceptions, and to require that all meetings of congressional committees, including conference committees, be open to the public.

Many steps are needed—and I shall not list them—but the common theme in all of them is greater openness to discussion and criticism and more candor with the conduct of the people's business.

The distinctive marks of a democracy are its commitment to an open society and the assumption that policy can be improved by steady public examination and debate. At

the very least, disclosure should be the rule, not the exception, and the burden should always be placed on the government to justify denying information to the people.

MONEY

2. The influence of money in politics should be reduced.

People will have confidence in their government only when they have confidence in the manner in which their governmental leaders are chosen.

Money has become critically important in American politics. The most important fact about political campaigns today is that they are frightfully expensive. Campaign costs have reached the stage where they threaten the lifeblood of the democratic system. They simply must be gotten under control. It is estimated that the 1972 campaign cost over \$400 million, a large increase over the 1968 level. In 1970, 15 candidates ran in Senate races in 7 large States. 11 of the 15 were millionaires and all of the seven winners were millionaires. Millionaires should not have an edge.

The presence of mountains of cash, unreported, and spent with no accounting, was a common element in almost every aspect of Watergate.

Today, 90 percent of the contributions made to political candidates come from only one percent of the population. This means, of course, that a small number of wealthy people have the potential to exert disproportionate influence.

The new campaign finance reform law of 1972 has helped reduce the excesses of our campaign spending practices, but a whole new series of steps must be taken to protect the integrity of American elections, including:

Sharp limitations on the size of individual gifts,

Overall limits on expenditures for a given race,

Complete reporting of contributions and expenditures,

The creation of a tough, independent enforcement agency to insure compliance,

And the use of public financing—perhaps to match private contributions up to \$50—to absorb some of the tremendous costs of running for public office.

Only with these reforms will the influence of money in politics be reduced.

POWER

3. The concentration of power in the Presidency should be reduced, and Congress should be restored to a co-equal branch of government.

Americans instinctively dislike placing all power in one person. They believe that governmental power should be jointly possessed. A mood of anxiety has gripped this country about the expansion of Presidential Power at the expense of the Congress.

I do not make this charge in a partisan sense. It is a simple fact of American political history that over a period of decades more and more power has concentrated in the Presidency. There are many reasons for this; not the least is the passivity of the Congress. Whatever the reasons, the results are apparent:

Presidents assert that they have the right to spend or not to spend money that the Congress appropriates if they believe it is in the national interest.

Presidents assert an executive privilege as a shield for information to keep information from the people—a privilege not mentioned in the U.S. Constitution.

Without consulting the Congress, Presidents commit American troops to Korea, Cuba, Lebanon, Dominican Republic, Vietnam.

Presidents make commitments pledging the money and lives of Americans, and conclude a ten-year war by executive agreement.

This concentration of power in the Presidency is not what the Founding Fathers intended. They intended for the Congress to play an important role in shaping the foreign and domestic policies of the nation. In the most important decisions of government, those involving war and peace, the Founding Fathers clearly intended to deny the Presidency unrestrained power.

The concern over the amount of power concentrated in the Executive cuts across party and ideological lines. Liberals and conservatives are concerned, Democrats and Republicans are concerned.

The present imbalance in our system of government must be corrected, not alone because it makes a sham of the Constitution—although that is sufficient reason—but also because a strong and independent role for the Congress is the best hope to prevent one-man rule in the most important decisions government makes.

We must set about the difficult task of restoring the balance. Congress must use fully the tools it has long possessed:

The power to oversee and investigate;

The power to confirm or deny appointments of certain officials;

The power of the purse;

The power to be informed.

The essential step is to support a government of shared power.

CONCLUSION

Theodore Roosevelt said that "The government is us; we are the government, you and I."

Because we are the government in a democracy:

We should not be deprived of power because we can't make enormous campaign contributions;

We should not be subject to one man rule; We should not be denied information.

Thomas Jefferson said: "The will of the people is the only legitimate foundation of any government, and to protect its free expression should be our first object." He was right in 1801, and he is still right in 1973.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INCREASE VETERAN'S DISABILITY COMPENSATION RATES BY 20 PERCENT

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to increase the rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans and their wives and children by 20 percent.

There are currently over 2.2 million veterans who have been disabled while fighting our Nation's wars and who receive disability payments compensation for the loss or reduction of their earning capacities resulting from their service-connected injuries. The Vietnam war has added 364,500 wounded veterans with disabilities to those of prior wars, so there is renewed need to emphasize and continue this program.

Service-connected disabled veterans received their last increase in compensation on August 1, 1972. Unfortunately since that date, the Consumer Price Index has reflected a continual cost-of-living increase. I am proposing a 20-percent increase in benefits to compensate the

disabled veteran for his past losses in buying power due to inflation plus additional amounts to reflect future consumer price increases likely to occur before legislation such as this is enacted. It is not always possible for the Congress to legislate increases rapidly enough to keep pace with inflation, so I believe it is wise to provide a "cushion" to protect our disabled veterans, who are already war casualties, from also becoming economic casualties.

The bill which I introduced today provides for a 20-percent increase in the basic disability compensation rates. In addition, it provides for a 20-percent increase in dependence and indemnity allowances to veterans with service-connected disabilities of 50 percent or more. Finally, my bill provides for a 20-percent increase in awards for the loss of one organ or extremity under section 314 of title 38, United States Code, which has not been increased since 1952. My bill also amends section 314(k) to provide additional compensation for loss of use of a lung and for kidney failure requiring regularly scheduled dialysis.

Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important that we do not neglect our disabled veterans who have so valiantly fought for our Nation during times of war. We should increase their benefits to keep pace with the spiraling inflation which particularly is injurious to persons on fixed incomes such as many of our disabled veterans.

I urge the Members of the Congress to join me in support of this legislation.

SUPPORT FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am very disturbed that, at a time when our Nation is becoming increasingly aware of our failures in meeting the educational needs of our non-English-speaking children, the administration is trying to cut back funding for bilingual education. Only \$35 million has been requested under title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the main source of bilingual education moneys, and no funding has been requested for the bilingual provisions of the Emergency School Assistance Act and none for bilingual teacher training under the Educational Professions Development Act.

This Nation has come a long way since the days when several States had laws expressly prohibiting the use of any language other than English as media for classroom instruction. A growing awareness of the value of other cultures, culminating in the enactment of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, has given impetus in recent years to efforts to provide our non-English speaking students with equal educational opportunities. We made a firm commitment in that act, which amended title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to

meet the needs of children 3 to 18 years of age who have limited English-speaking ability and who come from homes where English is not the dominant language. Title VII provides money in the form of grants to local educational agencies for the implementation and development of bilingual programs, and its guidelines encourage the instruction of the history and cultural heritage which reflects the value systems of speakers of both languages in order to develop the child's self-esteem and a legitimate pride in both cultures.

Although Congress clearly intended more than a token effort, authorizing \$400 million to be spent over a 6-year period, only a small proportion of the authorized funds have been expended by the administration.

I am greatly encouraged, however, by two recent steps the Congress is taking to meet the Federal responsibility to assist States in coping with this special educational need. Both the House and Senate Education Committees, in their consideration of renewal legislation for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, have added provisions to strengthen the title VII bilingual education effort. H.R. 69 has set the fiscal year 1975 authorization level for title VII at \$135 million. This effort is for naught, though, unless we can insure that the programs are administered effectively.

For this reason, I especially want to commend Chairman CARL PERKINS and the General Education Subcommittee for today beginning oversight hearings on Federal bilingual programs. I have submitted testimony for consideration in these hearings prepared by the Chicano education project, a coalition of some of the many groups which are seeking through legal and legislative action to improve the lot of Chicano children in Colorado.

The effectiveness of Federal bilingual programs is of great concern to me because of their impact on the large number of Spanish-speaking children in Colorado. It is estimated that there are 8,000 Chicano students in my State who do not speak English, and at least double that number who lack proficiency in English for their grade level. Less than 5 percent of the non-English-speaking students are being reached by bilingual education projects on the elementary level and only 2 percent at the high school level. The dropout rate for Chicano high school pupils is reported at 34.9 percent.

The Civil Rights Commission in a recent report found similar dismal statistics throughout the Southwest. The Commission found, for example, that Spanish language and Chicano culture are often excluded from the curriculums of schools; that there is a severe scarcity of Chicanos as school board members, superintendents, teachers, and other professional staff; and tragically that Chicano students far too often find themselves retained in grade, placed in low-ability groupings or designated for educable mentally retarded classes as a result of language or cultural bias in the schools. A very sad example of the latter

is recounted by the project in their testimony:

We met with some Chicano high school students in Montrose last week. All of them were special education students. One of them had been a special education student since first grade. For all of these students special education was a road to failure. We asked them why they were in special education and they said, "Because we are slow, because we are dumber than the Anglos."

There can be no doubt that an educational system geared only to English pushes these Spanish-speaking youngsters further and further behind, undermining their self-respect and confidence, and their ability to function successfully in our society.

That the problem is not limited to Spanish-speaking Americans was underscored by the now-famous decision in *Lau v. Nichols* where the Supreme Court found that the San Francisco school system had violated the national origins provision of the 1964 Civil Rights Act by failing to equip its nearly 1,800 Chinese children who do not speak English with language skills which would enable them to profit from their required attendance at school. The far-reaching implications of this decision are obvious.

I take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to give favorable consideration and full funding for all legislation that would help local educational agencies provide a meaningful education for the non-English-speaking students of our Nation.

UNITED STATES HARMED BY BAN ON RHODESIAN CHROME

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. refusal to import chrome from Rhodesia made this country rely on Soviet Russia as its major supplier of this vital material. Fortunately, the Congress repealed this ban in 1971 with the adoption of the Byrd amendment. The Senate voted recently to reinstitute this ban and the issue may soon come before the House of Representatives. The United States needs chrome for its key manufacturing industries and we should not allow ourselves to become dependent on the Soviet Union for our supply. A very informative article revealing how a policy of banning Rhodesian chrome has been detrimental to the best interests of the United States appeared in the March 9, 1974, issue of Human Events. I enter the article by columnist Robert S. Allen entitled "Soviets Profit by Boycott of Rhodesian Chrome" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SOVIETS PROFIT BY BOYCOTT OF RHODESIAN
CHROME

(By Robert S. Allen)

The détente-obsessed State Department is exerting heavy backstage pressure on the House Foreign Affairs Committee to report out a bill that would restore Russia's monopoly of the U.S. supply of metallurgical

chrome—vital in the production of planes, missiles and other key weapons.

The measure was unobtrusively approved several months ago by a Foreign Affairs subcommittee headed by Rep. Donald Fraser (D-Minn.), and the State Department is vigorously trying to force consideration by the full House.

Forcefully resisting this undercover drive are a number of House leaders—foremost among them Representatives Wayne Hays (D-Ohio), chairman of the Administration Committee and a ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Robert Sikes (D-Fla.), Appropriations subcommittee chairman.

Both are scathingly blasting the legislation as a highly profitable windfall to the Soviets.

Says Hays: "The only thing this bill will do is force us to buy chrome from Russia, which will get it from Rhodesia and charge us an exorbitant price for it. The Soviet Union has been getting chrome from Rhodesia for a long time and totally disregarding the United Nations sanctions."

Sikes, making the same charge, declares: "While the U.N. sanctions were in effect, we paid a costly premium for chrome, much of which was transhipped from Rhodesia through Russia to the U.S. at a handsome profit to the Russians. It makes no sense to put an embargo on ourselves. It makes no sense to pay a costly premium out of the pockets of the American taxpayer. Yet that is exactly what this legislation will do if enacted into law."

The State Department détente-motivated bill would repeal the measure put through Congress by Sen. Harry Byrd (Ind.-Va.), in 1971 abolishing the punitive U.N. embargo against Rhodesia. The department strenuously opposed Byrd's precedent-setting legislation.

Sponsors of the State Department's repeal bill are two leading supporters of the détente policy—Sen. Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.), and Rep. Donald Fraser (D-Minn.), chairman of the Foreign Affairs subcommittee that quietly approved the measure.

Fraser, an ardent McGovernite and, like Humphrey, an ultra-liberal and zealous internationalist, is now head of the New-Left Americans for Democratic Action.

Outcome of the tense backstage struggle over this little-noticed but far-reaching legislation will be decided in the House.

After a long battle and strenuous lobbying, it was rammed through the Senate last December in the closing days of the 1973 session. The State Department is now aggressively trying to repeat these tactics in the House.

Directly zeroing in on that, Rep. Sikes bluntly warned that if the bill is to be defeated, that will have to be done in the House.

"It has already been approved by the Senate," he pointed out, "so if we are to prevent the reinstatement of sanctions imposed by the U.N., which had adverse and highly costly effect upon our country and which would serve no useful purpose whatever, we will have to do it in the House."

"We must have no illusions about exactly what this legislation does. Under it, we would again become dependent on Russia for our chrome supply. I know of no nation on earth that would cut off its supply of a vital and strategic material from a friendly country and place itself at the mercy of an enemy country for essential defense metals. Yet that is exactly what this measure will do."

"It makes no sense to punish our friends and reward our enemies. It makes no sense to place ourselves in a position of dependence for chrome on Soviet whims. The House of Representatives must make forcefully clear to the U.N. and to the world that the United States knows how to place its own interests above the interests of others."

Just how lucrative the United Nations embargo was to Russia is graphically shown by the following:

Prior to these sanctions—put through by the votes of the Soviet bloc, black African and Arab countries—Rhodesia was the largest U.S. source of metallurgical chrome. This country has no production of this indispensable ore needed for the manufacture of military aircraft, missiles and nuclear submarines.

Following the embargo, Russia became the principal U.S. supplier, with exports soaring to 60 per cent of this country's chrome requirements. Simultaneously, the price skyrocketed from \$30 to \$72 a ton.

In 1971, the year Sen. Byrd's measure repealing the sanctions was enacted, Russian shipments amounted to more than 400,000 tons—at an increase in cost to U.S. taxpayers of more than \$15 million.

Since adoption of the Byrd bill, Rhodesia has again become this country's main supplier of chrome—upwards of 500,000 tons have been imported.

Sen. Byrd, citing the indisputable fact that many U.N. member countries are flagrantly disregarding the U.N. embargo, declared that reimposing it would be "senseless and self-destructive."

"That just wouldn't be sound judgment," maintains the Virginian. "By observing the U.N. sanctions, the U.S. would be forced to import Russian chrome—a perfectly ridiculous situation in view of the fact that the USSR is our major military threat. Congress decisively put an end to that ridiculous and untenable situation, and now to undo that would be the height of folly."

Foreign Affairs committeemen report they are being literally buttonholed by State Department lobbyists to bring out the chrome bill for a House vote.

If that does happen, it's possible the department may be in for a jarring surprise.

The House might defeat the measure. To the stunned astonishment of both the White House and the State Department, that's what happened on the bill to give a \$1.5-billion "replenishment" to the International Development Agency—the "soft loan" branch of the World Bank.

In 1972, the Administration had no difficulty putting through Congress a \$900-million "replenishment" for IDA. To date, the U.S. has provided approximately 40 per cent of its more than \$4-billion capital—which is loaned to so-called undeveloped countries on 40-year terms at minuscule interest rates.

But this time, under the vigorous leadership of Rep. H. R. Gross (R-Iowa), the House revolted and killed the measure by a margin of more than 100 votes.

It's entirely within the realm of possibility that the same upheaval may happen on the chrome bill. In the House, unlike the Senate, there is widespread bipartisan distrust of the policy of détente with Russia.

SIMAS KUDIRKA

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions recently I have stood on the House floor and spoken of the plight of Soviet Lithuanian Seaman Simas Kudirka, imprisoned in Russia for seeking freedom from tyranny. The success of my efforts to free Kudirka depends largely on the publicity I am able to origi-

inate, and thus the amount of attention brought to bear upon the Soviet Government. In this behalf, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the following article concerning our legislative efforts to free the seaman, published by the Chicago Today newspaper:

KREMLIN'S FEAR

Alexander Solzhenitsyn's arrest and subsequent deportation clearly reveals the Kremlin's fear of anyone having the courage to speak out against the injustices of the Soviet state.

The case of the Lithuanian would-be defector Simas Kudirka ended differently. During his trial Kudirka, in an eloquent appeal for the freedom of his homeland, denounced the court as an instrument of a foreign government responsible for the murder of many innocent individuals. He was sentenced to 10 years at hard labor.

His crime? The desire to leave Soviet tyranny. As you recall Kudirka jumped to an American ship from a Soviet one with the intention of receiving political asylum.

His attempted defection was frustrated by our own bureaucratic bungling. Soviet seamen were permitted to board the American ship and after beating Simas senseless, took him away.

The State Department, which was deeply involved in the incident, apparently hasn't taken any affirmative action to right this wrong. Finally Congress is taking the initiative.

Sen. Charles Percy in the Senate and Rep. Bob Hanrahan in the House have introduced Resolution 420, which directs the President and the State Department to take all possible steps to attain the release of Simas Kudirka and his family.

The passing of this resolution will show both to the world community in general and to the Kremlin specifically that the American people stand firmly behind the commitment to uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

JONAS KUPRYS.

MR. CACCесе

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of presenting the Engineer of the Year Award to Louis A. Caccese, Palmyra, N.J., on behalf of President Nixon. This is the second year in a row that a resident of the Sixth District of New Jersey has received this high distinction. Mr. Caccese was honored for his efforts to preserve ecology and for his method of dredging the Delaware River, which saves taxpayers \$1 million annually.

Mr. Caccese's acceptance speech made February 15 during Engineers' Week in the Delaware Valley was, I believe, most timely and of interest to us all. I am pleased to share these comments with my colleagues:

COMMENTS OF MR. CACCесе

Thank you, Mr. Chairman—distinguished guests on the dais—ladies and gentlemen—needless to say, I am delighted to have been selected as engineer of the year by the engineering community of this area.

Engineers' week is a time in the year when we engineers point proudly to our technologi-

cal accomplishments. It is also a time when we do some soul searching among ourselves for the true measure of the discharge of our social responsibility to society, our community and our neighbors.

It is easy to point proudly to our technological progress during Engineers' Week in 1974. We all know that more technological progress has been made in this 20th century than was achieved in all prior recorded times. We know that with modern medicine, with recent advancement in biomedical engineering and with engineers' escalating man's environment by providing more water supply, more sanitary facilities, more hospitals, more housing in this century than in all previous time, that diseases which killed monarchs in former years have now been eradicated. Life expectancy has been increased by 20 years during the last 50 years. This is a bonus we are all enjoying.

We know that through science, engineering, and technology we have learned to fly like birds during this century and can now travel through space at 25,000 miles per hour and land on the moon. We have—through technology—created a wondrous new energy source—namely—nuclear power. We have created radio, TV, and the motor vehicle. The list is endless. (pause).

We have had a veritable technological explosion in this 20th century. An explosion which has given each of us, in this generation, a quality of life which surpasses the expectations of the kings of former generations.

But while we point with pride to technological accomplishments—the realization exists that many problems have been created along the way which cry for solution—(pause) so complacency because of past achievement is not sufficient.

We have the very real and present problem of supplementing our energy sources. We have not properly developed our coal resources.

We have not solved the problems of solids waste.

We have not solved sewage sludge problems, and many pollution problems. We have not learned to significantly recycle and reuse natural resources. The extent of the natural resource problems is illustrated by the fact that, we in America with 6% of the world's population have been responsible for 1/3 of the world's annual consumption of natural resources. The very morality—or immorality—of such consumption rates is cause for concern. (pause)

Of considerable concern to economists, and a challenge to engineers as well as to labor and industry, is the fact that our per capita production in the U.S. has slipped to 5th place amongst the nations of the world. As you know, per capita production is the true measure of a society's economic health. (pause)

Despite our progress and achievements and despite the problems to be solved we have gone through a period where engineers, scientists, and technology in general have been in disrepute. In fact, this view was very well summarized in the National Observer recently when they quoted Dr. William Walsh Hagerty, president of Drexel university and one of our engineers of the year, when he said "at the very time that a new and more highly sophisticated level of technology is needed—a great wave of disillusionment about the application of scientific knowledge has swept the country," similarly Senator Frank Moss who is chairman of a technological committee in the Senate expressed the same view when he said last December "there is now a powerful anti-science and anti-technology movement in American society and to some degree in Congress."

This declining popularity of technology has had its effect on engineering school enrollment—enrollments have declined in re-

cent years despite the fact that the engineering graduate consistently receives more job offers—and higher pay—than his fellow graduates. The engineering societies address themselves to this problem during engineers' week.

There are engineer week activities which are designed to make young people and high school guidance counsellors aware of the challenges and the opportunities in the field of engineering. These activities are listed in the flyers at your place. (wave flyer)

Time does not permit me to discuss the year round ETSCO program for young people and sundry other activities. However, as typical of the endeavors for our young people, I recently was privileged to participate in the creation of a non-profit corporation by the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Society of Civil Engineers. The purpose of this corporation is to place and train the disadvantaged youth who otherwise cannot get a start in a technical career. I refer to these activities to confirm that we can rightly and proudly conclude that our engineering community is working hard at discharging their social responsibility to the youth of our community.

However, during this engineers' week, I want to propound the question as to whether our technical societies and engineering community have responded sufficiently to the other challenges in our region. To use one example—I, as an engineer associated with public works despair at our public works dilemma and our increasing inability to bring many needed and worthwhile projects in the public works field to completion. I refer to such delayed projects as:

I-95—here—despite the expenditures of over two hundred million dollars—this expressway through the city still is not complete. Controversy has brought segments of I-95 to a standstill. Its full completion is years away and cannot now be forecast. The failure to complete I-95 has had the second generation affect of suspending further progress on the Great Penns Landing. Financial institutions won't provide financing until I-95 completion in acceptable form can be foreseen. Consequently it is almost a certainty that a complete Penns Landing—despite the expenditure of millions of dollars of public funds—will not be available for the Bicentennial. I compliment the recent steps of Highway Commissioner Kassab and Mayor Rizzo to at least move this project through the Society Hill area.

The lack of I-95 is also having a second generation affect on Philadelphia International Airport. The \$150,000,000 airport expansion is well underway but the potential benefits therefrom are threatened because of the inability to complete I-95 and thereby provide proper access to the airport.

In the field of bridges—we see the completed Betsy Ross Bridge at Bridesburg—a fine structure—built at the cost of approximately a hundred million dollars of public funds but destined to be of no use for a number of years because of unresolved approach problems. Similarly, the much needed Girard Point Bridge which would relieve some of the congestion on the Penrose Avenue Bridge and which has cost millions of dollars—is practically complete—but cannot be of any use because of unresolved approach problems.

