

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, and Mr. KETCHUM):

H.R. 13562. A bill to designate certain lands in the National Park System as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. STEELMAN, and Mr. BAUMAN):

H.R. 13563. A bill to designate certain lands in the National Park System as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 13564. A bill to designate certain public lands and waters in the State of Alaska for national conservation purposes to be administered as units of the National Park System, the National Wildlife Refuge System, National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and the National Forest System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SEEBLIUS, Mr. STEELMAN, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, and Mr. CRONIN):

H.R. 13565. A bill to establish a national program for research and development in nonnuclear energy sources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 13566. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to eliminate certain restrictions on the rights of officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr.

HOWARD, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. MANN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 13567. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that advertising of alcoholic beverages is not a deductible expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H.J. Res. 940. Joint resolution to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide for designation of the 11th day of November of each year as Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H. Con. Res. 447. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President should evaluate the commodity requirements of the domestic economy to determine which commodities should be designated as in short supply for purposes of taxation of Domestic International Sales Corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 987. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 228; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

381. By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

382. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging the Secretary of Transportation and the National Rail Passenger Corporation to insure that the people of the State of Idaho shall have passenger service on an east-west basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

383. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to repeal of the National Occupational Safety and Health Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

384. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to continuation of the Lake Michigan ferry service between Manitowoc and Kewaunee, Wis., and Frankfort, Mich.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

385. Also, memorial of the Legislature of

the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, requesting Congress to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the use of public funds for secular education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

386. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to the establishment of a bilingual part of the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

387. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to lakeshore planning policies of the Army Corps of Engineers; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 13568. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Cmdr. Thurman Roddy Schnitz, U.S. Navy Reserves, retired, to the rank of captain on the Reserves list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 13569. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Fegi Matayoshi and Wilma Fegi Matayoshi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13570. A bill for the relief of Phan Manh Quynh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13571. A bill for the relief of Terrence Jerome Caguiat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13572. A bill for the relief of William M. Raisner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 13573. A bill for the relief of Resan Ocot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

405. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Legislature of Erie County, N.Y., relative to public transit operating assistance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

406. Also, petition of the Utah State Bar Association, Ogden, Utah, relative to the service of chief judges of U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## PATRIOTISM CAN BE REVIVED—EVEN NOW

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I read an uncommonly good and very timely editorial in the Heron Lake News, which I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all the Members of Congress may have the opportunity of reading it.

I particularly commend the closing paragraph:

Maybe a little more love of country and combined efforts to teach the youngsters what their country really means, may pave the road for the next generation somewhat.

They need to know the cost of having Old Glory flying in the breeze.

## PATRIOTISM CAN BE REVIVED—EVEN NOW

The United States hasn't been in such a spot for many a year. This would be an excellent time to reactivate the wonderful feeling of patriotism, particularly among the young children. Time was when no day was begun without the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag which schoolchildren knew from the time they entered the classroom.

To those who have lived through a few wars, the remembrance of the feeling of pride in being an American that was experienced as the flag passed in review was something great. The military parades, military funerals and Memorial Day services were something to remember. Every student could tell you all of the causes and effects of every war from the Revolutionary War on down to the present time by the time he graduated from the eighth grade. He could also tell you what countries were adjacent to

each other, the products, exports and industries of most of the nations of the world. He could tell with pride about the struggles of the Pilgrims and other immigrants who braved the many dangers of the new world to find freedom from oppression. He could tell with gratitude about the efforts of early statesmen who worked very hard to make America proud and beautiful—an example to other countries.

Because of the abundance of materials and technology, we have been the class of people to help all others. However, in our charity for others and being a benign Santa Claus we have neglected to remember that charity begins at home. As a result, the people of the United States are faced with shortages which should never have occurred.

Because of the many scandals which have put doubts in the minds of many, thoughts of patriotism have moved to the background as people are more concerned about self-preservation. During World War II, it was an honor to sacrifice for your country. No

March 18, 1974

one minded not having meat on the table if it was being used to bolster the strength and health of our servicemen. Housewives did not mind using substitutes for sugar and coffee, and children wore their scuffed shoes a little longer because they were rationed. Gas was conserved because it was being used to fly supplies to the forces who were fighting a war. Nylons and cigarettes were in short supply, but people stood patiently in line for a quota when word was passed around that some would be available. No sacrifice was too great for the GI's who were defending their country.

Times have changed, to use an old cliché, and shortages exist now because of greed. Maybe a little more love of country and combined efforts to teach the youngsters what their country really means may pave the road for the next generation somewhat. They need to know the cost of having Old Glory flying in the breeze.

#### LEGISLATION TO HELP HEMOPHILIA PATIENTS

#### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation, together with Congressman JAMES HASTINGS, to provide aid to families whose costs for treatment of hemophilia far outstrip their ability to pay.