We have a limerick nuclear generating station which has been engineered and sited. However, never ending impediments to its completion are occurring while the energy crisis is ever ascending. I am pleased to applaud the recent efforts of Mayor Rizzo and his energy committee to get this project off dead center.

You know Lee Everett, president of Philadelphia Electric Company and our engineer of the year in 1972, has promised that if he is permitted to complete limerick—and institute his other plans—that he will free this area of any dependence on petroleum within

the next ten years. This will also save approximately 25,000,000 bbls of petroleum per year which is more than enough petroleum to heat all the homes in the Delaware Valley. This is proof that—"engineering—is our greatest energy resource"—this is the engineers' week slogan for 1974.

In the field of water resources, I can point to the inability to initiate construction of a project such as Tocks Island Dam which will be so important to this region when the flood as occurred in 1955 repeats itself, in that instance, lives were lost. This was far more important than the 35 millions of dollars of flood damage which resulted.

Similarly, a repetition of the drought of the summer of 1965, which caused the President of the United States to declare an emergency because of the threat to Delaware Valley's water supply will have a more severe impact in today's situation.

It will be an unnecessary tragedy if construction of this Tocks Island Dam will only take place on the basis of a natural disaster such as a major flood or drought. The failure to promptly construct Tocks Island Dam may be a contribution to a future "water crisis" just as past complacency contributed to our present "energy crisis."

If time permitted—I could add other important projects in this region to the list of delayed projects, for example, the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal enlargement, a project with which I am associated. \$100,000,000 of public funds has been spent on this project. Its completion is now 5 years late and the date upon which the full project may be used cannot be accurately predicted.

It is worthwhile to ask how we have managed to so frustrate our efforts despite expenditures of vast sums of money. First, we have our bureaucratic problems to contend with. Our bureaucracy has gotten so large that we have lost decisiveness and have lost accountability—and our bureaucracy is getting larger. During the last 10 years the total national work force increased by 12% while the government work force increased by 19%. The Wall Street Journal reports that at this rate of growth everyone will be working for the government within 75 years. (Pause.)

Secondly, we have those who are dedicated to zero progress and who capitalize on any disfavor with a project—or with technology—to create controversy and stop progress. These people seem to believe that if progress can be halted—the quality of their life will be assured—and that life on their plateau will continue to be enjoyable. Such a viewpoint ignores the realities of the social consequences of insufficient goods, insufficient energy, economic recession and unemployment.

And thirdly—in our concern for environment we permit ourselves to forget that there is more to environment than just land, sea and air. Environment includes progress, power plants, public works, jobs—and all those things that are still paramount to the quality of life of the mass of our citizens.

The problems of controversy, suspended completion, and deferred progress on projects important to our region require resolution. I suggest that our technical societies and engineering community are:

- a. Well equipped to understand the problems and issues involved, are
- b. Well equipped to propose solutions, and
- c. That we therefore have an obligation to inject ourselves into the decision making process to force progress. It is not a sufficient discharge of responsibility to our community to be complacent with engineering expertise, while we abdicate responsibilities to influence final decisions on important works to those who are less informed.

We engineers must be effective as citizens as well as professionals. We must be more effective at the decision making levels whether they be corporate, political, or leg-

islative. We must become more involved with the social consequences of our engineering projects. Our engineering societies urge this.

The American Society of Civil Engineers are urging their chapters to have meetings on controversial matters with the public present—rather than having meetings where engineers talk only to engineers.

Last month the National Society of Professional Engineers stated that "Engineer involvement—at highly visible levels—is the name of the game for 1974."

The consulting engineers council have expressed the same view and Fortune magazine summed it all up when they said "Engineers have to adopt a grander vision of their jobs."

We engineers should all join in the goal of developing a program of involvement of our technical societies and engineering community to bring our expertise, efforts, and influence to bear to attain completion of projects which are of vital import to our region.

1974 is the year for involvement. The "energy crisis" has made us all sensitive to the fact that we do not have limitless wealth. The "energy crisis" has been a sobering influence. We realize now that progress must be made. Progress must be made with a proper appreciation of community interest and the environment.

We cannot indulge ourselves with the complacency of past achievements nor the luxury of permitting progress to come to a halt because controversy is encountered. Progress is essential! (pause)

I know that the task may be difficult—the time may be short—the task may not be ours to complete—but nevertheless, we are not free to refrain from the attempt.

VERMONT TAKES A NOVEL APPROACH TO HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress carefully considers various alternative proposals for a nationwide health insurance policy, the Green Mountain State of Vermont looks at a State-financed compulsory health insurance for all its residents.

I heartily recommend to my colleagues the following article as it appeared in the Boston Globe:

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 27, 1974]

VERMONT WEIGHS COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE

(By Richard A. Knox)

MONTPELIER.—Up here in the Green Mountain State, a panel of citizens and health leaders is currently mulling over a far-out, radical idea: state-financed compulsory health insurance of all Vermonters.

Are they serious? Yes, indeed. Impatient with what is referred to hereabouts as Federal foot-dragging on national health insurance, and armed with a disarming "why-not" attitude, the governor's Commission on Medical Care is apparently taking the idea in all earnestness.

This is not to say there aren't those who retain a healthy Yankee skepticism about the probable financial burden. After the treasury-busting inflation touched off by Medicaid and Medicare, does any state have the wherewithal to finance universal health coverage for its citizens?

Then, too, Vermont is not exactly a Cali-

fornia—where Sen. George Mosconi, a San Francisco Democrat, introduced a compulsory health insurance bill that inspired the governor's commission here.

Vermont is small (population 444,000) and has little native industry to fortify its tax base. Moreover, the individual Vermonter is already heavily burdened with taxes.

Lee Webb, a faculty member at Goddard College, in a recent monograph on "The Swindling of the Average Taxpayer," notes that "Vermonters pay the highest combined state and local taxes per \$1000 of personal income of any other state." (Massachusetts doesn't even make the top 10 states in terms of per capita tax burden.)

Eric Holt, an economist working on the compulsory health insurance proposal for the commission, thinks that the state's tax system is so regressive—meaning that the poor and middle-class pay a higher percentage of their income in taxes than the wealthy—that top-to-bottom tax reform would have to precede any health insurance scheme.

All this doesn't dishearten Dr. Robert B. Aiken, Vermont's forceful former health commissioner, who urged the health insurance idea on the commission several weeks ago.

After sending copies of Mosconi's California bill to the 18 other commission members, Aiken delivered them a challenge: "If I asked everybody in this room whether every Vermont citizen has a right to adequate health coverage, you'd all say yes," he said. "Well, let's put our money where our mouth is. If we don't believe in such a right, then let's say so."

In an interview last week Aiken, who is now health adviser to Gov. Thomas P. Salmon, explained that his intent was "not so much to endorse compulsory health insurance as to force the issue of discussing it. This is the kind of thing we ought to be discussing."

A subcommittee was duly appointed, and the commission's staff set to work trying to figure out how much money currently flows through the Vermont's health care system, and where it comes from.

The figures are enlightening. The staff estimates that Vermonters now spend a whopping \$185 million annually for health care.

As a "very conservative" estimate, at least one out of every four Vermont health care dollars comes not from health insurance companies, Medicaid, Medicare, Workmen's Compensation, Veterans Administration or other third-party coverage—but directly from the patients' own pockets. This is the part that no insurance plan or government program currently covers.

Taken altogether the \$185 million aggregate cost means that 11 percent of Vermonters' disposable income is spent on medical care.

Out of every dollar of disposable income in Vermont, about four cents find their way to hospitals and three cents to the state's 978 doctors. The rest is split among nursing homes, dentists, drugs, insurance company profits and expenses, and so forth.

Nationally the average citizen spends eight cents out of every dollar in health care.

The citizens of Vermont already appear to be spending a portion of their income on health substantial enough—about \$413 per person per year—to buy them all a handsome comprehensive health insurance package.

Another selling point of a state-funded health insurance program is that, well-designed, it would give the state control over the flow of those 185 million health care dollars. Basically, this is what the governor's commission is supposed to be about: suggesting new mechanisms to regulate and curb health costs.

But there is a small problem getting from

here to there. As long as health care is financed piecemeal out of commercial insurance, Blue Cross and Blue Shield, Medicaid, Medicare, other government programs and individual consumers' pockets, the total cost is well-hidden. This gives the individual Vermonter the illusion that the total is not so burdensome—though this is a vanishing illusion.

Funneling all health expenditures through a state insurance program, however, would make the true cost visible in the most painful possible way—through the tax system.

According to the "rough and dirty" calculations made by the commission staff, financing the state's health system at its current level would require an increase in state taxes averaging seven percent.

As the story goes, when these figures were presented to the subcommittee, the members—a collection mostly of lawyers and doctors who represent Vermont's small upper-middle class—did some fast mental figuring and were horrified at what seven percent in additional taxes might mean on the basis of their incomes.

One observer says the compulsory insurance idea died "right then and there."

Aiken, its perpetrator, concedes that "the figures are shocking."

The former health commissioner was only momentarily shaken, however. "This doesn't discourage me," he said. "My reaction is that if this is so expensive, then alright, what we're really saying is that we can't afford the current health care system. So you see what you can afford and water it (the plan) down to that level. Or you go the other way and set up a structure that reduces the costs and then see what you can afford."

This may appear to put the governor's commission back to square one—but with the difference that it may be more enlightened as to what its task is. Said James Guest, a commission member and the state's 33-year-old insurance commissioner: "This health insurance proposal isn't a fruitless exercise if it helps us get a better focus on what needs to be controlled."

In getting control of health costs, the current thinking here is that the commission will recommend creation of a state health authority—a superagency that would create and consolidate Vermont's regulatory powers over hospitals, doctors, nursing homes and the rest of the health industry. The authority's broad mandate would include controls on health care cost and quality, and the construction of new facilities or expansion of old ones.

Something along these lines is the subject of recently introduced Federal legislation that would pull together health planning, price controls and perhaps even quality-control measures into state or regional health "commissions."

Fortunately for Vermont, the state already has a running start on identifying its most serious medical care problems, to a degree unmatched elsewhere in the nation. In 1969 a statewide data system was set up to monitor detailed aspects of health care in 13 hospital service areas encompassing the state's 251 towns.

The data system has uncovered some startling discrepancies in the amount of medical care delivered to different regions. For instance, some areas consume twice as much medical care per person than others—with the most care going to the highest-income areas.

Native Vermonters see physicians only half as often as non-natives—which may reflect in part the state's incomes, class and urban-rural cleavages.

The cost of an X-ray in Vermont can vary as much as 400 percent, the cost of an electrocardiogram by 600 percent, laboratory tests by 700 percent.

Rates of specific kinds of surgery vary enormously: the probability that an individ-

ual will have had a tonsillectomy ranges from 16 percent in one area to 66 percent in another not far away.

Such wide variations in medical care accessibility and cost and in physician behavior clearly imply that some Vermonters are receiving too much of some kinds of medical care, while others receive far too little.

Furthermore, Vermont's poorer counties are subsidizing the medical care of its richer ones.

As one commission member remarked, it may be that through such data Vermont has a better idea of what its health delivery problems are than virtually any other state in the union.

The problem now is to decide what the state can do about those problems—and what it can rely on the Federal government to do.

CONGRESSMAN BOLLING WRITES ON "COMMITTEES IN THE HOUSE"

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Committees, I would like to bring to the attention of the House an excellent compendium of articles on "Changing Congress: The Committee System," from the January 1974 issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political Science*. Among this compendium is "Committees in the House" by the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Committees, Mr. BOLLING of Missouri. It has been my distinct pleasure and honor to work with Chairman BOLLING on the select committee and I am pleased to place excerpts from his very knowledgeable and perceptive article in the *RECORD*. His article is both an example of the excellence of this compendium and is in itself a first-rate discussion of the history and role of the House committees.

The article follows:

[Reprinted from the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Philadelphia, vol. 411 (January 1974)]

COMMITTEES IN THE HOUSE

(By RICHARD BOLLING)

The United States House of Representatives should be the most vigorous institution of the federal government. Its election every two years provides a representative form of government. Its Constitutional authority to raise revenues offers a means of control over federal activity and keeps the historic power to tax in a body responsive to the people. Its legislative responsibilities enable the House to set national policy objectives and to determine that which is legal or illegal. Its large membership enables the country's legislature to develop the issue expertise a smaller body cannot. Finally, the diversity and humanity of the House—its common touch—provide citizens with access to the federal establishment and remind us all that our national government is made up of real people, not simply white buildings and tax returns. The House of Representatives should be the forge of democracy.¹

Yet, today, the House is not the vigorous institution it should be. It does not occupy, as it once did, a commanding place in the American scheme of government. Hampered

by decentralized authority, lacking informational resources, stymied by obsolete rules and denying the Speaker his rightful tools, the House of Representatives cannot do its job. It is still, sadly, out of order.

THE COMMITTEES

Central to the operation of the House is the committee system. The ranking Republican member of the Rules Committee and Vice-Chairman of the Select Committee on Committees, Representative Dave Martin of Nebraska, called committees "the heart and soul of the legislative process."² Woodrow Wilson's famous dictum that the House of Representatives sits not for serious discussion, but to sanction the conclusions of its committees, remains generally true.³ At present the House conducts its business via twenty-one standing committees. These committees—which vary in size but average thirty-three members—enable the House to split up its work and concentrate on a variety of issues. Such division of labor and its accompanying specialization have helped the House meet modern legislative demands. They also have helped to keep the institution from becoming captive of the executive branch. In addition, committees have created entry points or gateways to the House of Representatives for those wishing to affect government. They have become vehicles for the advancement of members' interests and careers.

As does the House, itself, committees have had a long and fascinating history. In the earliest Congresses the House relied upon select committees for the consideration of legislation. At that time the House would resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to decide upon a bill's general principles, whereupon a select committee would be established to settle details and draft the final product. By 1800, after five Congresses had met, only four standing committees existed; of these, only one was a legislative committee. This committee—Interstate and Foreign Commerce—was established in 1795 and is now the oldest standing committee in the House of Representatives.

The Ways and Means Committee was created in 1802, the Judiciary Committee in 1813 and the Agriculture Committee in 1820. The Appropriations Committee was not established until 1865, nor the modern Rules Committee until 1885. By 1900 the House had fifty-eight standing committees; by 1930 it had sixty-seven such committees. Some of these, such as the Committee on Pacific Railroads and the Committee on Woman Suffrage, have disappeared. Others, such as the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Committee on Naval Affairs, have become subcommittees of committees or have merged with other committees. In 1946, when the House last reorganized its committee system, forty-eight committees were reduced in number to nineteen. In 1958 the Committee on Science and Astronautics was created; nine years later the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct was established. This raised the number of standing committees in the House to twenty-one.

The present committee system, however, fails the House of Representatives in four ways: (1) the system cripples the Speaker by denying him operational leadership of the House; (2) the system neither receives, utilizes nor generates adequate information; (3) the committee system does not consider the economy from a macroeconomic point of view; and (4) it does not facilitate coordinated policies, nor does it coordinate emerging issues, because the jurisdictions of House committees are outdated. The failure of the modern House to provide vigorous national leadership stems directly from these four shortcomings. No corporate board of directors would permit a company to operate with outmoded organization or without central direction, adequate information or economic integrity. Yet, that is what the House of Rep-

resentatives is doing. Who is to blame for the disarray? The 435 men and women who sit in the House as representatives. They are responsible for the resulting drift and decay of the House. These individuals—who, by and large, are honest, diligent and capable people—must now restore the institution in which they serve. What is needed is self-discipline and hard work.

A HOUSE IN TRANSITION

The House of Representatives has changed before; it can do so again. No immutable rules or customs exist, because the House is a dynamic institution. In times past Speakers have appointed committee chairmen; legislative committees have appropriated funds; seniority has been discarded—indeed, the system of seniority was not fully developed until after the turn of the century; a freshman member has been named Speaker; and party caucuses have ruled supreme. Precedents such as these indicate that the House is capable of significant changes.

For example, the Speaker, when a Democrat, now sits on his party's committee which makes committee assignments for Democratic members. This party committee is a focus of power in the House. Moreover, the Committee on Rules no longer obstructs the Speaker, who also benefits from new Democratic Caucus rules which strengthen subcommittees at the expense of full committees and their chairmen. Thus, the present Speaker, Carl Albert of Oklahoma, occupies a stronger post than his predecessor, Representative John McCormack of Massachusetts.

The Speaker

A strong Speaker is necessary if the House of Representatives is to regain its proper place in government. The only officer of the House mentioned in the Constitution, the Speaker is both coach and quarterback. Under such Speakers as Henry Clay, Thomas Reed, Nicholas Longworth and Sam Rayburn, the House of Representatives received firm leadership. Goals were set, strategy devised and tactics employed. The result was a record of achievement, a sense of purpose and public recognition for the whole House. No institution can obtain these results without such leadership.

Currently, the Speaker lacks the institutional tools of leadership. He must rely upon personal persuasiveness, as Longworth and Rayburn did. The Speaker cannot establish an agenda for the House. He cannot nominate—much less designate—its lieutenants, the committee chairmen. He cannot discipline the unfaithful, and he has little with which to reward the deserving. The Speaker is but titular head of the organization. His power is personal; thus, House leadership is dependent upon the rare fortune of finding an exceptional man.

Informational resources

In the area of informational resources, the House of Representatives operates at a disadvantage in comparison with the executive branch and the business community. The treatment of information by the House is archaic. An appropriate analogy is one of quill pens versus electronic computers. The House has overtaxed its committee staffs, misused its slender research facilities, distrusted automatic data processing systems and ignored the potential for contract research. Most important of all, the House has not realized that, in a society dependent upon technology, information must necessarily be viewed as a valued resource. Solutions to a legislative problem depend on the right kind of information; so, in fact, does the very perception of the problem.

Quite recently the House has shown signs of recognizing the importance of informational resources. It has established an office

Footnotes at end of article.

Footnotes at end of article.

for automatic data processing and an office for contract research with the Senate. The first office, the House Information Systems, has installed an electronic voting device and is supporting the Clerk of the House with administrative services. It has also developed a bill status system and is planning a system for the preparation of committee calendars. The second office, the Office of Technology Assessment, will hopefully increase the congressional evaluation of technology's impact on society. While neither office is comparable to the informational resources of the executive branch, nor equal to the House's potential, they are a start.

Macroeconomic role

The House of Representatives has also been operating at a disadvantage in the area of macroeconomics. The president and his advisers, the Office of Management and Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers are in charge. The federal budget is called the president's budget, and it is he who determines the amounts to be spent. The House does not coordinate the work of its taxing and spending committees. Its Appropriations Committee reviews less than half of the annual federal expenditures and does not report legislation on time—often because the authorizing committees fail to act in time in authorizing appropriations. Its members have no means of debating economic priorities. For a body with macroeconomic responsibilities, the situation is absurd. Unless the House of Representatives gets a handle on the federal budget, it will continue to be the economic mistress of the executive branch.

Late in 1972 the House began at last to reform the committees' consideration of the federal budget.⁵ In cooperation with the Senate, the House established a Joint Study Committee on Budget Control to recommend procedures which would improve "Congressional control of budgetary outlay and receipt totals" and would assure "an overall view of each year's budgetary outlays."⁶ Spurred on by the president's unprecedented impoundment of appropriated funds in 1972 and 1973, the joint study committee met and recommended additional committee structure: new House and Senate committees which would set a budgetary ceiling and attempt to sponsor a true debate over priorities. These proposed budget committees would be comprised of members from the respective taxing and appropriating committees, with additional members appointed by the majority leadership—in the case of the House, by the Speaker. Moreover, the new committees would have an enlarged professional staff with access to more data without which the House of Representatives simply cannot regain its macroeconomic role.

Unfortunately, the recommendations of the joint study committee had serious defects. For example, no provision was made for committee consideration of tax expenditures; no safeguards existed to prevent the new budget committees from predetermining the priorities debate; and, of great significance, no potentially powerful committee should be created in the House without greater participation of the Speaker.

Jurisdiction

The last area in which the committee system fails the House is jurisdiction. At present, the jurisdiction of the twenty-one standing committees is spelled out in Rule XI of the House rules. Last revised more than twenty-five years ago in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Rule XI is now unsatisfactory. House committee jurisdictions are unclear and duplicative. They are also full of omissions and antiquated or irrelevant listings.

Rule XI is unclear as to which committee in the House of Representatives has jurisdiction over the control of dangerous drugs; several committees have claimed jurisdiction.⁷ Clarity is also lacking in the area of water resources, in which three committees of the House are involved.⁸ The rule is also duplicative. For example, it designates two committees with jurisdiction over national forests, the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Rule XI is particularly deficient in omitting some subject categories. In 1946 these subjects were not national issues, thus, understandably, they were not covered by the rule. Today, categories such as energy and crime need a focal point within the House of Representatives. This is possible only by explicit designation of committee jurisdiction. As Representative John Culver of Iowa stated on the House floor:

"Our first obligation is to see that there is a coherent, realistic, and contemporary setting for the consideration of all legislation and to be sure that the most commanding and imminent issues of public policy are mirrored and realized in the organizational structure of Congress."⁹

The inadequacies of Rule XI, however, have not meant that the House fails to act in areas of jurisdictional uncertainty. Acting on behalf of the Speaker, the Office of the Parliamentarian refers all bills to committee, whether or not the subject is specifically listed in the rule. When Rule XI is silent or unclear, the office is guided by precedent, logic or political advantage. Over a period of time such a process inevitably leads to confusion and inconsistency. House committees acquire jurisdiction by accretion. Different committees receive similar subject matter. Procedural uncertainty frequently results. Public policy often suffers.

The same outcome sometimes occurs when House committees compete with one another for jurisdiction over emerging national issues. Often, bills are drafted so that they will reach a certain committee. Different committees sometimes end up with similar legislation and identical jurisdiction. Take, for example, the current fascination with energy. Three committees of the House have created subcommittees on energy, while a fourth committee considers itself the appropriate site of energy legislation.¹⁰ A coherent, sensible national energy policy is difficult to achieve under the best of circumstances; when several committees vie for control, it is next to impossible. At times, of course, overlapping jurisdiction is desirable because differing points of view which may be suppressed in one committee receive fair consideration in another. However, a diversity in communication patterns does not warrant conflicting legislation and this, too, can result from such overlap.

A further disadvantage with the present system of committee jurisdiction is imbalanced workload. Some House committees do not have much to do. Others are so busy that they must neglect urgent public business within their jurisdiction. In 1973 a member of the Committee on Ways and Means indicated that the committee had to postpone consideration of tax reform in order to take up trade legislation.¹¹ A critical issue was delayed because Ways and Means which has jurisdiction, under Rule XI and the precedents of the House, over taxes and the public debt, social security, national health programs, such as medicare and Medicaid, revenue sharing and trade was too busy.

A final disadvantage of the present configuration of committee jurisdiction is that subject areas or issues without a committee to call their own lose focus and protection. Committees in the House afford a subject a sense of place, a home in which its constituency can centralize strategy, develop friends and rebuff foes. Issues which are orphans usually do not fair well in the House.

Prestige is involved too. National issues need a legislative point of convergence which only committees can provide.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

In January of 1973 the House acted to remedy the problem of committee jurisdictions. At the initiation of the Speaker and with the support and encouragement of the minority leader, Representative Gerald Ford of Michigan, the House approved creation of a select committee to recommend changes in Rule XI, as well as in Rule X which designates the names and numbers of standing committees.¹² The Select Committee on Committees, as the new body is called, consists of ten members of the House, five Democrats and five Republicans. The balance between Democrats and Republicans is unusual because the makeup of congressional committees traditionally reflects the ratio of the majority and minority parties in each house. An exception was made in this case because the success of the Select Committee is dependent upon bipartisan support.

During the debate on the resolution creating the Select Committee, the question of why a select committee was required was raised. Could not the Joint Committee on Congressional Organization, the Committee on House Administration or the Rules Committee—which had legislative jurisdiction over changes in House rules—examine Rules X and XI? Any of these alternatives, it was argued, could do the job and save the time and expense of assembling a new committee and staff.

However, each of these alternatives presented serious difficulties. The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations would involve United States senators in the determination of House committees—an involvement for which they were neither qualified nor welcome. The Senate and the House are fundamentally different and need not be involved in each other's internal organization. Moreover, the joint committee is specifically prohibited from recommending changes in the rules, parliamentary procedures or precedents of either house.¹³ Also, it is not a bipartisan committee, but one in which Democrats currently outnumber Republicans. The absence of bipartisanship was again compelling in considering the Committee on House Administration as an alternate to the select committee. In addition, an obvious need existed for the body conducting the study to be free as possible of present committee structure. As one of the twenty-one standing committees of the House, the Committee on House Administration could not be neutral. It would have had an unfair advantage were it responsible for the study. A similar conflict of interest would occur were the Rules Committee to conduct the study of Rules X and XI. Moreover, the partisanship could be acute, as the majority outnumbers the minority on Rules two to one. Furthermore, the committee's staff is small and would be unable to assume the necessary added responsibilities. The legislative recommendations of the select committee, however, will be subject to clearance by the Rules Committee before they are debated and acted upon in the House, itself. Finally, the Select Committee on Committees is a nonexclusive body whose members serve on ten of the other standing committees. Such diversity gives the select committee to useful perspective on various aspects of the committee system.

CRITERIA FOR CHANGE

In examining Rules X and XI the select committee must keep in mind that any operating process in the House of Representatives must be democratic. This means that any reorganization of committees must be consistent with the underlying values of our political system. Committees in the House, regardless of their number or jurisdiction, must therefore function openly and with

Footnotes at end of article.

deliberation. The legislative process must be visible to the public. Moreover, democracy does not always operate best behind closed doors, and neither do committees. The process must also be deliberative. Committees are a place to think things through. Goals should be stated, premises revealed, alternatives explored and conclusions questioned. After all, the House is a legislative body, and the unique function of a legislature is to provide a forum for the debate of public issues.

To be democratic, House committees must also function responsibly. Here, again, a constraint has been placed upon the select committee. Its recommendations must enable the committees of the House to be held accountable for their actions; this means, simply, that credit or blame can be affixed. Such responsibility is vital to the political integrity of the House, particularly now when Americans' faith in their institutions of government is unusually low.

Another criterion for the reorganization of committees is representation, which means that affected interests are given an opportunity to be heard. The House of Representatives should not operate without hearing those who wish to be heard, as some committees have at times done. Representation means that committees must listen to those upon whom committee actions have an impact. Such listening is essential to fair play.

A further requirement for the democratic operation of committees is responsiveness. The House and its committees must be responsive to national needs. The criterion is an illusive one, of course, because people's perceptions of problems and remedies vary greatly. Yet, committees should not ignore that which generally seems to be a real problem, and committee structure should not prevent the House from working its will.

Two other criteria serve as additional guidelines for the select committee in reorganizing the committee structure of the House. The first is to maintain the relative equality of all members. A committee system should not make some members of the House feel that they are backbenchers. Every member of the House is important. Each has a vote equal to the other, and each should have a committee role of some importance. While the need for leadership in the House and the quirks of personality mean that some representatives are more influential than others, House committees should be structured to give all 435 a piece of the action.

QUESTIONS ABOUT COMMITTEES

In contemplating significant changes in Rule X and XI, the Select Committee on Committees—or anyone else planning a reorganization of House committees—must first ask some basic questions about the committee system. These questions should precede any rearrangement of committee jurisdictions. Their answers will comprise a necessary framework upon which to base reorganization. They also will heavily influence the committee arrangement which occurs. Four of these basic questions are discussed below.

An appropriate first question concerns the budget. Will reorganization include committee consideration of the federal budget? If so, several questions follow: (1) should the appropriation and authorization functions continue to be separated? Is the setting of a budget ceiling by the House desirable or practical? At what level of funding, and where in the committee process, does the priorities debate occur? Does a budget ceiling make an appropriations committee superfluous? What mechanism will guarantee coordination between spending and taxing?

A second basic question concerns the scope of jurisdiction. Should the jurisdiction of committees in the House cover several different areas of public policy or be limited to

one such area? Are single interest committees, such as the Committee on Agriculture whose jurisdiction is pretty much confined to agriculture, preferable to multiple interest committees, such as the Committee on Public Works whose jurisdiction includes water resources, transportation and public buildings? Additional questions include: do single interest committees develop greater expertise than multiple interest ones; do multiple interest committees become less susceptible to capture by lobbying groups; do single interest committees really function as a single unit rather than as a grouping of subcommittees? Should the interests of multiple interest committees be related or deliberately different?

Another basic question to ask before reorganizing committee jurisdictions concerns oversight—the monitoring of the executive branch. Is the oversight function best served by having a separate committee in the House perform most, or nearly all, of the oversight or should oversight be divided among the legislative committees, the Appropriations Committee and a Government Operations Committee, as is now the case? Should the party not in the White House direct oversight in the House? What mechanism will guarantee coordination of oversight activity with the House's appropriation of funds?

A fourth basic question concerns the size of committees. How many members should House committees have? Currently, the average size of the twenty-one standing committees is thirty-three members. Committee size, of course, affects a committee's jurisdiction and internal procedures. Committees of thirty-three members tend to be unwieldy if everyone attends, to discourage equal participation of members and to encourage the use of subcommittees. They also allow committees to have multiple interest jurisdictions, although the House presently has two larger committees which are single interest: the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Committees smaller than thirty-three members would most likely increase the number of single interest committees in the House. Larger committees would enhance the subcommittee system and enable members to serve on several committees. Whether House committees should be exclusive assignments is itself another basic question which directly relates to the size of committees.

Having answered basic questions such as these and, thus, devising a framework upon which to base a reorganization of House committees, the next step is to restructure committee jurisdiction. This is not easy, because policy areas are interrelated. It is not usual either, because those scholars and other observers who have commented on the committee system have neglected to present alternatives.

FOOTNOTES

¹ The phrase is Neil McNeil's; see his *Forge of Democracy: The House of Representatives* (New York: David McKay Company, 1963); and Richard Bolling, *Power in the House* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1968).

² U.S., Congress, House, *Congressional Record*, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 31 January 1973, daily ed., H 592.

³ Woodrow Wilson, *Congressional Government* (Cleveland, Ohio: Meridian Books, 1956, originally published in 1885), p. 69.

⁴ Representative Henry Clay, in 1811.

⁵ On December 5, 1973 the House of Representatives passed a budget reform measure, "The Budget and Impoundment Act of 1973."

⁶ See, U.S., Congress, Joint Study Committee on Budget Control, *Improving Congressional Control Over Budgetary Outlay and Receipt Totals: Interim Report* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 7 February 1973), p. 1.

⁷ The Committee on Education and Labor,

the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Judiciary.

⁸ The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Public Works.

⁹ U.S., Congress, House, *Congressional Record*, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 31 January 1973, daily ed., H 602.

¹⁰ The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Science and Astronautics have created subcommittees on energy. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considers itself to be the logical focus of energy legislation in the House.

¹¹ U.S., Congress, House, Select Committee on Committees, *Committee Organization in the House*, Hearings, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., volume 1 of 3, part 1 of 2, May and June, 1973, p. 283.

¹² House Resolution 132, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 15 January 1973.

¹³ P.L. 91-510, section 402(d).

SCHOOL OFFICIALS DISPLAY OUTSTANDING LEADERSHIP DURING CRISIS

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 of this year, the Bandon High School in Bandon, Oreg., burned to the ground. During this crisis two men—the superintendent of schools and the high school principal—were called on to make quick decisions on how to keep the school in operation. The following story of their outstanding leadership in crisis was written by Warren Strycker, editor of the *Bandon Western World*.

It is a moving story and a fine testimony to Otis Murray, superintendent of Bandon schools, and Robert Stolz, principal of Bandon High School, and I am glad to share it with my colleagues:

SCHOOL OFFICIALS DISPLAY OUTSTANDING LEADERSHIP DURING CRISIS

On January 24, 1974, the Bandon High School burned to the ground at the hands of arsonists. Everything went up in smoke including the band and shop facilities. Only the school buses were saved . . . and because of the gas shortage, even they were hampered in their operation.

During the middle of the night and before the building was yet gone, two men began making plans to reconstruct the school. First, the reconstruction would involve the traditional and spiritual aspects of the school. "We must keep the school together," these men reasoned to each other.

As January 25 began to grow light under smokey Bandon skies, these two men, Otis Murray, Supt. of Schools and Robert Stolz, Bandon High School principal . . . began putting the finishing touches on their night's thinking. Neither man was heard to complain to anyone. Tasks like this needed strong men. They would be strong.

Before the day was out, Stolz had met with teachers and instituted a plan to double-shift the schools using the remaining scorched junior high building as a base. Church basements, city council chambers, city libraries would be utilized, but the school would be running again soon. No one thought they could get it going in only five days. There were no school books other than those taken home the night before by energetic students.

No desks were saved. Grade books were lost. A grading period was due.

Several things happened that day. Two very tired men contacted architects, ordered desks, cleared rubbish, directed the building of houses over remaining boilers, and a score of other nearly impossible tasks for such a short time. But the one thing needed most, was provided in ample supply, strength. Stolz and Murray inspired the entire teaching staff as well as the town to get back to the task at hand.

This inspiration was responsible for over \$6000 worth of donated labor to clear the site. By Monday, the site was nearly level again.

The next few days would continue to be hectic. These two men would be called to meetings to discuss plans for the rebuilding, to talk about losses, to give out figures, to answer to unknowing patrons of the district. Offers of help came from every quarter.

As the weeks passed after the fire, Murray would lead the school board through the trying problems of insurance settlements, new school plans, problems of keeping a district going by having to guard the buildings against further attempts of destruction. Some indication of more acts of such a nature were made.

It would be Murray's task now to provide the board with a plan for new buildings. Under his leadership, the board voted to "go ahead" with a building concept based on a square foot cost figure. The work of the administration began to pay off now. Some work had already been done to re-evaluate the district's needs.

The operation of the school under the double-shift arrangement was problematical. High school students were being hauled all over town. Some were missing buses, some were walking. The high school principal kept his cool, administering as an understanding man with a firm hand. Athletic contests would not be canceled, the administration said. "It will hold us together". It did too! An ailing basketball team began showing signs of team spirit and began to win some ball games.

Plans were being made to ask for support of the new bond issue. Everyone knew taxes were already too high. At this time, the outcome of this election is unknown . . . but one thing is known . . .

Bob Stolz and Otis Murray will not soon be forgotten as the men who pulled a disaster into teamwork in a community where leadership was needed. The call was made and two men made a cool decision. The town of Bandon will always be grateful!

THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, our Nation today is facing an impending recession: unemployment is rising and inflation is entirely out of hand. This year alone, the unemployment rate is expected to jump to between 8 and 10 percent, gravely affecting thousands of more Americans. Moreover, in Massachusetts, the percentage of unemployed workers is considerably higher than in other industrial States. It has become increasingly evident that this situation is in urgent need of remedy.

The administration must recognize its obligation to provide some measure of compensation for those Americans who are losing their jobs. It seems to me that the Government has a positive responsibility toward the unemployed. The administration and the Congress would be wise to take another look at the public works projects which, under Presidents Roosevelt and Johnson, were created to insure additional employment and a relatively secure income.

In 1935, the Works Project Administration—WPA—was established requiring local governments to sponsor programs that would meet requirements for Federal funds. Roads, bridges, public buildings, and so forth, were built under this program. What is more important each person employed in these projects received between \$20 and \$100 monthly.

The 1968 amendments to the Housing Act authorized new interim assistance funding to municipal and county governments. The interim assistance program was designed to alleviate detrimental conditions in slum areas by repairing streets, sidewalks, publicly owned utilities and the like. If reinstated, this program could create thousands of jobs—jobs that are desperately needed today—as well as help protect our urban areas from decay in a period of tight Federal moneys.

It is time that the Federal Government take a fresh look at essential employment programs. I believe programs are necessary to provide jobs and begin to solve other problems posed by our weakening economy. The Library of Congress has provided me with background on the Work Project Administration and the interim assistance program which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues. It seems to me that they indicate a useful direction for us to begin to take. The text follows:

[From the Library of Congress Congressional Research Service]

NEW DEAL PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS—SOME SALIENT DATA

(By Nelson Rimensnyder, Analyst in American National Government, Government and General Research Division, December 14, 1973)

WORKS PROJECT ADMINISTRATION (WPA)

The WPA was established by Executive Order 7034 of May 6, 1935, under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. Its liquidation was authorized effective June 30, 1943. The WPA was created to operate programs of useful public works projects and to aid the unemployed by providing work on such projects. WPA projects were funded through Federal-State-Local matching grant formulas. By February 1936, 3.3 million persons were employed in WPA projects. Monthly wages ranged from \$20 to \$100 per person. Average employment was over two million per year through the termination of all WPA funding in 1943. Generally, local governments were required to "sponsor" a project in order to qualify for Federal funds. This sponsorship included the designation and planning of a project and guaranteeing partial local funding. WPA projects were labor intensive and ranged in cost from small projects of \$1000 or less to New York's La Guardia Airport which cost \$40,000,000.

What did the WPA accomplish in terms of completed projects? WPA built 651,000 miles

of new roads, 124,000 bridges or viaducts, and 85,000 public buildings while reconditioning 35,000 other buildings. Additional construction included: 62,000 sidewalk and curbing projects, 3100 stadiums, 7800 parks, 7500 playgrounds and athletic fields, 1100 swimming pools, 3500 utility plants, 19,600 water distribution system projects, and 700 landing field projects. WPA projects also supported garment repair programs, school lunch programs, and food canning and distribution programs. Numerous WPA projects also supported the work of thousands of artists, musicians, and writers.

It is estimated that \$11 billion of Federal, State, and local revenues were expended on WPA projects over an eight year period.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS (CCC)

The CCC was established by Executive Order 6101 of April 5, 1933 and was originally called the Emergency Conservation Works Program. It was reorganized by an act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 314) as the CCC and functioned until June 30, 1943 when it was terminated by a provision of the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1943 (56 Stat. 569).

The CCC programs were developed especially for youth. These programs employed, on the average, 250,000 to 300,000 youth annually who lived in work camps and built trails, roads, cabins, firebreaks and planted millions of trees. The yearly cost of each enrollee approximated an expenditure of \$1000. Enrollees were paid a basic cash allowance of \$30 per month. Total Federal obligations for a period of nine years approached \$3 billion.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION (NYA)

The NYA was established by Executive Order 7086 of June 26, 1935, under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (48 Stat. 1055). The NYA was terminated under an act of July 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 539).

NYA employed annually an average of 150,000 to 190,000 in-school and out-of-school youth in parttime jobs or job training programs. Funding information is not immediately available.

INFORMATION ON THE INTERIM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(By Marion Schlefer, Analyst in Housing and Urban Affairs)

The enclosed description of the Interim Assistance program was duplicated from the National Urban Coalition's 1971 "Guide to Federal Low- and Moderate-Income Housing and Community Development Programs". Pages are also duplicated from the 5th and 6th Annual Reports of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, giving the numbers of communities assisted and the funding amounts. The Program is not mentioned in later Annual Reports of HUD which eliminated the old program oriented format. After fiscal year 1971, the program was not separately listed in the budget. However, in fiscal year 1973 the program was revived and funded from Urban Renewal Title I funds to assist in alleviating the problems resulting from flood disasters. These new interim assistance programs were all located in Pennsylvania with one exception which was located in Ohio.

The Report of Urban Renewal Operations dated December 31, 1972, gives a cumulative total of 54 programs in 50 localities of which 10 programs had been completed. As of that date there were 44 active programs in 41 locations. The cumulative table on page 2 of that report lists the amount of \$36,130,000 for cumulative program approval. For fiscal year 1973 \$13,100,000 of Title I funds for

the flood disaster programs was approved. As of December 31, 1972 total disbursements by HUD were listed at \$28,586,000 and for fiscal year 1973 an additional \$10,825,000 of Title I funds was also disbursed.

No HUD evaluations of these programs are available.

INTERIM ASSISTANCE FOR BLIGHTED AREAS

The 1968 amendments authorize new "interim assistance" grants to municipalities and counties.

The program is intended to assist localities in carrying out activities to alleviate harmful conditions in any slum or blighted area of the community for which substantial clearance, rehabilitation, or federally assisted code enforcement is planned in the near future but which needs some immediate public action.

Under the program such immediate short-term actions could be taken as: (1) repairing serious deficiencies in streets, sidewalks, parks, playgrounds, publicly owned utilities, and public buildings to the extent needed to maintain or restore decent conditions until permanent action can be taken (no new construction or major capital improvements are permitted); (2) the improvement of private properties to the extent needed to eliminate the most immediate dangers to public health and safety; (3) the demolition of structures deemed structurally unsound or unfit for human habitation and which are a public nuisance and a serious health and safety hazard; (4) establishment of a temporary public playgrounds on vacant land; and (5) improvement of such public services as garbage and trash collection and street cleaning.

Grants may not exceed two-thirds of the cost of planning and carrying out an interim assistance program (three-fourths of the cost in communities with populations of 50,000 or less).

Those displaced by interim assistance activities are eligible for federal relocation payments and assistance to the same extent as if they were displaced by urban renewal activities.

A locality must have a workable program for community improvement.

TURTLE CREEK WATERSHED ASSOCIATION, INC.

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, recent events in the energy field have catapulted our Nation's need to preserve and properly utilize its natural resources into national prominence. We know now, we must use these resources to obtain maximum benefit with minimum waste.

Several years ago, however, this need was recognized by several concerned and responsible citizens of western Pennsylvania, who foresaw the problems to be encountered through the misuse of land and water. To combat these problems, they formed the Turtle Creek Watershed Association, Inc., which serves a part of my 20th Congressional District.

Since 1970, TCWA has compiled an enviable record in this fight. Under the

leadership of Mr. John L. Schwartz, Jr., chairman, and John M. Mores, executive director, TCWA's conservation efforts have brought it statewide recognition and now it is a candidate for "Watershed of the Year." This is an award presented by the National Watershed Congress for outstanding efforts to improve environmental conditions for people and industry.

I believe TCWA is worthy of such recognition. Its past record includes adoption of strong watershed erosion controls, acid mine drainage study and abatement, sewage and solid waste problems identification and the establishment of a data bank of information to combat environmental problems through planning, public awareness and proper municipal land use.

The Turtle Creek watershed includes portions of Allegheny and Westmoreland counties, comprising 147 square miles of territory, 218,000 people, and 28 municipalities. Most of the area is open space, and farmland with approximately 30 percent consisting of urban development.

It has strong ties with our Nation's colonial and industrial history. It was part of the transportation corridor followed by General Braddock on his ill-fated march toward Pittsburgh in 1755. The general's troops were ambushed by French and Indians. General Braddock was mortally wounded and a young aide, George Washington, assumed command and with the French at his heels, led the troops east to a site where he constructed a temporary stockade, aptly named Fort Necessity, where he fought until his ammunition was exhausted and he was forced to surrender.

The watershed was the scene of another major battle in 1763. A vast alliance of Indians, led by the famous Chief Pontiac, was crushed by combined British and American troops led by General Bouquet.

It made industrial history when it was selected by George Westinghouse as the location for his plants which produced the first equipment generating and transporting alternate electrical currents. In 1894, the Westinghouse Corp. constructed three gigantic waterwheel generators there for use at Niagara Falls.

Today the watershed's industrial complex includes the East Pittsburgh Works of Westinghouse Electric Corp., one of the Nation's two largest facilities for producing large electric generators; several United States Steel Corp. facilities, including a research center with the world's largest electronic microscope used in the analysis of moon rocks, and the Westinghouse Air Brake Co. In all, the complex provides job opportunities for more than 21,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, the work and results of the TCWA is far too vast to be mentioned in detail here today. It is sufficient to say the organization has dedicated itself to the objectives of the National Watershed Congress and has proven itself worthy of national recognition.

DEMOCRACIES IN A MUDDLE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I direct to the attention of the Members a very thoughtful and, I believe, very sound lead editorial in the Chicago Daily News of March 5, which comments on the political crisis not only in the United States but in so many other countries in the free world.

I especially emphasize my concurrence with the closing paragraph of this editorial.

The editorial follows:

DEMOCRACIES IN A MUDDLE

When Prime Minister Edward Heath tried to strengthen his hand by calling an early election, he put the question in the stark terms of "Who rules Britain?" The answer wasn't what he expected, for the vote was so indecisive that it boiled down to the proposition that nobody rules Britain. A shaky government by minority or coalition is the best that can be hoped for until another election is called or forced.

But Britain is far from alone in its dilemma. There is hardly a nation in what used to be fondly described as the "free world" that isn't in the same boat of division and indecision, beginning of course with the free-world superpower, the United States. Confidence in government is at an all-time low wherever it has been openly tested, and the last two elections—in Britain and in Israel—brought weakness instead of strength.

France has just been through a cabinet shakeup. Italy's government has fallen, and of the other Common Market nations only tiny Luxembourg and perhaps Ireland have stable leadership. In West Germany, Chancellor Willy Brandt is in increasing trouble, and his party suffered a bad setback in state elections over the weekend.

Nor is the malaise confined to Europe. In Japan, Premier Tanaka faces burgeoning opposition. Canada has a minority government under Prime Minister Trudeau. In Latin America, nations not under dictatorships exhibit signs of instability.

The energy crisis appears to be a common denominator, but the causes go deeper. The Arab oil embargo and the drastic hike in oil prices triggered one crisis, but it is linked to many others, including a world food shortage that is sending prices skyrocketing everywhere.

National leaders get the blame for economic woes, naturally, yet the sort of inflation that is raging now can hardly be contained within national borders. And what is most needed—co-operation among the democratic nations—is falling into ever shorter supply as political leaders try desperately to shore up their strength at home.

Some observers are already speaking of a "crisis of democracy," and others of a "crisis of leadership." Nowhere in sight is there a leader with the stature to issue a clarion call that would bring order out of the increasing disorder. President Nixon tried it, with his appeal for a united front of Western Europe, Japan and the United States in the oil bind, but his own leadership capacity is so badly undermined he got nowhere.

The Communist nations, where rule by minority through fear and repression is the rule, are doubtless chortling over the evidence of the "breakdown" of democracy, but they would be wrong to predict its demise. That the world is at some kind of watershed in its

history may be true. Rapid advances in technology, communication and affluence have converged at a point where a leveling-off process must take place while the gains are being absorbed. The readjustment, by all indications, will be painful.

But we would not bet against the collective wisdom of the people to make the right choices as the muddled facts become clearer and the realities come into focus. And the cries for strong leadership now being heard aren't necessarily the answer—in that direction also lie the demagogues and the dictators. Democracy may be in a passing state of confusion, but no better mechanism for pulling through to cooperation in an interdependent world is likely to be found.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in favor of title XIII of H.R. 69, which proposes a White House Conference on Education in 1975.

This conference would be patterned after a similar one held in 1955. Nearly 1,500 meetings were held across the country that year, and then representatives from these sessions met in Washington. The members of that 1955 Illinois conference are still an active group with a strong interest in education. It was a member of that group which originally brought to my attention the fact that there seems to be a precedent for holding a conference every 10 years. According to that calendar, we should have such a conference in 1975.

There was a White House Conference on Education in 1965. It differed from the 1955 conference in that it was not preceded by State and local sessions.

It is interesting to read the reports from 10 and 20 years ago. They give one a good sense of the national problems we faced in education at those times. In 1955, the conference stressed the need for new buildings and hiring enough teachers to keep up with growth. It is interesting to note that there was nothing written about higher education.

This was just the opposite of 1965 where higher education was a major topic along with urban education. There were recommendations on preschool education, special education, and educating students for the world of work in 1965. The point is that the major social conditions which shape education shift from decade to decade. The White House conferences helped increase understanding and awareness in former times. I believe that the same thing could happen in 1975.

The purpose of this conference is to draw attention to some of the problems of today's education and hopefully to offer some solutions. The conferees are free to address any problems they feel are important; but they should give special consideration to preschool education, the adequacy of primary education in providing children with skills in communication and arithmetic, career and occupational preparation, problems of higher

education, and finally the educational needs of special students. Examples of this last item include education of mentally retarded, physically handicapped, and exceptional students.

These topics should be considered at local and State level conferences before the national conference is held. Each State and territory will receive between \$25,000 and \$75,000 to defray the costs of the conferences. We intend that the conferees will be representative of all aspects of American life and that educators not be allowed to predominate. In this way, policymakers should get the broadest vision that the American people have on education. I believe that this is an effective way for us to involve the intelligence of the people of this country in a concern that is vital to everyone.

The National Conference Committee supervising the conference will have 35 members. Not more than 12 of these people shall be educators. The remainder should be broadly representative of the public interest in education. Fifteen are to be appointed by the President, 10 by the President pro tempore of the other body, and 10 by the Speaker of the House. Let me emphasize that the President pro tempore and the Speaker must consult with the minority leaders in their respective Houses before they make their appointments. The National Committee will be required to make a final report on the findings and suggestions of the conference.

Such sums as necessary are authorized. We estimate the total cost of the program to be \$5 million.

I think a conference scheduled at this time is appropriate. There are unresolved questions about tuition in higher education which have major implications for the future of post secondary education in this country. We have groups in the Nation concerned with ways to expand and upgrade the quality of vocational education in our schools. We face a major problem due to the decreasing enrollment in all of our schools. And we have parents across the country wondering whether their children are getting the education they need to become purposeful, well-adjusted, responsible adults.

These are just a few of the many critical issues that are upon us. A White House Conference will help draw attention to the problems and to resolutions. Certainly professional educators will welcome the report. We in Congress would be well served by the organized reports from our local districts and States. And most hopefully the children in our schools will be the beneficiaries of this program.

LAND USE PLANNING ACT OF 1974

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, the Rules Committee determined that H.R. 10294, the Land Use Planning

Act of 1974, should not be brought up for consideration by the House at this time. I am convinced that this decision was a mistake, and I would hope that the committee would be willing to reconsider its action.

There is a great need in this Nation for the kind of planning for the use of our land to best advantage that this measure would encourage. In essence, H.R. 10294 offered to the States Federal assistance in developing land use plans consistent with the needs and desires of their own area.

To those who contend that this measure represents the end of private property rights, and is a Federal zoning law, I can only suggest that they reread the bill. It does not establish substantive Federal standards for land use decisions. It does create a grant-in-aid program to help States develop and administer their own plans and regulations.

Participation in the program would be completely voluntary. Any State which does not want to participate is free to do what it wishes—without facing the loss of Federal funds in other existing programs. The hope of those who have worked so hard preparing this legislation is that the funds made available under it—\$800 million over 8 years—would serve as a meaningful incentive for States to participate.

On February 27, 1974, the American Institute of Planners, during their meeting in Washington, approved a resolution in strong support of congressional action on this land use legislation. I would like to include the text of that resolution for the consideration of my colleagues at this point:

RESOLUTION

The American Institute of Planners is gravely disturbed by the recent action of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives relative to the National Land Use Planning Act. This legislation has received thorough and deliberate consideration by both Houses of Congress for the last four years. Early in the first session of the 93rd Congress, the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, adopted its version of this Land Use Legislation. The House in order to allow just and thorough consideration for final disposition of this act must allow a final vote of the House.

We of the American Institute of Planners working at all levels of government as professional public employees bear the responsibility for planning and implementing land use programs in all of our 50 states.

We currently are struggling with the complex problems of striking a balance between the environmental and energy needs of our country as they impact on our respective jurisdictions.

We currently are struggling with the immediate and pressing problems of guiding the processes of urbanization in large cities and small communities alike.

We currently are struggling with the urgent problems of maintaining and restoring the economic vitality of our rural countryside while protecting its natural resources.

We are struggling, as a delegate assembly of the planners of this nation, to formulate policy recommendations which would enable us to perform these vital planning functions efficiently and effectively. High on this priority list is the enactment of the National Land Use Planning Act which furthers our ability to plan and implement for our elected policy makers at each level of State and

local government. This is particularly vital as the "New Federalism" places increasing responsibility on all jurisdictions of government to build the capacity to plan and implement programs of their own making.

Therefore, be it resolved: That we the delegates of the Planning Policy and Government Relations Conference of the American Institute of Planners urgently request the leadership of the House of Representatives to insist that open and deliberate consideration of the National Land Use Planning Act be allowed on the floor of the United States House of Representatives by the Rules Committee of that Body.

I urge the Rules Committee to reconsider their action on this measure. The House should have the opportunity to debate this vital measure, and to vote on it. The people of this Nation have a right to know what the Congress will do in this area, and to expect the Congress to take action.

NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, few would deny that Watergate is the press' finest hour. The Watergate scandal was uncovered by the best efforts of American journalism. Corruption and illegality in the highest places have been exposed—not by lawyers or prosecutors or police, but by persistent journalists on newspapers and network television, and by a very tough Federal judge.

A number of men received worldwide recognition for their instrumental role in the investigation of the past year's dominant news topic, but two virtually unknown reporters were the principal agents in precipitating disclosure of the tragic Watergate story. In 1935, a New York jury refused to convict John Peter Zenger for publishing "scandalous, virulent, false, and seditious reflections" about the British Governor of that State. And in 1973, Karl Bernstein and Robert Woodward of the Washington Post demonstrated anew why freedom of the press has been revered as one of the sacred cornerstones of our liberty since that time.

Interest in Watergate has been so consuming that many have forgotten that it was slightly more than a year ago that the press was trying to convince the public that it could not survive without a shield law. Two years ago the Supreme Court struck a hard blow at a vital element in news gathering by ruling that a reporter has no right to protect his confidential relationship with news sources. The news media in recent years has been showered with subpoenas from both prosecutors and defense lawyers in both civil and criminal cases. Federal, State, and local grand juries not preoccupied with Watergate have continued to serve reporters with subpoenas.

The press came to Congress with a strong argument for a shield law. Without such protection, courts would force

disclosure, and confidential news sources would refuse to talk to reporters, and the press could not fulfill its constitutional role of informing the public about matters that the guilty want to hide.

Then came Watergate, which has provided a windfall of news, obtained from confidential, unidentified sources. And somehow the urgent necessity for a shield law has fallen away. But, ironically, the press' instrumental role in Watergate may well make a shield law more necessary than ever.

Newsman are obligated by the practical necessities of their profession not to disclose confidential information which comes into their possession. When the Government seeks to compel such disclosures by threat of imprisonment, it is in effect sentencing the newsman for being a newsman. This treatment is totally incompatible with the great tradition of free press in this country. Federal shield legislation is an appropriate and desirable method of dealing with this matter. The following views represent my best judgment on how to reconcile the public interest in the free flow of information with the fair administration of justice.

I am satisfied that there is justification for legislation to define and establish a shield or privilege for those who disseminate news and information to the public. The detrimental effect of threatened imprisonment for refusal to reveal confidential news sources is widely attested to by members of the working press. Extensive congressional hearings have established the nature and extent of the impairment of news gathering.

Representatives of the news media have testified that they have been unable to conduct interviews with news sources because of inability to assure the source of confidentiality.

Newsman should not be required to practice their profession under the hazard of loss of their personal liberty. Newsman seek no protection for themselves but protection for their function. The first amendment's guarantee of freedom of the press protects the public's right to know the facts about their government and the functioning of its institutions, as well as business and other private abuses. The shield is not intended to create a privileged class of newsmen. Any privilege which is recognized must serve the purpose of protecting the public interest in freedom of access to news and information and must not impose conditions upon that free access.

The coverage of such legislation should be sufficiently flexible to include all individuals who gather and disseminate news to the American public. Protection should not be limited to employees of large daily newspapers or established broadcast media. Authors of material generally available to the public should be protected regardless of the regularity of publication or size of distribution.

The need for shield legislation relates primarily to the preservation of confidential sources of news and information. The protection of these relationships is justifiable, to facilitate the uncovering of official malfeasance and corruption

in both the public and private sectors. Several types of information must be protected.

First is the identity of a confidential source. A newsman's ability to protect the confidentiality of his sources is critical to his ability to obtain information about matters of urgent public importance. Unless the newsman can offer assurance of confidentiality, sources will, I am convinced, dry up and the public will be deprived of crucial information.

A second matter the shield should protect is the content of communication imparted to the newsman in confidence. As a practical matter, there is a substantial risk that revelation of the contents of a confidential communication would lead to disclosure of the identity of the source. Thus, in order to protect the confidentiality of the source, privilege for confidentiality of the communication is also justified.

Finally, a degree of protection should be recognized for information or materials obtained by the newsman in the course of gathering the news—whether inside or outside the context of a confidential relationship. This category could include such diverse items as a newsman's draft of an account of a public meeting, the "outtakes" of a television camera crew, or the tapes of a radio newsman's interview. Such matters, comparable to the concept of an attorney's work products, are the result of a newsman's performance in his news-gathering function. Newsman, like lawyers, might be reluctant to commit their thoughts to writing or to make notes on what they observe if their memorandums, drafts, or notes were available on demand to outsiders.

Congress will consider a bill this year which would provide that no newsman could be required to disclose confidential information or its source to a Federal or State grand jury or to any pretrial proceeding. But, in an actual trial, such disclosure could be required, if the information sought was indispensable to the prosecution or defense and could not be obtained from any other source and if there was a compelling public interest in disclosure.

The bill is supported by Representative ROBERT KASTENMEIER, chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil Liberties, and by others including some news organizations whose devotion to freedom of the press is unquestioned. I am a member of that subcommittee but voted against the bill. I call for even more protection—the bill falls short of an absolute privilege. We should simply restate the guarantees of a free press, or do nothing at all.

The bill does protect, up to a point, the confidential relationship that must exist between the press and its news sources. But it still concedes the courts the authority to compel a newsman to betray his news source. Such a concession will give, for the first time, statutory approval to the trend to bind the press as an agent of the court, the prosecution, or the defense in civil as well as criminal cases. Confidential sources would not fail to understand the implications of this, and as a result, there would be a chilling

effect on the sources. If an employee or a source comes forward to report corruption, he must know he will be protected or he will not come forward at all.

Many news sources are actuated by a variety of motives, and they might communicate their information even without the guarantee of absolute privilege. However, some sources will communicate only if they can rely on the assurance that their confidences will be maintained. It is impossible to say how many news sources fall into this category, but as Watergate has illustrated, those who do may have information of vital public importance to reveal.

The sanctions imposed on the press are penalties imposed on this Nation, against a tradition of two centuries of freedom under an unwritten, absolute privilege that was commonly thought to be essential to an effective press until very recent years. If reporters can be forced to testify for or against one side or the other in court, the ability of the press to continue its function as an independent gatherer of news will be gravely diminished.

An independent press— independent of judicial censorship, secure from the power of courts to compel testimony that breaks down the confidentiality of news sources—is indispensable to democratic government. The past year has exposed the desperate need for the investigative force of the press to serve as a viable check on abuses by Government. The dramatic revelations of Watergate demonstrate more than anything else that we must eliminate, once and for all, the practice of jailing newsmen for doing their job.

HELPFUL HINTS FOR SENIOR CITIZEN TAXPAYERS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Special Committee on Aging has recently published some helpful hints for senior citizen taxpayers. I draw my colleagues' attention to this timely and useful report:

CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS FOR SCHEDULE A (FORM 1040)

MEDICAL AND DENTAL EXPENSES

Medical and dental expenses are deductible to the extent that they exceed 3% of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income (line 15, Form 1040).

INSURANCE PREMIUMS

One-half of medical, hospital or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to \$150) without regard to the 3% limitation for other medical expenses. The remainder of these premiums can be deducted, but is subject to the 3% rule.

DRUGS AND MEDICINES

Included in medical expenses (subject to 3% rule) but only to extent exceeding 1% of adjusted gross income (line 15, Form 1040).

OTHER MEDICAL EXPENSES

Other allowable medical and dental expense (subject to 3% limitation):
Abdominal supports.

Ambulance hire.
Anesthetist.
Arch supports.
Artificial limbs and teeth.
Back supports.
Braces.
Capital expenditures for medical purposes (e.g., elevator for persons with a heart ailment)—deductible to the extent that the cost of the capital expenditure exceeds the increase in value to your home because of the capital expenditure. Taxpayer should have an independent appraisal made to reflect clearly the increase in value.
Cardiographs.
Chiropodist.
Chiropractor.
Christian science practitioner, authorized.
Convalescent home (for medical treatment only).
Crutches.
Dental services (e.g., cleaning teeth, X-rays, filling teeth).
Dentures.
Dermatologist.
Eyeglasses.
Gynecologist.
Hearing aids and batteries.
Hospital expenses.
Insulin treatment.
Invalid chair.
Lab tests.
Lip reading lessons (designed to overcome a handicap).
Neurologist.
Nursing services (for medical care).
Ophthalmologist.
Optician.
Optometrist.
Oral surgery.
Osteopath, licensed.
Pediatrician.
Physical examinations.
Physician.
Physiotherapist.
Podiatrist.
Psychiatrist.
Psychoanalyst.
Psychologist.
Psychotherapy.
Radium therapy.
Sacroiliac belt.
Seeing-eye dog and maintenance.
Splints.
Supplementary Medical Insurance (Part B) under Medicare.
Surgeon.
Transportation expenses for medical purposes (6¢ per mile plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, busses, etc.).
Vaccines.
Vitamins prescribed by a doctor (but not taken as a food supplement or to preserve general health).
Wheelchairs.
Whirlpool baths for medical purposes.
X-rays.

TAXES

Real estate.
State and local gasoline.
General sales.
State and local income.
Personal property.

If sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, you may add to the amount shown in the tax tables only the sales tax paid on the purchase of 5 classes of items: automobiles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes and materials used to build a new home when you are your own contractor.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income (e.g., Social Security or Railroad Retirement Annuities).

CONTRIBUTIONS

In general, contributions may be deducted up to 50 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 15, Form 1040). However, contributions to certain private nonprofit foundations, veterans organizations, or fraternal

societies are limited to 20 percent of adjusted gross income.

Cash contributions to qualified organizations for (1) religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes, (2) prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or (3) Federal, state or local governmental units (tuition for children attending parochial schools is not deductible). Fair market value of property (e.g. clothing, books, equipment, furniture) for charitable purposes. (For gifts of appreciated property, special rules apply. Contact local IRS office.)

Travel expenses (actual or 6¢ per mile plus parking and tolls) for charitable purposes (may not deduct insurance or depreciation in either case).

Cost and upkeep of uniforms used in charitable activities (e.g., scoutmaster).

Purchase of goods or tickets from charitable organizations (excess of amount paid over the fair market value of the goods or services).

Out-of-pocket expenses (e.g. postage, stationery, phone calls) while rendering services for charitable organizations.

Care of unrelated student in taxpayer's home under a written agreement with a qualifying organization (deduction is limited to \$50 per month).

INTEREST

Home mortgage.

Auto loan.

Installment purchases (television, washer, dryer, etc.).

Bank credit card—can deduct the finance charge as interest if no part is for service charges or loan fees, credit investigation reports. If classified as service charge, may still deduct 6 percent of the average monthly balance (average monthly balance equals the total of the unpaid balance for all 12 months, divided by 12) limited to the portion of the total fee or service charge allocable to the year.

Points—deductible as interest by buyer where financing agreement provides that they are to be paid for use of lender's money. Not deductible if points represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g. VA loan points are service charges and are not deductible as interest). Not deductible if paid by seller (are treated as selling expenses and represent a reduction of amount realized).

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage—deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts—may deduct the "finance charge" if the charges are based on your unpaid balance and computed monthly.

CASUALTY OR THEFT LOSSES

Casualty (e.g. tornado, flood, storm, fire, or auto accident provided not caused by a willful act or willful negligence) or theft losses to nonbusinesses property—the amount of your casualty loss deduction is generally the lesser of (1) the decrease in fair market value of the property as a result of the casualty, or (2) your adjusted basis in the property. This amount must be further reduced by any insurance or other recovery, and, in the case of property held for personal use, by the \$100 limitation. You may use Form 4684 for computing your personal casualty loss.

CHILD AND DISABLED DEPENDENT CARE EXPENSES

The deduction for child dependent care expenses for employment related purposes has been expanded substantially. Now a taxpayer who maintains a household may claim a deduction for employment-related expenses incurred in obtaining care for a (1) dependent who is under 15, (2) physically or mentally disabled dependent, or (3) disabled spouse. The maximum allowable deduction is \$400 a month (\$4,800 a year). As a general rule, employment-related expenses are deductible only if incurred for services for a qualifying individual in the taxpayer's house-

hold. However, an exception exists for child care expenses (as distinguished from a disabled dependent or a disabled spouse). In this case, expenses outside the household (e.g., day care expenditures) are deductible but the maximum deduction is \$200 per month for one child, \$300 per month for 2 children, and \$400 per month for 3 or more children.

When a taxpayer's adjusted gross income (line 15, Form 1040) exceeds \$18,000, his deduction is reduced by \$1 for each \$2 of income above this amount. For further information about child and dependent care deductions, see Publication 503, Child Care and Disabled Dependent Care, available free at Internal Revenue offices.

MISCELLANEOUS

Alimony and separate maintenance (periodic payments).

Appraisal fees for casualty loss or to determine the fair market value of charitable contributions.

Campaign contributions (up to \$100 for joint returns and \$50 for single persons).

Union dues.

Cost of preparation of income tax return. Cost of tools for employee (depreciated over the useful life of the tools).

Dues for Chamber of Commerce (if as a business expense).

Rental cost of a safe-deposit box for income producing property.

Fees paid to investment counselors.

Subscriptions to business publications.

Telephone and postage in connection with investments.

Uniforms required for employment and not generally wearable off the job.

Maintenance of uniforms required for employment.

Special safety apparel (e.g., steel toe safety shoes or helmets worn by construction workers; special masks worn by welders).

Business entertainment expenses.

Business gift expenses not exceeding \$25 per recipient.

Employment agency fees for securing employment.

Cost of a periodic physical examination if required by employer.

Cost of installation and maintenance of a telephone required by the taxpayer's employment (deduction based on business use).

Cost of bond if required for employment.

Expenses of an office in your home if employment requires it.

Payments made by a teacher to a substitute.

Educational expenses required by your employer to maintain your position or for maintaining or sharpening your skills for your employment.

Political Campaign Contributions: Taxpayers may now claim either a deduction (line 33, Schedule A, Form 1040) or a credit (line 52, Form 1040), for campaign contributions to an individual who is a candidate for nomination or election to any Federal, State or local office in any primary, general or special election. The deduction or credit is also applicable for any (1) committee supporting a candidate for Federal, State, or local elective public office, (2) national committee of a national political party, (3) state committee of a national political party, or (4) local committee of a national political party. The maximum deduction is \$50 (\$100 for couples filing jointly). The amount of the tax credit is one-half of the political contribution, with a \$12.50 ceiling (\$25 for couples filing jointly).

Presidential Election Campaign Fund: Additionally, taxpayers may voluntarily earmark \$1 of their taxes (\$2 on joint returns), to help defray the costs of the 1976 presidential election campaign. If you failed to earmark \$1 of your 1972 taxes (\$2 in joint returns) to help defray the cost of the 1976 presidential election campaign, you may do

so in the space provided above the signature line on your 1973 tax return.

For any questions concerning any of these items, contact your local IRS office. You may also obtain helpful publications and additional forms by contacting your local IRS office.

OTHER TAX RELIEF MEASURES FOR OLDER AMERICANS

	Required to file a tax return if gross income is at least
Filing status:	
Single (under age 65)-----	\$2,050
Single (age 65 or older)-----	2,800
Married couple (both spouses under 65) filing jointly-----	2,800
Married couple (1 spouse 65 or older) filing jointly-----	3,550
Married couple (both spouses 65 or older) filing jointly-----	4,300
Married filing separately-----	750

Additional Personal Exemption for Age: In addition to the regular \$750 exemption allowed a taxpayer, a husband and wife who are 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year are each entitled to an additional exemption of \$750 because of age. You are considered 65 on the day before your 65th birthday. Thus, if your 65th birthday is on January 1, 1974, you will be entitled to the additional \$750 personal exemption because of age for your 1973 Federal income tax return.

Multiple Support Agreement: In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met: (1) Support, (2) Gross Income, (3) Member of Household or Relationship, (4) Citizenship, and (5) Separate Return. But in some cases, two or more individuals provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support.

However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a \$750 dependency deduction if the following requirements are met for multiple support:

1. Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if it were not for the support test—together contribute more than half of the dependent's support.

2. Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10 percent of the mutual dependent's support, but only one of them, may claim the dependency deduction.

3. Each of the others must file a written statement that he will not claim the dependency deduction for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax return of the person who claims the dependency deduction. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

Sale of Personal Residence by Elderly Taxpayers: A taxpayer may elect to exclude from gross income part, or, under certain circumstances, all of the gain from the sale of his personal residence, provided:

1. He was 65 or older before the date of the sale, and

2. He owned and occupied the property as his personal residence for a period totaling at least five years within the eight-year period ending on the date of the sale.

Taxpayers meeting these two requirements may elect to exclude the entire gain from gross income if the adjusted sales price of their residence is \$20,000 or less. (This election can only be made once during a taxpayer's lifetime.) If the adjusted sales price exceeds \$20,000, an election may be made to exclude part of the gain based on a ratio of \$20,000 over the adjusted sales price of the residence. Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Personal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded by an elderly taxpayer when he sells his home.

Additionally, a taxpayer may elect to defer reporting the gain on the sale of his personal residence if within one year before or one year after the sale he buys and occupies another residence, the cost of which equals or exceeds the adjusted sales price of the old residence. Additional time is allowed if (1) you construct the new residence or (2) you were on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces. Publication 523 (tax Information on Selling Your Home) may also be helpful.

Retirement Income Credit: To qualify for the retirement income credit, you must (a) be a U.S. citizen or resident, (b) have received earned income in excess of \$600 in each of any 10 calendar years before 1973, and (c) have certain types of qualifying "retirement income". Five types of income—pensions, annuities, interest, and dividends included on line 15, Form 1040, and gross rents from Schedule E, Part II, column (b)—qualify for the retirement income credit.

The credit is 15 percent of the lesser of:

1. A taxpayer's qualifying retirement income, or
2. \$1,524 (\$2,286 for a joint return where both taxpayers are 65 or older) minus the total of nontaxable pensions (such as Social Security benefits or Railroad Retirement annuities) and earned income (depending upon the taxpayer's age and the amount of any earnings he may have).

If the taxpayer is under 62, he must reduce the \$1,524 figure by the amount of earned income in excess of \$900. For persons at least 62 years old but less than 72, this amount is reduced by one-half of the earned income in excess of \$1,200 up to \$1,700, plus the total amount over \$1,700. Persons 72 and over are not subject to the earned income limitation.

Schedule R is used for taxpayers who claim the retirement income credit.

The Internal Revenue Service will also compute the retirement income credit for a taxpayer if he has requested that IRS compute his tax and he answers the questions for Columns A and B and completes lines 2 and 5 on Schedule R—relating to the amount of his Social Security benefits, Railroad Retirement annuities, earned income, and qualifying retirement income (pensions, annuities, interest, dividends, and rents). The taxpayer should also write "RIC" on line 17, Form 1040.

BUILDING THE SOVIET MILITARY MACHINE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union recently completed a fourth launching in its current series of ICBM tests. The technology for such advanced missiles includes the use of computers. Anthony Sutton, probably the foremost expert on Soviet technology, has written:

All modern technology, including modern military technology, depends on the use of computers. To make any progress in weapons systems the Soviets have to utilize modern high-speed computers. These computers and the necessary computer technology have come from the West and still comes from the West, almost exclusively from the United States.

Stefan Possony, senior fellow at the Hoover Institute, Stanford University, writes:

One of the main Soviet purposes in following a detente policy is to obtain much needed computer equipment.

He also states that:

Computers are very necessary for modern weapon systems to "be built, integrated, tested, deployed, kept combat ready and operated."

On a number of occasions I have informed this body of new deals with the Soviet Union—deals that have definite strategic value. The Soviets buildup of their military forces is growing rapidly. What sense does it make to help the Soviets build up their armed forces in order that they may be more of a threat to us?

Are the Soviets expanding their military power in order that they may have protection against American aggression? While certain American leftists may answer yes to that last question, the vast majority of Americans know that the truth is the exact opposite. I cannot understand how a policy of so-called détente that is supposed to be helping form a more peaceful world is providing the technology to the Soviets that will make the world a place where war and disturbances will be more prevalent because of a Soviet military superiority made possible by Western technology. It is time for the administration to realize that the providing of advanced technology to the Soviets does have costs to American national security—costs which are not being compensated by any Soviet moves.

The Soviets need American technology. We do not need a more powerful Soviet Union. The construction of Soviet industry and armaments with American technology serves neither the cause of peace nor of free men. If President Nixon is serious about building a peaceful future for our children and grandchildren, I urge him to cut off trade with the Soviet Union. Helping the Soviets build weapons does not help the United States build peace.

At this point I include in the RECORD two articles entitled "Russia Fires Fourth Missile in Pacific Ocean Test Series" and "Détente Linked To Soviet Need For Computer Technology" from the February 28, 1974 issue of *Aerospace Daily* and a Joseph Alsop column "The Missile Scoreboard" from the March 4, 1974, issue of the *Washington Post*.

RUSSIA FIRES FOURTH MISSILE IN PACIFIC OCEAN TEST SERIES

The Soviet Union Tuesday carried out the fourth in a current series of ICBM tests. It was the first launch of an SS-X-17 missile into the Pacific Ocean from the Tyuratam launch site in central Russia.

The SS-X-17, along with the SS-X-19, is expected to be a replacement for the present SS-11. In Tuesday's test, it carried only one inert warhead. Pentagon spokesman Jerry W. Friedheim noted that it is credited with being able to carry up to four MIRV warheads.

The test brings to three the number of new Russian ICBMs fired over their full ranges. The others, tested in January and earlier this month, are the SS-X-18 and SS-X-19.

DÉTENTE LINKED TO SOVIET NEED FOR COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY

"One of the main Soviet purposes in following a détente policy is to obtain much needed computer equipment," according to Stefan Possony, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University.

"Without computers, modern weapon systems could not be built, integrated, tested,

deployed, kept combat ready and operated," he said. "In fact weapons such as missiles, aircraft, tanks and submarines incorporate computers as part of their armament."

If the West were not to sell computers to the USSR, Possony observes, "... Soviet bloc research and development structures will be able to solve the problem by themselves, but only after considerable time and after their approach to computer design and production has been reorganized."

"For the time being they will continue to trail, but as they move forward, presently insoluble military problems will be solved ... It should be kept in mind that the Soviets have no difficulty with the mathematics and the other scientific bases of the computer sciences. Their difficulties are of an industrial nature, and they also seem to lack the personnel to carry out extensive software programs. The industry appears to be inefficiently organized."

Finally, Possony notes, "According to Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger, the Soviet MIRV force could reach parity with the U.S. force by 1980. As a planning factor it must be assumed that by that time the MIRV technology available to the USSR battle order will have been perfected."

"The U.S. must anticipate the danger and take suitable precautionary actions which may include among other improvements the stepping up of the technological development of thermal lasers, the construction of site defenses for missile launchers, the acceleration of Trident and B-1 and the building of more modern and improved missiles to replace the Minuteman warhorse which, though still useful and even vital, is aging."

His views are detailed in the current issue of *Orbis*, a quarterly journal of world affairs published by the Foreign Policy Research Institute in association with the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University.

THE NEW MISSILE SCOREBOARD

(By Joseph Alsop)

If we go on as we are now, the scoreboard at the end of this decade will show the Soviets with 7,000 land-based, long-range nuclear warheads averaging about one megaton apiece. Meanwhile, the United States will have no more than 3,000 nuclear warheads averaging about 170 kilotons apiece.

Thus we shall have only three-sevenths of the Soviet number of warheads. And each U.S. warhead will have much less than one-fifth of the Soviet warheads' power to destroy, per warhead!

Those are the stark figures indicated by the new series of Soviet long-range missile tests in the Pacific. One must add, of course, what these figures leave out. Above all, they leave out proportional strengths in other weapons systems, not having to do with land-based missile of intercontinental range.

That means, first of all, that the figures omit the relative U.S. and Soviet strengths in "SLBMs." This simply means ballistic missiles of a submarine-launch. But the first SALT agreement permits the Soviet to build up to above 900 submarine-launched nuclear missiles, against approximately two-thirds of that number for the United States.

The Soviets are rapidly proceeding with the permitted buildup of SLBMs. The buildup includes new submarines with extra-long-range missiles that can lurk in the Sea of Okhotsk, for example, where they will be all but immune from U.S. antisubmarine warfare. Because the submarines will be virtually beyond danger, this new submarine-missile combination should be at least as good if not better than the U.S. "Trident" system.

Secondly, the above-cited figures for proportional strengths in land-based, long-range nuclear missiles also omit the capabilities of the two powers in manned bombers. The

Soviets, to begin with, are building a long-range bomber known as the "Backfire," which is intercontinental, however you may look at it.

The Backfire, much like a slightly smaller version of the projected U.S. B-1, can do a one-way mission to U.S. targets. Or it can fly one way and refuel, for instance, in Cuba, or it can fly two ways with air refueling, if the Soviets build the needed fleet of aerial tankers. (The Backfire has machinery for air refueling.)

These facts are rather vividly interesting because of the almost total dismantling of U.S. air defenses. This is now close to completion. This dismantling, furthermore, enormously multiplies the destructive potential of every Backfire.

Meanwhile, the Soviets are spending unimaginable fortunes on strengthening and maintaining the most dense and costly air defense that the world has ever seen. Thereby, they are casting legitimate doubts on the power to penetrate to major Soviet targets of both the U.S. B-52s and the B-1s the United States will have later—if Congress will pay for them.

So there you have it in a nutshell. The Soviet tests of long-range, land-based nuclear missiles were conducted from the Tyuratam Missile Development Center all the way to the mid-Pacific. These tests therefore traversed a range of at least 5,000 miles. They indicate, as briefly noted, that this country can be at a hopeless disadvantage by 1980, unless the United States promptly makes great efforts to improve its strategic power.

The Soviet tests conducted to date have been: First, two tests of one of the two Soviet follow-ons from their SS-11 missile (of which they have about 1,000, with an existing power comparable to that of our 1,000 Minuteman missiles). Both these tests of the new, far more powerful SSX-19 missile showed that this follow-on was MIRVed with multiple re-entry warheads. Also MIRVed were the two more recent tests of the second SS-11 follow-on, the SSX-17, with no less than four warheads of at least a megaton apiece.

Then there was the follow-on of the SS-9, the supergiant Soviet intercontinental missile. Two of the new SSX-18s showed no MIRVing. They are therefore being interpreted in some quarters as a happy "signal" for the SALT talks. But there has already been one SSX-18 test with five MIRVed warheads of well above a megaton apiece. In short, the one bright spot is the probable fact that the Soviets are still having trouble with their new solid-propellant missile, the SSX-16.

So two questions now confront us: First, what is the value of our official strategic concept of "assured destruction" in the light of the foregoing grim facts? And, second, what to do about the next round of SALT?

CYRUS JOHNSON, JR.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Friday evening, March 8, Cyrus Johnson, Jr., a hometown boy made good, returned to Alton, Ill., as the speaker at the first annual recognition dinner sponsored by the Alton Advisory Committee of the Madison-St. Clair County Urban League. Mr. Johnson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Cyrus Johnson, Sr., and one of the Nation's outstanding blacks in business leadership, attended Alton schools and gradu-

ated with bachelor and master degrees from the University of Illinois. He swiftly became an executive with Illinois Bell Telephone Co. and was invited by the leadership of General Mills to become corporate vice president, a capacity in which he now serves. He holds directorships on the Board of General Mills Foundation, Abbott-Northwestern Hospitals, and serves on the allocation committee of the United Way of Minneapolis and the advisory committee to the National Board of Directors—YMCA. He and his wife reside in Minneapolis.

In his address to the Urban League, Mr. Johnson made an eloquent defense of the profit system in economic life. Here is the text of his statement:

ALTON URBAN LEAGUE FIRST ANNUAL RECOGNITION DINNER—MARCH 8, 1974: ALTON REVISITED

This, I consider a rare occasion, a distinct honor and an opportunity you have afforded me and my company, General Mills. When your President, Mr. Pitts, invited me to be here he suggested that I might talk about my experience in urban affairs or management; the Black man in business or the social responsibilities of corporations. All of these topics are of consuming interest to me and I would like to briefly touch on each of them.

You will discover with very little effort that I thoroughly enjoy business, industry and the free enterprise system even with all of its ills. I simply know of no other system which has provided a comparable standard of living. Our societal problems have continued through history and involve the political and social implications of the distribution of wealth and the consumption of our resources. That, however, is not one of the topics Mr. Pitts suggested I speak on.

I think it will also help you to appreciate the things I shall say if you know that I have never had a job which I didn't enjoy or on which I didn't learn. Those job experiences go something like this: farmer, military service, student, waiter, many management assignments in operations and staff of the telephone company and, now, an officer of General Mills—but always a product of Alton.

Many of you know that this is a homecoming experience for me. I hope you realize how nice it is to come home to friends like you and to share your thrill of honoring your awards recipients for their distinguished service to people. This audience vividly reminds me of that one unique ability I have—that of finding myself with wonderful people and organizations. The people of Alton and the Urban League are, I think, second to none. I congratulate the Urban League for its achievements, dedication and its local and national leadership. Vernon Jordan, the National Urban League Executive Director is, as you know, an outstanding leader, lawyer, gentleman and a friend.

Certainly some of you have never heard of me, but you perhaps know my parents or some other member of the Johnson or Keen families. I hope you can share with us the pleasure of your invitation and the subtle requirement to voluntarily give an accounting for the some 23 years of my absence from Alton as a full-time resident.

I am reminded of those of somewhat similar heritage whose report, if given and completed, would include personal misfortunes—like drug dependency, incarceration, ill health, unemployment, severe poverty and the many other ills of our society which are disproportionately identified in the ranks of the poor and minority people, particularly black people.

Thus I want to believe and you to con-

sider that your attendance here tonight is a significant indication that you and some of the companies you represent recognize the importance of the Urban League and the service it can provide this community and its citizens. You, as informed citizens are perhaps more aware than I that there remains, even in Alton, some unfinished social business, too serious to ignore and delay. I shall not attempt to list them all, but just as a reminder, those social issues include the age-old burdens of poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, unemployment, poor housing, etc. Much of the leadership necessary to deal with these problems in Alton is in this room, and it will require your best efforts. Nationally, the problems in the black community are of this approximate size as compared with the majority population:

Infant mortality rate—2X.
Male life expectancy—10 years less.
School dropouts—2X.
Teenage unemployment—4X.
Male unemployment—2X.
Average income—lower approximately \$2,000.
Juvenile delinquency—higher.

From what I could learn of the 1969-70 census data, the national figures are fairly applicable to Alton. I think that the Urban League, business and industry, educators, religious leaders, government and just plain concerned citizens can and will direct themselves more vigorously to solving these people problems. Some of these have legal requirements with financial penalties to hopefully hasten the time of more equitable treatment. However, more importantly, the solutions make good common sense and the results are mutually beneficial, particularly considering the alternatives.

I think I would be remiss in my responsibility if I did not ask this entire audience to each, individually, provide as much influence and motivation as you can to young people to stay in school and continue their education or training as far as possible. I do not mean to indicate that I think it necessary or possible that everyone pursue a college degree. They do, however, need to expand their minds and develop skills to be able to productively function in our society. You can help them to understand that education and training are not absolutes, finite or a burden identified only with youth. In business, as in other fields, we find it necessary from time to time to update ourselves by taking additional training or even returning to a University for supplemental education.

Tell them also, to learn the system—use the system and that you can't use the system if you don't understand the system. One learns that you don't need to use an axe to open a door if you have the key to the door.

From a self-interest point of view, I know of no short term investment which yields such a high rate of return over such a long term with the added flexibility to exercise the alternative choice. The training of a mind is a fantastic investment in self and country. To waste a mind is a criminal disaster.

Let me share with you some personal experiences which I consider to be attributable to two basic fundamentals; one—being blessed with outstanding, Christian parents who believe in hard work, and secondly—my having acquired some education. Although one can plan his life, much occurs by chance or luck, given some minimum standards like education, interest or involvement. I am reminded of occasions like a conference at the White House with President Johnson, meeting with Senator Paul Douglas and Congressman Adam Clayton Powell to get release of poverty program funds for Chicago.

Last summer I had an experience I think you would be interested in for it, too, speaks to the point of preparation, the confidence

of other people, and luck. My boss, James A. Summer, Vice Chairman of the Board and Chief Financial Officer of General Mills, advised me that he had been requested to participate in a two-day meeting with Palo Alto, California, but that other business commitments would not permit him to attend. My schedule permitting, he wanted me to represent him. He explained that he didn't like to disappoint John D. Rockefeller, or for us to miss the follow-up on the issue and the need for increased dialogue between youth and business. You guessed it—I went! While several of us were discussing our concerns and suggestions, I realized that my discussion was with A. W. Clausen, President of Bank of America—the largest U.S. bank, and John D. Rockefeller III. My immediate thought was what is the route one can plan that leads to such an experience with these giants of business and finance; one from the West Coast, and the other from the East Coast, yet well-known around the globe. Although I knew that my boss and General Mills had to be represented well, I had that additional motivation that I could not embarrass Alton.

During my 13 years in Illinois Bell, my work experience was in the three major operations departments (commercial plant and traffic) and, also, the general staff in developing rates, preparing the tariffs and some work with the Illinois Commerce Commission staff.

I have told you these things about my experience in management—not that they are important or particularly representative, but perhaps through this explanation you will appreciate why I perceive what I shall say on the topic of a Black man working in business.

I think that a Black person (male or female) who wishes to experience average or better success working in business, must prepare themselves the same as their competition, and when they are hired, they must deliver performance comparable or better than their competition. They should seek initial assignments in the main stream of that business and learn as many facets of it as is possible. This is no small order, for it will require a great deal more perspiration than inspiration. As a manager, realize that you will probably no longer have the luxury of an 8 hour work day. Considering that one's success has some luck and contributions from others, black people seeking business careers can, as the competition, expect that there are no short cuts and success can elude us for reasons other than race or sex. As McGeorge Bundy, Executive Director, Ford Foundation, recently said, "Competition is not the most agreeable of human phenomena but it is one of the most clearly inevitable."

While I don't want to bore you with detail about Corporate Social Responsibility, history fairly accurately records that the American corporations have provided varying levels of social responsiveness from their early days—usually as philanthropy.

For a more contemporary view, the period of the mid-60's to the present is when America first became interested in the quality of life instead of just the quantity of life. Students on college campuses began to ask why we did things as we did, who is responsible and even dared to ask isn't there a better way. Students were persistent and society and business reacted mostly by resisting change.

One can observe confusion, frustration, alienation and a lack of trust in this country. This does not merely affect the Archie Bunkers, hard hats and blue collar workers; it reaches into higher occupational levels as well. A new climate is recognizable in the environment of American business and a new phrase describes management's response: Corporate Social Responsibility. Is this

phrase mere rhetoric? Is it substance? Is it a little bit of both? What is it?

General Mills has expressed its feelings on the subject and set its corporate course thusly:

"As a major corporation enjoying the rights and responsibilities of the American free enterprise system, General Mills believes its existence and success depend upon the competitive excellence, value and satisfaction we consistently provide consumers through goods and services. Our objective of serving the wants and needs of the consumer guides our day-to-day decisions and is consistent with our obligations to shareholders, employees and society. In our view profits measure and reward effective and efficient performance in meeting consumer wants and needs. Through profits, we thus satisfy our obligation to shareholders and implement the growth of the corporation, thereby assuring a dynamic, challenging environment for employees. We also gain the means to discharge our broader responsibilities to society."

General Mills does not consider that statement to be mere rhetoric but a creed which affects our decisionmaking.

The what is it or a definition which I consider applicable is: Corporate social responsibility means a willingness on the part of the corporate manager (acting not only as an individual but as a decision-maker implicating his firm) actively and with moral concern to confront certain social problems he deems urgent and to bend the influence of his company toward the solution of those problems insofar as the firm is able to do so. Such responsibility requires that the manager balance intelligently the needs of the many groups affected by the firm so as best to achieve both profitable production and the common good, especially in situations in which he is not required to do so by law or by external pressures which the company cannot easily resist.

There can be no doubt that Americans are becoming acutely aware of social needs and irresponsibility on the part of anyone—be it business, government, church or any other institution. One will naturally observe that obviously business cannot do it all alone. I think that business will give a good account of itself because of its goal orientation and sensitivity to the needs and desires of those it serves, customers, stockholders and employees—its society.

It is interesting to consider that this new climate concerned with the quality of life occurred after America had achieved a very high quality of life. I hope that you share my concept that a nation can enjoy both a high quality and quantity of life.

While it would appear that the American corporation has historically been considered as an economic entity, I think a closer examination certainly will permit one to agree that providing goods, services and employment in a free economy are at least socioeconomic endeavors.

Even with this enlightened self-interest of corporations, we citizens must continue to ask ourselves do we want corporations to have the dominant responsibility for the delivery and be the vehicle through which social services are provided? Should they, therefore, decide the services, issues and priorities? Is government a viable alternative?

I, for one, see great strength in our system and am confident that our corporations are becoming more sensitive to customer and societal desires beyond the specific product or service.

And so it is rewarding to observe your involvement and commitment to make a better Alton for all of its sons and daughters.

CUYAHOGA VALLEY HISTORICAL PARK AND RECREATION AREA

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with Members of the Ohio delegation, and other Members of Congress, in support of legislation to establish the Cuyahoga Valley Historical Park and Recreation Area.

The purpose of this legislation is twofold: First, to protect a unique and valuable national resource from encroaching urban development and environmental deterioration; and second, to develop an area rich in natural beauty as a recreation area for the American people.

The Cuyahoga Valley area is steeped in historical significance. Archeological remains of Indian tribes date back to the period of 600 B.C. to A.D. 800. The region served as an important communication and transportation link for the famous Erie Indian nation. During the 18th century, the valley area was the home for many displaced tribes, including the Shawnees, Delawares, Mohicans, Ottawas, Miamis, and Hurons—tribes whose legacies to this country can be found in the names of numerous towns, villages, and geographical regions. In addition, during the settlement of the Northwest Territory and the new lands to the West, the Cuyahoga Valley and River were the passageways to new lands and homes for thousands of settlers. Finally, with the construction of the Ohio Canal, this region played a vital, if not the key, role in the industrial development of northeast Ohio.

Encroaching urban and commercial development now threaten these historical sites. In addition to the archeological finds, there are preserved in this region portions of the historic Ohio Canal as well as numerous structures from the 19th century. It would be a black mark on the history of not only Ohio, but also the American people, if these genuine relics of our historical past should fall victim, as so much else has, to the unrelenting advance of urban and commercial sprawl.

Besides its history, the Cuyahoga Valley is a land richly endowed with natural beauty and breathtaking landscapes. The area possesses a unique variety of wildlife and foliage, because it is, as my colleague Mr. SEIBERLING has pointed out, a botanical crossroads. Needless to say, once urbanization invades this virgin territory, the accompanying environmental impact of commercial development would have a devastating effect upon the wildlife and foliage of the valley.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to my colleagues that we also have an obligation to future generations to preserve the natural beauty of this region. As President Kennedy correctly said:

It is our task in our time and in our generation to hand down undiminished to those who come after us, as was handed down to us by those who went before, the national wealth and beauty which is ours.

The establishment of the Cuyahoga Valley Park would preserve this extraordinary natural resource as a recreational facility for present and future generations of Americans. Presently, 73 percent of the American people live in urban areas. Yet only 8 percent of all Federal recreation areas are located in urban areas. In Ohio there are no national parks or Federal recreation areas.

In 1971, President Nixon asked us "to put the parks where the people are." This bill is consistent with that policy. It would give all citizens access to recreational facilities in the area. If enacted, this legislation would provide the opportunity to enjoy such facilities to 4 million inhabitants of the Cleveland-Akron region. Indeed, I am confident that many more people, from both within and outside of Ohio, will enjoy the splendors of this valley. Similar Federal assistance was provided in the last Congress when Gateway National Recreation Area in New York Harbor and Golden Gate National Recreation Area near San Francisco were established as urban area parks. Consistent with that expression of congressional policy, this legislation seeks to establish a similar recreational area in a highly urbanized region within the interior of the United States where the need for recreational facilities is particularly acute.

Critics have argued that Federal funds should be limited, if not prohibited, for the establishment of this park because it is "regional" in nature. Quite frankly, I fail to understand this position. Indeed, all national parks are "regional" in the sense that they are located in one of the 50 States. Moreover, it seems only logical that those citizens closest to a national park will use it more frequently than those who must come from a greater distance. But if one were to prevent the establishment of national parks on the ground that they are "regional" in the sense I have just noted—and this is the only basis I can perceive for declaring the proposed park "regional"—then I submit, Mr. Speaker, there would be no national parks.

One of the truly impressive aspects of this bill is the degree of State and local cooperation it contemplates, and which it has already engendered. The State of Ohio has designated the preservation of Cuyahoga Valley as its No. 1 recreational goal. A recent comprehensive study of northern Ohio by the Northern Ohio Urban System Corp. has endorsed the acquisition of such land in Cuyahoga County. The plan has also been endorsed by some 46 State and local organizations in Ohio, including major newspapers, city councils, historical and conservation groups, and regional planning commissions. Already the Cleveland and Akron metropolitan park districts have purchased 1,625 acres of land within the valley for preservation.

Why then the need for Federal legislation?

First of all, the legislation contemplates the establishment of a national park for use and enjoyment of all citizens in an area rich in natural beauties and national history.

Second, Federal legislation would be consistent with both previous congressional practice as well as administration policy statements.

Third, and most importantly, the State of Ohio simply cannot do it alone. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that unless Federal funds are forthcoming, there will be no Cuyahoga Valley Historical Park and Recreation Area. The State of Ohio estimates that it will take approximately 20 years to purchase the necessary lands. During this period, many valuable parcels of land will be lost to commercial development while the State attempts to raise sufficient funds to purchase the additional 14,500 acres. Moreover, with the passage of time and the spread of commercial development into the region, the cost of the additional acreage will inevitably increase.

We must act now if we are to preserve these lands. If we fail to act, we will be dooming much of this land to commercial development. There comes a point when citizens must stand up and insist that enough is enough. There comes a point where development becomes destructive. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is such an instance.

COMING TO GRIPS WITH THE WELFARE CRISIS

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, the fact that American taxpayers are pumping more than \$100 billion a year into more than 100 different welfare and income maintenance programs, with chaotic duplication of effort and waste, is a great concern to me and my Arizona constituents.

Our concern is compounded by the widespread realization that costly bureaucratic welfare programs have not only failed to fully help less-fortunate Americans or to get at the root causes of poverty. They have encouraged cheaters, loafers, and high birth rates among people who can ill-afford large families. And they have destroyed motivation for most welfare recipients to find regular work in a positive effort to become economically self-sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, my worst fears about the chaotic state of Government welfare programs have been confirmed by the Joint Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy's 2-year scientific study of welfare programs nationwide.

Chaired by the able Mrs. MARTHA GRIFITHS, our colleague from Michigan, the subcommittee has so far completed 13 lengthy reports in its studies on public welfare. Among the subcommittee's

findings, researched and tabulated by an impressive group of scholars and government experts, are these salient facts:

While Government statistics show that 119 million beneficiaries received public assistance from welfare-related programs in 1972, it was 60 million different individuals who actually received benefits. This was because the current system allows a single person to receive overlapping benefits from any number of many different welfare programs.

Twenty percent of families receiving assistance in 1972 were enrolled in five or more programs, with tax-free incomes ranging from \$3,672 to \$8,112—substantially above the after-taxes median wage levels for full-time working people in the same areas studied.

On this point, the subcommittee noted:

The sizeable average benefits going to these households indicate that many of them are better off now than they would be if they derived all of their income from wages, given the wage level at which their members would find employment and the Social Security and income taxes that would have to be paid from those wages.

Generous welfare benefits alone thus constitute a substantial work disincentive, especially for families of four or more. In the words of one subcommittee report:

In combination and sometimes even individually, these programs can make it extraordinarily unprofitable to work.

Error or fraud occurs in at least one out of every four welfare payments. This costs taxpayers an estimated \$4 billion a year. Both administrative bungling and the difficulty in recouping fraudulent claims or overpayments make this high cheating rate possible under the current welfare system. According to one subcommittee report:

The present welfare system is an administrative nightmare.

When "in-kind" benefits—food stamps, day care, job training, medicaid, medicare, and so forth—are counted along with actual cash welfare payments to beneficiaries, more than 60 percent of those considered "poor" actually move past the poverty level.

One typical household of five people studied by the subcommittee at one point was receiving tax-free benefits from 11 different programs totaling \$691 a month, of which \$599 was in cash.

The combination of benefits received from different programs is rarely the same among beneficiaries receiving more than one kind of public assistance, indicating that overlap is encouraged by the current welfare system. Of 1,059 households sampled for one study, benefits received were scattered among 144 different combinations of benefit categories. Only 130 households were receiving just one type of assistance.

More than 3 million families are currently receiving welfare under aid for dependent children, which requires that such families be headed by the mother or an incapacitated father. Since family size determines the amount of benefits received, one subcommittee report noted, illegitimacy is encouraged and children are often reared in totally immoral environments.

Family instability is thus encouraged. Illegitimacy has now soared to 10 percent of all U.S. births. Failure of welfare administrators to establish paternity and to enforce the father's duty of financial support not only substantially adds to the taxpayer's burden, but also deprives children of their right to social security survivor's benefits, life insurance, and health insurance.

Between 1963 and 1971, according to the subcommittee, Congress approved \$6.8 billion for manpower training programs to help the poor. Despite this large expenditure, trainees leaving programs funded under the Manpower Development and Training Act, according to the most optimistic studies, still averaged only \$3,100 in post-training annual earnings—more than \$800 below their poverty line.

The subcommittee points out that current Federal data gathering makes it impossible to determine whether trainees have much access in retaining jobs following such training.

Mr. Speaker, my own analysis of the subcommittee's 13 reports to date has convinced me that our current welfare system, deeply entangled in a hopeless sea of bureaucratic redtape, will remain a ludicrous farce of inefficiency and fraud unless it is dramatically reformed from top to bottom.

Before such total reform is possible, the subcommittee's findings suggest several necessary first steps that Congress must write into law to pave the way.

A uniform residency requirement nationwide must be established. The present lack of such a residency requirement encourages migration of welfare recipients from State to State, threatening to disrupt economies in whole areas of the country.

Concepts of employment, self-sufficiency, and social responsibility must be written into law through job-training and work requirements for adult welfare recipients. However, work programs should not take priority over regular jobs in the public or private sectors. And welfare administrators should not become employment agents for welfare recipients.

Welfare mothers must be required to supply information about the fathers of their children before they can get public assistance of any kind. Welfare payments for fatherless households should be frozen at current levels so that women receiving welfare realize that more children will not get them more money.

Welfare rules and regulations governing welfare payments and benefits nationwide must be tightly enforced to the letter—applied equally and fairly to all welfare recipients without interference from politicians and pressure groups. Otherwise, fraud and inefficiency will continue.

Once this has been done, Congress should perhaps consider abolishing all categorical welfare grants to profligate States whose per capita resources exceed the States' average of \$3,894. There seems to be no apparent good reason why large, big-spending States with

per capita resources should receive Federal Welfare grants to supplement their own programs. And it seems especially ludicrous that many large, profligate States receive more Federal dollars back from Washington than their own citizens pay in Federal taxes, while smaller, frugal States receive less.

Federal welfare funds are supposed to help the poor. It seems unnecessary for dollars to make the round trip from States to Washington and back, when with their own available resources they could adequately maintain their own welfare programs without Federal involvement.

Mr. Speaker, our welfare crisis is not insurmountable. But we must meet the challenge head-on with sensible reforms to eliminate fraud and inefficiency, and to promote the work ethic and social responsibility.

THE LONG OVERDUE NEED FOR PAROLE REFORMS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, last week a group of well-known and highly qualified citizens, headed by former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Prof. Herman Schwartz of the State University of New York at Buffalo Law School, issued a report on its penetrating and in-depth investigation into New York State's parole system. After a year and a half study the Citizens' Inquiry Into Parole and Criminal Justice condemned the parole system as poorly conceived, inefficiently implemented, and arbitrarily administered. The group's report concluded that the parole system does little or no good and revealed the startling fact that those who are released on parole return to prison in the same year at a rate just a little better than those who serve the entire length of their sentences.

Clearly the issue of parole is one which is hotly debated but which generally receives far too little attention. It is an imperfect system at best and, at its very worst, is one of the prime factors underlying the high rate of recidivism in our Nation's prisons and jails. It is an area in which substantive and meaningful reforms are long overdue.

Shortly after the release of the Citizens' Inquiry report two very timely and perceptive followup articles appeared in the Washington Post and the New York Times. Written by William Raspberry and Tom Wicker, respectively, these articles examine some of those serious shortcomings and gaps investigated by the citizens' group and comment on some of those factors which plague the parole system and make it largely unworkable in its present form.

I commend these articles to the attention of our colleagues and urge that they give this long-ignored issue their careful consideration and attention.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1974]

PAROLE: THE IMAGE AND THE REALITY

(By William Raspberry)

Parole is "a tragic failure" and ought to be (a) drastically reformed AND (b) abolished. That, in a sentence, is the conclusion of a Citizens' Inquiry into Parole and Criminal Justice after a year and a half of looking into parole as practiced in New York State.

Nearly every finding of the group, headed by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, can be applied to parole systems in every state as well as to the federal system.

In a 47-page summary of its 300-page study, released yesterday, the Citizens' Inquiry condemns parole as poorly conceived, inefficiently implemented and arbitrarily administered and contends that it does little or no discernible good.

But you can't just wipe it out. "To abolish parole because of its demonstrated irrationality and harm and leave the rest of the process as it presently exists would cause even more harm," the report concludes.

The major fault of parole is the fault of "corrections" theory generally: the notion that criminality is treatable on a medical model.

It begins with the assumption that criminality is the result of personality defects or disorders in the individual criminal. Correctional institutions (which turn out to look very much like prisons) are established to diagnose and treat those disorders. And at the optimum moment in that treatment process—the moment at which an offender is least likely to commit new offenses—the offender is paroled—that is, he is released into the community, but under benevolent supervision in order to help him complete his readjustment to good citizenship.

Everybody knows it doesn't work that way, but as the report summary observes, "The usual response to the gap between the image and the reality of parole is to assume the validity of the theory and to recommend reforms in the practice."

It is the theory that is wrong. The truth is, we don't know what personality flaws turn people to crime in the first place, so we don't know what kind of treatment program is likely to work, or when we are close enough to cure that we can rely on the "out-patient" services of parole to finish the job.

We don't know much of anything, really, except that the rearrest rates for former inmates released on parole is not encouragingly different from those released after full service of sentence.

Let me offer a quickie test for those confused over the applicability of medical models for criminals: Would the "patient" pay for the services being offered if he had the money?

Send a man to a hospital for treatment of, say, tuberculosis; then retain him as an out-patient during his rehabilitation, and he is likely to suppose that you are doing it for his good as well as for society's. And if he could afford it, he would pay for the service, or something very close to it.

But make the "disease" a predisposition to criminality; transform the sanitarium into a "correctional" institution, and substitute parole for outpatient care. Would anybody in his right mind buy it?

Of course not, and not for the reasons that most parole reform efforts address. There are good people on parole boards. There are attempts at making the granting of parole less arbitrary—by spelling out reasons for denial, for instance. There are efforts to weed racial and political considerations out of the parole process. There are moves to increase the amount of investigation and record-keeping and responsiveness so that an inmate's freedom doesn't turn solely on one 10-minute interview.

Those are reforms that the Citizens' In-

quiry concluded ought to be made—pending abolishment of the parole system.

For what is basically wrong is the utter inability of parole board members—however well-meaning and intelligent—to predict who will and who will not commit new offenses. As the report puts it:

"The similarity between defendants granted parole and those denied is striking enough to suggest that, despite its attempts at professionalism and competence, the [New York] parole board is unable to distinguish the rehabilitated from the nonrehabilitated. The community supervision program, instead of helping parolees adjust to nonprison society, is usually irrelevant and sometimes harmful."

That would be argument enough for ending the practice of parole. But parole has other burdens that would first have to be disposed of.

One of the chief functions of parole in practice is to modify draconian sentences. Legislators frequently enact super-harsh penalties for certain categories of crime but soften their effect by providing for "indeterminate" sentences. Judges sometimes hand down unduly long sentences for infamous crimes and leave it to the parole boards to moderate the penalties. Prison officials use parole as an additional means of maintaining discipline.

To get rid of parole before setting these other things right is simply to make bad matters worse, as the report concluded.

The 70-member task force included Herman Schwartz of the Buffalo University Law School, as executive vice chairman; Coretta King, William Vanden Heuvel, Kenneth B. Clark, Victor Navasky and Arthur Miller.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 8, 1974]

THE LESSONS OF PAROLE

(By Tom Wicker)

The idea of parole is that if an offender's degree of rehabilitation can be judged and found sufficient, he or she can safely be released from prison; and with that promising start, a program of close supervision can help the offender find a useful place in society. Most of the time, unfortunately, this idea proves to be an illusion—primarily because nobody knows how to bring about "rehabilitation" or whether it has occurred.

The unfortunate results in New York State have just been pointed out by a Citizens' Inquiry on Parole and Criminal Justice. Headed by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Prof. Herman Schwartz of the State University at Buffalo, the inquiry learned that offenders released on parole return to prison in the same year at only a slightly better rate than those who serve out their terms. Over a typical five-year period, 50 per cent of those paroled are found delinquent, either for committing a crime or for violating parole rules, and of those about 80 per cent are returned to prison.

Parolees, that is, do little better in the community than those who are not paroled, which suggests that "discretionary release" is really pot-luck, and those who decide who gets paroled have only the sketchiest idea of who has been "rehabilitated." And even if they could decide that elusive question, the facts of life for parolees work strongly against them. Here is the way the New York Citizens' Inquiry described those facts:

"[The parolee] is given only a suit, \$40, the name and address of a community supervision parole officer to whom he must report within 24 hours, and a list of rules that he must follow, on pain of losing his freedom. He is generally qualified only for unskilled or semi-skilled work, and he faces other major problems in getting and keeping a job. Although the parole service recognizes employment as a major goal of each parolee, the parole officers provide little assistance in finding jobs. In 1970, New York parole officers

helped obtain only 506 jobs, although over 16,000 people were on parole at some time during the year, 5,680 of them employed full-time.

"Similarly, the Department of Correctional Services does next to nothing to help the penniless parolee with financial problems. 'Gate money' of \$40 is inadequate, the parole service has no loan fund, and New York parolees are not eligible for unemployment benefits."

How arbitrary and harassing such a system can be is suggested by the facts that, for example, a parolee can be searched or visited at home or at work at any time, and without notice, by his or her parole officer (who has the impossible task of being both law-enforcement officer and social worker); and that a parolee cannot even drive or own a car without the permission of that officer. Explaining the driving rule, Russell G. Oswald, a former chairman of the New York Board of Parole, has written, "The purchase and the driving of automobiles after confinement in prison can sometimes be a heady experience. And in order to get money for cars, or for payments on cars, there might be a temptation to steal."

But that is to assume that the parolee is in need of watching every minute lest he or she commit a crime, which is hardly the way to reintegrate anyone into ordinary life. The prohibition on driving sharply reduces, moreover, a parolee's employment opportunities—even the ability to hunt for a job.

Parole has many faults—arbitrary, generally unreviewed, and unexplained decisions on when people get out of prison and when they have to go back, as well as oversupervision of, but little real help for, the parolee. Yet, parole is a logical outgrowth of the idea of rehabilitation, upon which the American corrections system is based; and it can hardly be abolished unless that corrections system itself is substantially changed.

The great contribution of the Citizens' Inquiry report, therefore, is that, rather than merely recommending "improvements" in current parole practice (which it does), the report attacks the root of the correctional problem—the idea of rehabilitation—asserting flatly that "future human conduct cannot be predicted and even basic changes in personality and character cannot usually be assessed."

That being the case, "decisions as to length of sentence and timing of release based on an assessment of an inmate's rehabilitation" often are incorrect and frequently are irrational, even cruel. Shorter sentences, with more certainty for the offender of his or her exact date of release, alternatives in most cases to imprisonment, a wider variety of educational and job training programs for those who do go behind bars, less restriction upon and more assistance for those coming back into the community—all make more sense for offenders and the public alike than the uncertainties and inequities of parole as now administered.

ANTIABORTION AMENDMENTS ATTEMPT TO SUBVERT WOMEN'S RIGHTS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the protection of women's rights insured by the Supreme Court decision on abortion is being threatened by "Right to Life" forces pushing for a constitutional amendment outlawing abortions. The

Washington Post of March 8 reported on the appearance of four cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church at the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee hearings on anti-abortion amendments as "spearheading a mounting campaign" to pass such amendments.

In a country that prides itself on religious freedom and that attempts to maintain a separation between church and state, proponents of one religious belief are trying to force their beliefs on the country as a whole. This point was eloquently raised by Bishop James Armstrong of the Dakotas area of the United Methodist Church at the Senate hearings:

A church that proclaims celibacy to reflect the highest levels of excellence and that takes the dimmest possible view of scientific methods of birth control is not in a logical position to impose its view on abortion on the remainder of the citizenry.

Yet it would also be blatantly undemocratic for men, ultimately unable to identify with many of the feelings and experiences of women, to force their convictions on women. As Bishop Armstrong pointed out, this is presently being attempted:

With all due respect, should a male dominated religious hierarchy determine the moral posture and legal status of the opposite sex when the woman in question is caught up in a dilemma no man can fully understand?

In light of these crucial human rights issues, I wish to include two letters in the RECORD. One letter contains a resolution that was adopted by the Professional Women's Caucus at its annual convention in September of 1973. The resolution is an eloquent, poignant defense of women's rights, a defense that all Members of Congress should take into careful consideration when they view the present efforts to outlaw abortion.

The second letter contains a resolution passed by the California Democratic Council in February that urges opposition to any attempts such as the anti-abortion constitutional amendments to infringe on personal rights.

The letters follow:

CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATIC COUNCIL,
February 25, 1974.

ALICE TRAVIS,
Women's Caucus Chairperson, CDC,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DELLUMS: Enclosed is a copy of the "Resolution Re-affirming CDC's Position on Abortion" which was overwhelmingly passed by the California Democratic Council at the statewide convention this month.

We feel it is extremely important that you be aware of our position regarding any constitutional amendments limiting the right of a woman to have an abortion on demand. We stand now, as before, as always, diametrically opposed to any governmental infringement of this personal right.

In view of the proposed hearings in the Senate by Senator Birch Bayh's subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments which will concern itself with previously tabled anti-abortion amendments, we seek your support on this matter now. These amendments must go no further. The Supreme Court has ruled, and we believe correctly. In a recent poll approximately 80% of the Californians asked agreed.

Please act on the California Democratic Council's resolution.

Sincerely,

ALICE TRAVIS.

RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING CDC'S POSITION ON ABORTION

Content: Reaffirms CDC position on a woman's right to obtain an abortion, in light of the present pressures in Congress on this matter.

Submitted by: Alice Travis, Women's Caucus Chairperson, and Barbara Hewitt, President—Westside Democratic Forum.

Whereas, The CDC passed a resolution in March 1972 stating that "the inalienable right to custody of one's own body is violated when a woman is compelled by the state to bear an unwanted child", and the Supreme Court's decision on abortion effectively supports this position; and

Whereas, Certain groups are lobbying, with some apparent effect, the Congress of the United States to move a constitutional amendment prohibiting abortion under any circumstances except to save the mother's life;

Therefore, be it resolved, That the California Democratic Council reaffirms its position on a woman's right to abortion on demand and does not support any constitutional amendment limiting this right, and that the CDC is in full support of the Supreme Court's ruling on abortion; and

Be it further resolved, That all California congresspersons and all members of the House Judiciary Committee be informed of CDC's position.

PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CAUCUS,
January 22, 1974.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DELLUMS: The Professional Women's Caucus is a national organization of women in over fifty professions, including art, architecture, academia, engineering, law, media, medicine, government and science.

We are convinced that the right of every woman to control her reproductive processes is an elementary Constitutional Right upon which all of her other efforts and aspirations toward equality are based. We would like you to know that at our annual convention held in New York City at the end of September, 1973, the following resolution was adopted:

Since control over our bodies is the very cornerstone of any equality for women, passage of the so-called "Right to Life Amendment" to the Constitution, which is now in the Judiciary Committee of the United States House of Representatives, would be an unmitigated disaster to the cause of women in the United States. It is an anomaly indeed, that while we still lack a Constitutional Amendment giving equal protection to women, we are now faced with the very real prospect of passage of a Constitutional Amendment granting greater rights to the fetus. Accordingly, defeat of the proposed "Right to Life Amendment" now in the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives in the United States Congress is imperative.

Respectfully yours,
SUE WIMMERSHOFF-CAPLAN, President,

THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 15th anniversary of statehood for

Hawaii. When word that Congress voted for our statehood reached the islands there was jubilant celebration. However, many people stopped to give thanks and to offer prayers of thanksgiving.

One such memorable message came from the Reverend Abraham Kahikina Akaka, one of Hawaii's most beloved and respected citizens. In a ceremony at historic Kawaiahao Church the following morning, he eloquently expressed the thoughts of his fellow Americans, which I would like to share with you:

ALOHA KE AKUA

(By Rev. Abraham Kahikina Akaka)

"One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all"—these words have a fuller meaning for us this morning in Hawaii. And we have gathered here at Kawaiahao Church to give thanks to God, and to pray for his guidance and protection in the years ahead.

Our newspapers lately have been full of much valuable historical data concerning Hawaii's development, growth, and aspirations. I will keep these stories as long as I live, for my children and their children, for they call to mind the long train of those whose sacrifices were accepted, whose prayers and hopes through the years were fulfilled yesterday. There yet remains the formal expression of our people for statehood, and the entrance of our Islands into the Union as a full-fledged member.

I would like today to speak the message of self-affirmation: that we take courage to be what we truly are, the Aloha State.

On April 25, 1820, one hundred and thirty-nine years ago, the first Christian service conducted in Honolulu was held on this very ground. Like our Pilgrim Fathers who arrived at Plymouth, Massachusetts, in 1620, so did the fathers of a new era in Hawaii kneel in prayer after a long and trying voyage to give thanks to God who had seen them safely on their way.

Gathered around the Reverend Hiram Bingham on that day were a few of our "kupunas" who had come out of curiosity. The text of the sermon that day, though it was April and near Easter time, was from the Christmas Story. And there our people heard these words for the first time: "Mai maka'u 'oukou, no ka mea, eia ho'i, ke ha'i aku nei au ia 'oukou i ka mea maika'i, e 'oli'oli nui al e lilo ana no na kanaka apau. No ka mea, i keia ia i hanau al, ma ke kulakauhale o Davida, he ola no 'oukou, aia ka Mesia ka Haku'—'Fear not, for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour which is Christ the Lord.'"

Although our grandfathers did not realize it fully then, the hopes and fears of all their years through the next century and more were to be met in the meaning and power of those words, for, from that beginning, a new Hawaii was born. For through those words, our missionaries and people following them under God became the greatest single influence in Hawaii's whole development—politically, economically, educationally, socially, religiously. Hawaii's real preparation for statehood can be said to have truly begun on that day and on this spot one hundred and thirty-nine years ago.

Yesterday, when the first sound of fire-crackers and sirens reached my ears, I was with the members of our Territorial Senate in the middle of the morning prayer for the day's session. How strange it was, and yet how fitting, that the news should burst forth while we were in prayer together. Things had moved so fast. Our mayor, a few minutes before, had asked if the church could be kept open, because he and others wanted to walk across the street for prayer when the news came. By the time I got back from the Senate, this sanctuary was well filled with peo-

ple who happened to be around, people from our government buildings nearby. And as we sang the great hymns of Hawaii and our nation, it seemed that the very walls of this church spoke of God's dealing with Hawaii in the past, of great events both spontaneous and planned.

There are some of us to whom statehood brings great hopes, and there are some to whom statehood brings silent fears. One might say that the hopes and fears of Hawaii are met in statehood today. There are fears that Hawaii as a state will be motivated by economic greed; that statehood will turn Hawaii (as someone has said) into a great big spiritual junkyard filled with smashed dreams, worn-out illusions; that it will make the Hawaiian people lonely, confused, insecure, empty, anxious, restless, disillusioned—a wistful people.

There is an old "mele" that reminds me of such fears as these, and of the way God leads us out of our fears. "Haku'i i ka uahi o ka lua, pa i ka lani, ha'aha'a Hawai'i moku o Keawe i hanau'ia . . . po Puna, po Hilo, po i ku uahi o ku'u'aina . . . ola ia kini, ke 'a mai la ke ahi'—"There is a fire underground, but the firepit gives forth only smoke, smoke that bursts upward, touching the skies, and Hawaii is humbled beneath its darkness . . . it is night over Hawaii, night from the smoke of my land . . . but there is salvation for the people, for now the land is being lit by a great flame."

We need to see statehood as the lifting of the clouds of smoke, as the opportunity to affirm positively the basic Gospel of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We need to see that Hawaii has potential moral and spiritual contributions to make to our nation and to our world. The fears Hawaii may have are to be met by men and women who are living witnesses of what we really are in Hawaii, of the spirit of Aloha, men and women who can help unlock the doors to the future by the guidance and grace of God.

This kind of self-affirmation is the need of the hour. And we can affirm our being, as the Aloha State, by full participation in our nation and in our world. For any collective anxiety, the answer is collective courage. And the ground of that courage is God.

We do not understand the meaning of Aloha until we realize its foundation in the power of God at work in the world. Since the coming of our missionaries in 1820, the name for God to our people has been Aloha. One of the first sentences I learned from my mother in my childhood was this from Holy Scripture: "Aloha ke Akua"—in other words, "God is Aloha." Aloha is the power of God seeking to unite what is separated in the world—the power that unites heart with heart, soul with soul, life with life, culture with culture, race with race, nation with nation. Aloha is the power that can reunite when a quarrel has brought separation; aloha is the power that reunites a man with himself when he has become separated from the image of God within.

Thus, when a person or a people live in the spirit of Aloha they live in the spirit of God. And among such a people, whose lives so affirm their inner being, we see the working of the Scripture: "All things work together for good to them who love God . . . from the Aloha of God came his Son that we might have life and that we might have it more abundantly."

Aloha consists of this new attitude of heart, above negativism, above legalism. It is the unconditional desire to promote the true good of other people in a friendly spirit, out of a sense of kinship. Aloha seeks to do good, with no conditions attached. We do not do good only to those who do good to us. One of the sweetest things about the love of God, about Aloha, is that it welcomes the stranger and seeks his good. A person who has the spirit of Aloha loves even when the love is not returned. And such is the love of God.

This is the meaning of Aloha. I feel especially grateful that the discovery and development of our Islands long ago was not couched in the context of an imperialistic and exploitive national power, but in this context of Aloha. There is a correlation between the charter under which the missionaries came—namely, "to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to cover these islands with productive green fields, and to lift the people to a high state of civilization"—a correlation between this and the fact that Hawaii is not one of the trouble spots in the world today but one of the spots of great hope. Aloha does not exploit a people or keep them in ignorance and subservience. Rather, it shares the sorrows and joys of people; it seeks to promote the true good of others.

Today, one of the deepest needs of mankind is the need to feel a sense of kinship with one another. Truly all mankind belongs together; from the beginning all mankind has been called into being, nourished, watched over by the love of God. So that the real Golden Rule is Aloha. This is the way of life we shall affirm.

Let us affirm ever what we really are—for Aloha is the spirit of God at work in you and in me and in the world, uniting what it separated, overcoming darkness and death, bringing new light and life to all who sit in the darkness of fear, guiding the feet of mankind into the way of peace.

Thus, may our becoming a State mean to our nation and the world, and may it reaffirm that which was planted in us one hundred and thirty-nine years ago: "Fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

A MESSAGE TO U.S. BUSINESSES:
YOUR WORTHY SEARCH FOR
ADDITIONAL MARKETS SHOULD
NEVER JEOPARDIZE EFFORTS TO
ENHANCE INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY
IN FOREIGN LANDS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, to those who act consciously, virtually everything in life is a matter of establishing priorities—what things are more important than others and what ought we to do first.

Certainly, Members of Congress are faced with such priority determinations on a daily basis—what bills to hold hearings on, what bills to bring to the floor, what meetings to attend, what issues to be vocal upon, how much money to authorize or appropriate for a particular program. Making these decisions is not always easy. No one expects it to be.

American business—the private sector of our economy—must also determine its priorities—what new product lines to promote, how much profit to reinvest, what new markets to explore, what social responsibilities to exercise. And, like in the Congress, making these decisions is seldom easy.

One of the top priorities for several major American firms is the expansion of markets in countries controlled by Communist governments.

There are a number of reasons why those businesses are seeking these markets, and I can understand some of

them—which, of course, does not mean that I necessarily agree with all of them.

The opening of a new market, by definition, expands the number of consumers to which one can sell a product, potentially generating more jobs and income for workers—there and here. When profit margins in the home market are falling because of rising costs, price controls, and Government regulatory policies, a search to expand production by expanding markets abroad is understandable.

But, I have been disturbed during the past weeks over several major articles which have appeared in newspapers and magazines on the expansion of U.S. business activity in Communist countries, even when today, UPI reported that the Soviet Union is beaming radio broadcasts in Arabic to the Middle East urging Arab nations to resist American pressure and not to lift the oil embargo.

One is left with an almost inescapable conclusion that some businessmen by far, not all—and I do not intend, here today, to talk about particular executives or particular companies—have placed the search for new markets and profits to be derived from those markets above other and more important considerations. In essence, while their search for markets may be worthy and understandable, it loses those qualities when measured against a higher purpose: The use of American economic power as a weapon for freedom.

I believe strongly—both practically and philosophically—in the private enterprise system. Based upon a market economy and sustained by the time-proved laws of supply and demand, that system has produced the highest standard of living in the long history of civilized man. I am not, therefore, here today to denigrate that system. I am here, however, to discourage by argument the establishment of any priorities by business which would jeopardize, in any way, the many commendable efforts being made to enhance individual liberty through the use of our economic power.

American economic power can be, and should be, a weapon for freedom. It can not be such a weapon if such a search for markets for markets' sake undercuts efforts on behalf of freedom.

As equally antithetical to the free market philosophy is the use of Government regulation and loan guarantees to foster such foreign business ventures. If a corporation wants to invest in a foreign land, it is hypocritical for business to say, on the one hand, that it is doing it to further the causes of capitalism, yet, on the other hand, take funds from Government—from the taxpayers—with which to do it. Loan guarantees—such as those made through the Export-Import Bank—constitute subsidies borne by the American taxpayers when U.S. funds are used to make up the difference in interest rates which can sometimes result in millions of dollars of subsidy.

It is said by some, including the President, that recent thaws in United States-Soviet economic relations contributed mightily to Alexander Solzhenitsyn being exiled to Western Europe instead of being executed or exiled to the Soviet Union. I agree with that. But instead of such an argument buttressing a position

that we should use our leverage less and not try to encourage further a relaxation in the Soviet Union of its repression of individual liberty, the argument, quite to the contrary, supports a position for using our economic power even more.

Look at the official Soviet trade delegations which have come to this country, seeking greater trade. Look at Andrei Gromyko's personal trip, on his way back from Cuba, to Washington to try to persuade the White House to take a tougher line against Members of Congress who support the Jackson-Vanik amendments to precondition a relaxation of trade upon their relaxation—first—of repression against their own citizens.

Look at the Soviet officials who, only this week, made personal appearances and held press conferences asking Members, particular Senators, to put aside their considerations for the rights and liberties of Soviet citizens and approve better trade terms for the Soviets. Does not all this effort by the Soviets reflect how badly they need our economic help, not how less? And does not that, in turn, indicate to us how much we can use that strength as leverage to help those Soviet citizens obtain more freedom?

I have spoken, Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions during the past 3 years on the dangers of trade for trade's sake. Trade needs to be on certain conditions—that we are paid in cash or gold and not through long-term, low-interest credits subsidized in part by the American taxpayers; that such trade is not in strategic or potentially strategic goods or commodities; and, of course, that such trade be preconditioned on a relaxation of restraints on freedom. I am not here today to recount all of my previous remarks.

I call upon American businessmen—and their names are in the press almost daily now—to place a higher purpose above the search for markets. You owe it to yourself, your corporation, your shareholders, and most of all, you owe it to those who live in your potential markets to place freedom above profit. They—these people of other lands—would rather have freedom than a cola.

GREAT PAPER MONEY FLOOD

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the January 1974 issue of *Dun's Review*, entitled "The Great Paper Money Flood." The article begins with a brief recapitulation of the shenanigans of one John Law, who today would undoubtedly hold a major university chair in economics. After persuading the Duke of Orleans to print paper money, Law perceived the consequences of monetary inflation, and admitted before he died:

Money created in great quantities brings destruction. Unless it is issued with restraint, it will ruin confidence; it will ruin a government; it will ruin society.

The consequences of the 18th century paper money inflation in France were shortages "as sellers withheld goods to obtain a better price a week later. Paper money began to sell at a discount from coin."

Today we are seeing in this country the consequences of monetary inflation that have occurred many times throughout history. I fear for the future of this country if our leaders persist in following a path to destruction.

The article follows:

THE GREAT PAPER MONEY FLOOD

(By Max Shapiro)

In 1714, an obscure Scottish economist named John Law went to Paris with a heretical notion. "The Government," Law wrote to the Comptroller of Finance, "should introduce paper currency. This will surely augment trade and general well being."

With his realm reeling under a crushing debt, and unemployed beggars marauding in the nation's large cities, Louis XIV, the reigning monarch, was certainly in need of financial advice. But he rejected Law's proposal, calling it "against the rule of reason and fraught with dangers to our State."

A year later the king was dead, but the economic problems of France lived on. Hunger riots broke out in Marseilles, Paris and Lyon. Holders of government bonds besieged Parliament, clamoring for payment on the long overdue debt. In the face of these events, Law continued to publish pamphlets advocating the inauguration of a government-backed paper currency. Finally in 1716, the Duke of Orleans, who had become regent of France after Louis' death, gave Law and several other investors permission to organize a private commercial bank that could issue paper money. While this currency would not have the guaranty of the government, it would be redeemable into coin at the bank upon request.

At first, business in the new paper money was dishearteningly slow. But as the bank continued to meet its obligations to redeem paper into coin, demand for the new, convenient currency began to grow. Soon French and foreign depositors were pouring their hoarded coins into the bank and exchanging them for paper. A minor boom developed, and Law, recognized as its architect, became the hero of France. He was lauded and lionized. His bank became one of the leading financial institutions on the Continent. Eventually, because it had become so crucial to the economy of the nation, it was nationalized by the regent.

Law and his associates were paid 3.5 million livres (approximately \$875,000) for their stock—in newly printed paper money. Law objected to the manner of payment (although he later accepted it), pointing out that while he could readily accept compensation in paper money if it were issued with proper backing, no government could use its power to issue paper at will simply by cranking up the printing presses. That, he argued, was the road to economic ruin. But the regent, who had no experience or interest in economics, waved the objections aside, and advised Law that the government was at that very moment contemplating the print-up of many millions of livres for the redemption of at least part of the nation's long overdue obligations. The alternative was an immediate declaration of bankruptcy.

Within hours, Law proposed an alternate plan that might extricate the government. He and several associates had previously formed the Mississippi Company, a private corporation for the purpose of "engaging in Commerce along the Mississippi River in the Royal Territory of Louisiana." If the Corporation were granted the exclusive rights "to all trading, hunting, fishing, foresting

and mining in the Louisiana Territory." Law would make a public offering of stock in the company. Payment for the stock could be made in coin or in government bonds purchased on the open market. Moreover, a subscriber paying in bonds would be given full credit at par value, even though most bonds were selling for less than 20% of par; this meant that each share issued at 500 livres could be bought for an outlay of 100 livres. Hopefully, thousands of new investors would buy up government bonds to take advantage of the "bargain" method of payment for their Mississippi stock, and a substantial portion of the national debt would therefore wind up in the treasury of the Mississippi Company—relieving the government, at least temporarily, of its obligations.

The regent grasped at the plan with the desperation of a drowning man. The Mississippi Company was granted all the rights it requested and—to sweeten the pot—also was given sole privileges "to trade in the East Indies, China and the South Seas." With such munificent prospects, Law decided that the company would guarantee the payment of a yearly dividend of 100 livres, assuring investors of a 100% return annually.

News of the stock offering swept through Paris like wildfire. Thousands of investors rushed to Law's house, where orders for the impending issue were to be recorded. Day after day they queued up, waiting their turn. One afternoon violence broke out, forcing Law to flee. The Place Vendôme was barred to traffic and equipped with makeshift booths. There, the subscription process was resumed. By the time the order books were closed, over 200,000 investors had submitted purchase orders for the 50,000 shares offered. In anticipation of making payment, they had bought up a considerable part of the overdue government debt.

Trading in the Mississippi issue began in August 1717. A great, wild roar rose in the Place Vendôme as speculators rushed in to buy the stock. By nightfall, the price of the stock had soared to 1,125 livres a share. Within a few months, it had climbed to 4,373 livres, more than nine times the issue price. Fortunes were made in the stock, sometimes within a few hours. Members of the nobility and the royal family—who were among the heaviest speculators—reflected their new opulence. Conditions also visibly improved for the populace. Farmers and merchants ordered new clothes; bakery shops, recently empty, were now crowded; old establishments were refurbished and new houses built. Wages were rising, and—slowly at first—so were prices.

While most Frenchmen attributed the heightened prosperity to the phenomenal rise of the Mississippi shares and to Law's genius, actually there was a more mundane explanation. With his government beset by mounting expenses, the regent had surreptitiously ordered the print-up of close to a half-billion livres. As this new stimulant coursed through the economy, it produced the inevitable result: a sharp rise in demand, production and standard of living.

John Law suspected that the money supply had been swelled by an input of new paper currency, but he no longer objected. He had succumbed to adulation and political ambition, and was awaiting his promised appointment as Comptroller of Finance.

During 1718, the government engraving presses spewed out almost 1 billion additional livres. As the effect of this massive injection made itself felt, Paris became the most opulent capital in Europe—a bulging warehouse of foods, silks, jewelry, gold and art objects. And the cost of living continued to rise. The price of the Mississippi Company stock roared upward to 9,700 livres. Early in 1719, 200,000 new shares were offered at 10,000 livres each, for a total value of 2 billion livres. To assure the success of the new offering, the regent surreptitiously ordered the print-

ing of another half-billion livres; a considerable part of this new money supply was made available to brokers for margin requirements. The new issue was oversubscribed, with a sizable portion taken up by foreign investors. And the stock resumed its ascent into the stratosphere.

So did the cost of living. By the beginning of 1720, tallow sold at three times its 1717 price; butter was four times as high, and a chateau in the Loire Valley that had been bought for 30,000 livres three years earlier now brought 265,000 livres. The holders of bank notes, seeing their purchasing power deteriorate overnight, scrambled to get rid of their money by buying anything in sight that was not perishable. This propelled prices higher, and shortages began to appear as sellers withheld goods to obtain a better price a week later. Paper money began to sell at a discount from coin.

In an attempt to shore up the value of bank notes, the government passed an edict making it a crime to carry more than 140 livres in coins. This accelerated the hoarding of metal money and the depreciation of paper, riots broke out as crowds besieged banks to exchange bank notes into coins.

With faith in paper money destroyed, the charisma of John Law and the stock of the Mississippi Company dissolved. From its incredible high of 19,000, at which it was selling in May 1720, the stock plummeted, amid scenes of wild disorder, to 3,000 by October. By that time, living costs were rising as sharply as the Mississippi shares were falling (a pair of boots cost 7,000 livres, or \$1,750 in today's money), and paper money was being converted into coin at an 80% discount. By November, bank notes had become virtually worthless and were being thrown away or used to light fires. By December, the Mississippi shares were worthless. Thousands of desperate sellers roamed the streets looking for buyers. There were none, at any price.

In subsequent hearings before Parliament, the regent admitted that he had ordered the secret print-up of over 2.7 billion livres in a three-year period. (In the preceding 1775 years, the French nation had been able to accumulate a coin money supply worth less than 2.6 billion livres.) With the printing and circulation of paper money outlawed and with coin money withheld through hoarding, purchasing power in France was severely reduced and a decade-long depression set in.

As for John Law, he escaped from France when a lynch mob of hundreds of ruined Mississippi shareholders descended on his house. He died eight years later in Venice, in poverty—a broken man. A friend who visited him shortly before his death, asked him what he had learned from his experience. Law sighed and finally replied: "Money created in great quantities brings destruction. Unless it is issued with restraint, it will ruin confidence; it will ruin a government; it will ruin society."

Our country has not learned this lesson. During the past decade, the government of the United States has produced new money at a dangerous pace. We are now experiencing the inevitable consequence: a galloping inflation. But the architects of our dangerous policy—disregarding the lessons of history—continue to overlook the obvious warning signals.

In the decade from 1962 to 1972, our money supply (known formally as M², and consisting of currency in circulation, demand deposits and time deposits of less than \$100,000) soared by more than 100% from less than \$246 billion to more than \$525 billion. The immensity of this money growth can best be appreciated when put into historical perspective.

During the 186 years prior to 1962, the United States had experienced the need for a growing stock of money for the waging of five major, costly wars (and a number of smaller military actions) and for the fund-

ing of a vast expansion. During much of that period, the adherence to convertibility had restrained the creation of new money; our national treasury lacked a sufficient offsetting supply of gold and silver against which a large quantity of bank notes might be issued.

In 1933, however, the printing presses began whirring after Congress passed an act abrogating convertibility. From 1933 to 1942, the money supply rose by \$48 billion to \$79 billion. Much of this newly created money was used by the New Deal for pump-priming during the Depression of the 1930's. During the 1943-1952 decade, the money supply advanced by \$89 billion to \$168 billion, with the nation forced to print huge sums for the waging of World War II and the Korean War. In the next ten years (1953-1962), the creation of new money was more gradual; the supply rose by \$78 billion.

By the end of 1962, we had already established the world's greatest industrial complex, the most formidable military force ever assembled, the most prolific agricultural system, the most extensive and powerful banking apparatus yet created, and our population of 186 million enjoyed the highest living standard achieved by any nation until that time. The attainment of such power and growth had required a vast, accelerating supply of money. Nevertheless, the money stock had grown by less than \$246 billion during a 186-year period. But in the next ten years (1963-1972), it jumped by more than \$279 billion.

This massive infusion of new money during the 1963-1972 period fueled an unprecedented demand for goods and services by all sectors of the economy (private consumers, business and government). After eighteen decades, annual expenditures in the United States had reached a level of \$619 billion by 1962. But in the following decade they almost doubled, surging by an additional \$547 billion to an all-time high of \$1,166 billion in 1972.

As this unparalleled demand spread through the economy, it had a traditional forest-fire effect, with one price rise igniting another. Producers raised prices to offset increased wages. Consumers, upon receiving expanded wages, bought an increasing amount of higher priced goods and services. Manufacturers and farmers responding to this new demand, borrowed money at high interest rates to expand output. Their plant and inventory expansion raised the consumption of materials, raising prices additionally. Meanwhile, government agencies also exercised upward pressure on prices by services. Then came yet another round of wage increases, touching off further cost-of-living hikes and creating fresh buying power for goods selling at peak prices.

In this fashion, the most tenacious inflation in our history was created. In November, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) posted its fifty-ninth consecutive monthly advance. Unbroken since January 1967, this string of month-to-month cost-of-living increases is by far the longest in the sixty-year history of the index. Since 1913, there have been only eleven cycles in which consecutive rises in living costs went beyond six months. The longest previous interval, created by the pressures of World War II, lasted 22 months, and was terminated by the imposition of wage-price controls. Similar controls have failed in the present crisis.

The tenacity of our inflation is matched by its erosive force. The cost of living as measured by the CPI, advanced by 38% during the ten years between 1963 and 1972, with an average annual rise of 2.6% prevailing during the five years between 1963 and 1967, and an average rate of 5% during third quarter of 1973, inflation was racing ahead at a disturbing 7.4% annual rate. The upward rush of living costs—especially in 1973—is evident in the price changes that have oc-

curred in ten key items since the end of 1962 (see bottom table, page 50).

As yet, we are not paying \$1,750 for a pair of boots, but we are on our way. All indications point to a substantial acceleration in the rate of inflation in 1974, and beyond. The chart on page 51 (not shown) which shows the past course taken by inflation as well as its likely future course, substantiates the conclusion that we are passing into more dangerous territory. . . .

Finally, when out-of-control inflation begins to cause unbearable distress, destabilization and social unrest, governments will be forced to call a halt. The exponential growth of money will be throttled for a considerable period. In all likelihood, a major, long-run, worldwide recession will set in until the fire is taken out of international economies. Then, after inflation has died down, perhaps we will attempt to manage our money supply more prudently and to look for stability rather than breakneck growth.

WHO IS TO BLAME?

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives this thought-provoking letter which appeared recently in *The Evening Sentinel*, a daily newspaper which is published in the city of Ansonia in my Connecticut district.

I also wish to thank the Honorable Francis X. Kelley, mayor of the neighboring city of Shelton, Conn., who first brought this letter to my attention and suggested that it be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

While we may not be in complete agreement on all issues, I feel there are some extremely good points, particularly in regard to the need for citizens to let their representatives know just where they stand on the critical issues of the day. This also includes a responsibility on the part of the representatives to actively seek out such opinions and to establish and maintain open avenues of communication with constituents, a practice I have followed.

I commend Mr. Tortora's letter to your attention:

WHO IS TO BLAME?

To the Editor:

Many people would like the answer to what is now an old question: How real is the energy crisis in the United States, and who is to blame for this crisis?

Being fairly intelligent people we would be safe to assume that our federal government and the major oil corporations are responsible for the energy crisis in this country. American technology is second to none, and is known to be the best in the world. An energy crisis in the United States could only have been planned and plotted by persons presently unknown, for reasons that are very obvious, and which, if allowed to continue unchecked, will prove disastrous.

But the real crisis where energy is concerned, and the blame for it, lies with the middle-income, apathetic and complacent American. Human energy, or the lack of it, is the real reason for the crisis we are faced with today.

The average American has been sitting on

his backside since the end of World War II and has falsely convinced himself that someone else would take care of the everyday problems that have confronted the United States. He comfortably viewed television newsfilm of NROTC buildings burning. He watched young so-called "peacemakers" burn their draft cards. He watched and saw the youth of America step on, spit upon and burn the red, white and blue of our American flag. He saw our Supreme Court make rulings that benefit few Americans and insult the intelligence of those who remain. He has without question allowed the federal government to rape his income with exorbitant wage deductions, and has allowed import and export legislation to betray the very livelihood of his country.

Oh yes, he was moved by all this, he expressed disgust and was at times furious. But what did he as a good American do about it? After watching the evening newscast, this great American flipped the TV channel to view his favorite comedy show where some celebrated comedian would belittle and scorn the moral, political, social and spiritual attitudes of the United States. He soon forgot what made him furious in the newscast and began laughing, along with millions of other viewers, about some remark made by the comedian regarding racial discrimination, or Watergate or perhaps the Jewish or Catholic faith. There he sat night after night, laughing at himself.

This same wonderful American not too long ago was elated and overjoyed because a Canadian news commentator, in an open letter, asked the world to come to the assistance of the United States in their "time of need." I say, Shame on America, that a Canadian had to say anything of the sort! Why didn't we as Americans speak up for ourselves? Why didn't Mr. and Mrs. America tell the people they voted for what it was they wanted? The number one infamous excuse of the complacent American is: "Because they (the elected) won't do anything about it."

The person who makes that statement is dead wrong. People like Ron Sarasin, Abe Ribicoff, Lowell Welcker or any elected official will never do a solitary thing unless they know how the people feel, unless they know to some degree what it is the majority of people want. . . . remember I said, majority, the middle-income American is by number the majority.

The very rich and the very poor are the majority today, self-appointed, but nevertheless the majority, they are the real benefactors of our laws as they are written today because they go to all extremes to inform their elected officials. They have to, to survive, and they have survived well at the expense of the middle-income American.

If you don't believe that, take a good look at only a few of our laws. How does the oil depletion allowance benefit you? How does welfare assistance to those not worthy benefit the middle-income person? What of the \$1,404, the middle-income worker and his employer will have to pay to Social Security this year. Isn't that a good deal of money to pay without question?

There are many such questions, some of which need to be answered. How many of us have taken the time to ask the persons who have the answers? How many have expressed their opinion where it counts? Where it would really do some good?

During the last two decades we have allowed prayer in school to be a thing of the past. . . . filth to run rampant in our communities. . . . and we have watched our courts handcuff our law-enforcement officers. Our church attendance indicates we have forgotten there is a Supreme Being, and the banking business is a sure sign we have inflated our pocketbooks. We have become a "talk too much," "take everything for granted," "Do-nothing society." We are a disgrace to our forefathers who fought,

prayed and worked hard to make the United States the greatest country in the world.

Our problems today are the product of apathy and nothing else. No country can be strong with weak minded, undisciplined, poorly guided, do-nothing citizens. Isn't it time we stand up? Suppose, Mr. and Mrs. America, that the next time you find yourself sitting in a block-long line waiting for high-price, limited-purchase gasoline, that you think of what you would like to tell people like Ron Sarasin, Abe Ribicoff or Lowell Welcker. Stop telling the gasoline station attendant or your coworker, he may be as complacent as you were. And when you finally leave the gas station and reach your 68-degree home perhaps you can put your frustrations into letter form and mail them to your favorite (or not so favorite) elected official.

Somewhere in your letter be sure to ask for an immediate roll-back of prices on our everyday necessities. If you don't do it soon you may wish you did. Yes, bread may cost 95 cents per loaf as some have predicted, but only if you allow it to be, only if you don't care, and if you continue to sit back and think your neighbor will do something about it, the price for that loaf of bread may be one dollar.

In closing I would like to ask the Editor of the *Evening Sentinel* to publish as a service to the public, the names and addresses of all congressmen and senators in the state of Connecticut. I further request that the Editor continue this practice until something definite is done with the present crisis in energy—human or otherwise.

ALFRED M. TORTORA,
Shelton.

BENEFITS TO CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the conscientious objector has had a most difficult time in this country of freedom.

A man can follow his conscience, but often a price is demanded of him.

Certain men chose—according to law and a duly established legal procedure—not to serve their country by participating in a war. They chose to serve their country instead and according to law, by "alternate" service.

Now they are denied certain benefits offered to those who served in the military; almost as if alternate service is no service at all.

Perhaps there is an inequity here, as is so well pointed out in the following letter I received from a constituent:

THE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES*,
Supreme Court,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I have recently read of your decision regarding the withholding of benefits from conscientious objectors who have fulfilled their two years of alternative service. According to the account I read, you said that the aim of the benefit law is "to make military service more attractive and to aid in readjustments after the disruptive effects of active duty in the service."

It seems to me that there is no need

* With the exception of Justice William O. Douglas, who was the one dissenter.

to make the military any more "attractive" than it already is. Aside from the obvious post-service benefits, the military person can look forward to (a) equal or better pay than most C.O.s will receive, (b) free room and board for the duration of their service, (c) free clothing, (d) free medical, dental, optical and psychiatric care, (e) use of commissary and PX facilities all over the world for themselves and their family members, (f) cut rates on airlines and trains, (g) allotments for wives, children, and other dependents, and (h) career training. Not bad for someone who doesn't even have to pay union dues.

As to the need for military people to readjust after the "disruptive effects" of active duty: may I remind you that thousands and thousands of military people never experience anything which might even remotely resemble combat. A friend spent three years in Germany, typing for six hours a day. A teacher of literature I know spent two years in France, chauffeuring a general from officers' clubs to night clubs to beaches to spas. A schoolmate of mine spent four years in England, making out payroll checks. Let us not be too ready to assume that every ex-military person is suffering from shell shock and terrible memories.

Now, what about the disruptive effects of having been a conscientious objector? Some of these effects are: (a) being ostracized by pre-military people, (b) being relocated for one's alternate service in a place as far from one's home as possible, (c) working for little or no money for two years, (d) being considered A.W.O.L. if one is fired from one's job for any reason, or if one quits an intolerable job before the two years are completed, and (e) being jeopardized in the job market because one was a "peace creep" instead of a soldier.

The main point of all this is that the United States Government says that two years alternative service performed by a conscientious objector in connection with the health, education or welfare of the United States is *equal* to two years military service, and yet C.O.s are *punished* for their religious and moral beliefs, despite performance of this supposedly "equal" service, by being denied their rightful benefits.

This is just another example of the government talking out of both sides of its mouth, and another example of peaceful, passive people being made targets for ridicule and theft of legal rights. I know whereof I speak since I have been living with a conscientious objector for six years.

VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1974

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Congressional Black Caucus held a press conference to announce our unqualified support of H.R. 8053, the bill which will establish a system of post card registration for Federal elections.

Joining with the Congressional Black Caucus at this conference was Mr. Angel Almedina the Washington representative of the National Association for Puerto Rican Civil Rights. Mr. Almedina's statement was so noteworthy and eloquent in its support for this new registration system that I feel compelled to share it with my colleagues. I commend his statement to your attention:

COMMENTS ON THE REGISTRATION ACT OF 1974

(By Mr. Angel Almedina)

American voter participation in the electoral processes ranks among the lowest in the democratic nations of the world. The most advanced technological country of the world is also one of the most backward with regard to voter registration. Without an actively participating and well-informed electorate, this Nation is deprived of the foundation of the democratic spirit. The greater the participation and education of the electorate, the closer we come to the ideal of democracy.

It is highly appropriate that each session of Congress give birth to new reforms in the voter registration laws of this country. No session of Congress should pass without a review of these laws and the manner of their administration. If our national government does not set an example, we can hardly expect state and local governments to do better. If voter registration and participation is not a priority concern during the agenda of each Congress, the electorate will undoubtedly know that their active participation is a "non-priority."

Great strides have been made over the past generation towards the inclusion of the nation's adult population in the electoral processes. The youth vote and the voter rights of minorities indicates some of the advances. Nevertheless, as successive elections have demonstrated, voter registration of these sectors, as well as of the general electorate, continues to remain low. There are clearly many reasons and explanations for this circumstance.

One of the fundamental reasons rests in the manner, and in the quantity of eligible constituents that we reach through existing voter registration mechanisms. These mechanisms, like many other services, have not been able to keep up with the pace of urbanization and of the population explosion, as well as of the participation by new constituents. In many areas of the country, voter registration laws, procedures, and administration, are extremely complex. In some instances, the laws, procedures, and administration are so entrenched, that the ordinary or average working man or woman, is confronted with unnecessary barriers, rather than needed opportunities.

The simplification of the voter registration procedures for federal elections through the establishment of a *supplementary* system whereby the electorate can also register to vote through the postal service, can make an effective contribution to increased participation.

Such a system needs to be viewed in the context of a supplementary system! Equally important is the need for modernizing the existing voter registration mechanisms. There appears to be a drastic need for expanding the number of registrars, and an equally drastic need for providing access to working people for registration during non-working hours and during weekends. There is a need for increased information dissemination to the constituents, to remind them of their rights and obligations as citizens, as well as of the appropriate deadlines for registration.

Both the proposed supplementary mass registration approach through the postal services, as well as the existing systems, are in need of requirements that would insure that peoples of non-English speaking origins and backgrounds are appropriately informed of their rights and obligations in their home language. The inclusion of appropriate language in the public law to insure that bilingual registration forms, instructions, and related information are provided in postal areas where there are high concentrations of non-English-speaking people, is highly desirable. Perhaps the Postal Services and the Bureau of Census should become involved in the selection of the neighborhoods on an annual basis, to determine the areas

of high concentrations of the non-English-speaking. Similarly the establishment of appropriate advisory committees concerned with reviewing of and recommending changes in approaches towards implementing effective bilingual * * * an annual report to Congress, relative to this matter. A thorough system analysis of the management of the voter registration through the postal service should accompany the first few years of operation, to aid the postal service, as well as provide Congress with needed information.

As a Vietnam veteran, I believe it is appropriate to suggest that careful attention be given to the effective registration of servicemen, and that this matter be carefully studied, towards insuring within the next Congress, that all of our young servicemen have an opportunity to register and to receive extensive information.

Finally, it is our hope, that the proposed voter registration changes be instituted at the earliest convenient date. The issue presented has been before us for quite some time now, and action is thus long overdue. The implementation of these changes will—we hope—open the doors for equally long overdue changes of benefit to the American citizens in general, and to particular groups.

We express our appreciation to the many dedicated people, including members of the Congressional Black Caucus, for their efforts to help reform the voter registration laws of the federal government. Likewise, we wish to note our appreciation to members of both parties for their dedication to these ends.

THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months, I have been receiving articles on gun control by Mr. James B. Sullivan, who is a board member of the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy.

Today, I would like to insert his paper entitled, "Public Protection From Weapons and Ammunition," which outlines and emphasizes the hazards handguns create in our society. Mr. Sullivan's paper reflects my own reasons for introducing the bill, H.R. 12989, which would effectively eliminate the handgun from public circulation.

It is only to be hoped that Congress will take action on this bill as swiftly as possible, before more people are needlessly killed by handguns.

Mr. Sullivan's paper follows:

PUBLIC PROTECTION FROM WEAPONS AND

AMMUNITION

TRAGEDY

From 1964 through 1973 America suffered more than 95,000 gun murders, 100,000 gun suicides, 700,000 gun woundings and 800,000 gun robberies. In the last half of that decade gun murders rose 50 per cent over the first half, as did gun assaults; gun robberies rose 75 per cent. Gun murders of policemen rose 90 per cent. Our firearms violence rates are incomparably higher than the rates in Great Britain, West Germany, France, Sweden, Italy, and Canada—all of which require handgun licenses, which are not required in 42 of our states. United States overall murder rates are also much higher, and at least a third of thefts are found to be unreported.

COST

Gun owners share the unique American tax burden resulting from weapons crime and sometimes endure the death or disability therefrom. America pays up to \$10,000 a year to jail a person for the misuse of an easily available \$10 gun. Weapons crime also accounts for much of the cost of enforcement, justice, federal grants—now \$900 million a year—welfare, insurance premiums, medical expenses, recuperation time waste, and business and personal property losses. The annual cost of weapons crime probably is well over \$10 billion. It could be cut easier than the cost of food or fuel. Mostly hidden, crime taxes are not comprehended by taxpayers; they do know that the criminal pays his debt to society with their money.

OBLIGATION

Through government and a small minority, our society is heavily responsible for weapons crime by mental incompetents, drug addicts, alcoholics, former felons, convicted threateners, subversives, juveniles, etc., because it leaves guns, knives, etc., freely accessible to them. Safe owners should go with safe guns. Mankind is commanded not to kill or to steal. Normal people must try to remove the means for such misdeeds from abnormal people. Influential and public-spirited people must seek legislation to lighten the tax burden largely for the middle class and to lessen death and disability largely for the lower class. America must account for its slaughtering in steel—guns, knives, abortion instruments, carelessly driven vehicles. America must account for the fact that 40 per cent of its firearms fatalities are children aged one to 19. America must account for the loss of health, the use of blood plasma due to avoidable shootings and stabbings, and the waste of metals that provide weapons for the unfit.

PROTECTION

Society must be protected from the commission of crime as well as by the committal of convicts. A gun in dangerous hands in the home is as lethal as a concealed weapon on a dangerous person in the street. The range of reasons for Americans shooting and stabbing one another is appalling and barbaric. Protection from weapons in dangerous hands is as rightful as protection from bad or harmful drugs. The property right to own a gun must not nullify the right to life or other property. Many ex-felons and other unfit persons could be curtailed in the commercial or private purchase of weapons or ammunition or made liable for illegal possession, through licensing. Their sources in illegal transfers would risk prosecution. The gun group overestimates the cleverness and the education of the average criminal. Most criminals are small-timers without contacts or resources. To protect itself, the United States has greater need for controls due to weapons numbers, racial strife, crowded cities, ghetto life and para-military arsenals.

REGULATION

Regulating the ownership of lethal weapons should be parallel with gun-carrying permits and with accepted controls on pois-

ons, narcotics, explosives, etc., as well as prosaic activities that involve fellow citizens. Fifty types of United States licensing have been counted. Independent polls show that 60 per cent of gun owners favor licensing.

FEDERAL CONTROL

The United States Supreme Court and the American Bar Association have said that there is no Constitutional barrier against federal firearms control. Federal cover is as legal and as appropriate as federal sentences for certain types of crimes. Open borders obviate a state's control of weapons from other states. State and local governments could go outside of a federal umbrella with their own restrictions.

CRIME EXPERTS

America should heed the counsel of its criminologists, police commissioners and psychologists, most of whom champion controls. Psychologists and crime experts say guns lead some types to crime. They say guns are more deadly, accurate, sensitive and impersonal than other weapons and are used illegally most often. Psychiatrists say that guns stimulate violent behavior.

SHORT-TERM REMEDIES

Short-term alternatives to weapons control—swift justice, mandatory penalties, stiffer sentences—overlook enforcement problems, preventive difficulties (murder in the home), the mental state of violators, the specter of ghetto life, current punishment in contrast with foreign moderation, deterrent shortcomings, frequent withdrawals of charges, and justice and incarceration costs. Sentences harden rather than deter. Murder sentences are the most severe but potential murderers are generally unmindful of them. Only 20 per cent of serious crimes are cleared but prisoners are overcrowded. Juveniles need help, not isolation. In any case, there can be other reforms in addition to weapons control.

LONG-TERM REMEDIES

Long-term solutions for weapons crime—better social conditions, reformed rehabilitation programs, more mental treatment, more responsible child training—would delay the reduction of weapons crime for years.

SECURITY

Safeguarding of lethal weapons is more important than recording and protecting securities and automobiles. Guns unserved, neglected and carelessly stored lead to fatal accidents, injuries and thefts. The home is the chief source of stolen weapons. Keeping of guns for protection or as heirlooms should be discouraged. They cause far more deaths and injuries to occupants by design or accident than apprehension of intruders. The frequent shootings of armed, alert policemen in public underscores the dubious defense provided by home weapons. Life is seldom in danger from intruders, who normally cannot be shot legally if there is no life threat. Losing property—especially if insured—is better than suffering wounds or death. Gun violence has increased with private arming. Reduced possession would be reflected in reduced violence, just as fewer vehicles on the

highway due to fuel shortage has reduced accidents.

INCONVENIENCE

A minimum of inconvenience and a few dollars' worth of fees by hunters and others accustomed to regulations and form-filling would be a small sacrifice compared with years of misery, impairment of health, or death itself. Weapons control would be a blessing not a burden. Controls are not considered a burden around the world. Controls that some Americans think they can't live with would be better than the lack of controls that some of us may have to die with. We cannot isolate the dangerous unless we pass on all license applicants. The pledge of eligibility under the Gun Control Act of 1968 should be solidified with the proof of eligibility under licensing. Obtaining a permanent weapons-ammunition ownership license and presenting it for purchases or transfers would be more convenient than self-clearance, detailed recording or go-between mail orders for every commercial purchase.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The small arms civil defense designated in the Second Amendment has long since been superseded by state militias and modern military power. The Second Amendment reflects fear of a central standing army, not gun regulation, which was part of the colonies' European heritage. The Amendment has no qualifications for personal ownership. No President, Attorney General or Secretary of Defense has ever advocated citizen arming for protection, civil or private. The Bill of Rights does not provide absolute rights in speech, press, house privacy or real estate ownership.

LEGISLATION

I propose federal ownership requisites for state licensing to purchase, borrow or sell lethal weapons or transfer ammunition in person or by mail; state and local prerogatives on procurement procedures; a federal ban on cheap, non-sporting handguns; states' decision on the registration of guns and any participation in the FBI computer center for gun recoverability; state action on gun familiarity and safekeeping; a federal 30-day wait for all weapons acquisition; federal compensation for submitted handguns and for all guns of the disqualified; and a federal guarantee against arbitrary confiscation. These recommendations do not represent any other council board member.

CRIME WAR

Warring on weapons crime is even more important than fighting organized crime. Anything short of weapons control would be surrender on weapons crime. Without weapons control our citizens would continue to pay, bleed and die from such violence far more frequently than the rest of the industrialized world. Any American who does not live to see the day of weapons control will die as excessive weapons crime endures.

JAMES B. SULLIVAN,

Board Member, National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, Inc.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 13, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord; and He will teach us His ways and we will walk in His paths.—Isaiah 2: 3.

Eternal God, our Father, who hast opened the gates of a new day—we lift our hearts unto Thee in grateful praise

for Thy goodness to us. We confess that in our enjoyment of Thy gifts we often forget the giver and because of the abundance of Thy blessings we fail to appreciate the greatness of Thy goodness. Help us to keep alive within us a continuous spirit of gratitude and to remember that though at times we do forsake Thee, Thou dost never forsake us.

Grant unto us and unto our people the realization that in these dark days of discouragement and disillusionment Thou art with us endeavoring to lead us in the ways of truth and give to each one of us the firm faith that right will triumph over wrong, goodness over evil, and love over hate.

Therefore, let us run with patience the