Hemophilia is the inherited blood disease which causes a male child to bleed uncontrollably unless injected with that factor of blood plasma in which his blood is deficient. At first, all hemophilia victims were treated with transfusions of whole blood; then, as more was known about the disease, with blood plasma. Today doctors can identify different types of hemophilia, and can therefore supply each patient with just that part of plasma useful to prevent or stop his bleeding. This advance is invaluable because it permits other parts of the plasma to be used for other patients, and other diseases. Blood factor VIII, the coagulating factor, can now be separated from human plasma by a process called cryoprecipitation. Other factors can also be separated.

Unfortunately, treatment for hemophiliac patients has not been widely available, principally because of money. Costs of replacement therapy are increased because blood banks often do not fractionate or cryoprecipitate, or do not have the needed blood on hand. Many would have to purchase commercial forms of factor VIII. Some advances have been made to reduce the cost: Some patients can self-administer the clotting factor at home, and happily, the supply of factor VIII is somewhat more plentiful now. Thus, the earlier cost of replacement therapy could run to \$25,000; today the average cost amounts to about \$6,000 a year for a moderately affected patient, and far more for the severely affected person. But, Mr. Speaker, even \$6,000 exceeds the amount most patients can afford.

We cannot allow a youngster to die for lack of money when we have the medical knowledge and technology to save his life. We could make a normal life possible for him, if we had enough money to provide him with preventive blood transfusions.

In Rochester, we have one of the few completely staffed and equipped hemophilia centers. A Community Chest agency, it has been able to add outreach persons to its staff, bringing many patients into the center for diagnosis and treatment. A private physician is in charge of the ongoing care of the patient, but the facilities and consulting staff at the center, which serves a 12-county area, are always available to him. This is doubly important when the patient cannot afford to private physician.

As the hemophiliac grows older, the disease causes various bone and dental problems. For this reason, the Hemophilia Center in Rochester provides orthopedic treatment and rehabilitation in the center, which is located in the Rochester General Hospital; it coordinates education in dental care with dental treatment supplied by and in the Eastman Dental Center. Psychiatric services help families to accept the child, and cope with the strains on the family generated by lifelong illness and staggering costs.

Our center has a comprehensive coagulation laboratory which provides blood analysis and a variety of services related to coagulation not only to hemophilia patients and their physicians, but to any physician who requests their aid in evaluation of any patient. The coagulation laboratory is licensed by the State of New York, and is directed by a full-time hematologist. In 1973 it served 970 patients.

When a center is as comprehensive as this one, it can—and the Rochester Hemophilia Center does—function as a teaching and demonstration institution. Medical technologists, medical and dental students from the University of Rochester, and nursing students, rotate through the center, learning in formal classes and working in the laboratory. In this way the benefits of its research and methods extend beyond the vast region it directly serves.

Mr. Speaker, we need more centers, and, in some established centers, more complete facilities and services. The legislation I am introducing is identical to S. 1326, authored by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It will provide for payments in whole or in part—depending upon income and third-party assumptions for portions of the cost—to the hemophiliac or his family for as long as he needs treatments. It will establish other hemophilia centers across the Nation, and blood fractionation facilities—which may be incorporated within the treatment centers or at different laboratory sites. It will establish a Hemophilia Advisory Board to be associated with the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my colleagues, in reviewing patient needs, and the bill, will want to support this important legislation.

#### LINCOLN DAY REMARKS

#### HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, someone has said there is nothing new under the sun.

A recent event in Gettysburg proved that statement to be in error so far as that area is concerned.

For many years, the Adams County Council of Republican Women have commemorated the birthday of Lincoln with appropriate exercises. For the first time in the long history of this affair, a lady was the speaker of the evening.

Miss Georgiana Sheldon, Deputy Director, Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, broke that tradition. She delivered an excellent speech in which she touched on some of the lesser known facts concerning Lincoln. She also spoke of the increasing role women are playing in policymaking positions in practically every phase in business, government and the professions.

The local press used these words in commenting on her talk:

The women liked Georgiana Sheldon for speaking out on the importance of woman's role in shaping and preserving the moral fiber of the nation. The men liked her because she is pretty, feminine and soft-spoken.

The speech follows:

LINCOLN DAY REMARKS, GETTYSBURG, PA., FEBRUARY 14, 1974

It's indeed an honor to celebrate the birthdate of Abraham Lincoln in the place he has enshrined in history of the human spirit.

The Gettysburg Address is a tough act to follow.

Nothing can nor need be added to what Abraham Lincoln said here; and there is little to be added to what we know today about Lincoln the man and the President.

Everyone knows that Honest Abe's solemn exterior hid a tremendous sense of humor. Everyone has his favorite sample of it. Mine is the story they tell about his famous debates with Stephen Douglas.

Douglas concluded one speech with a sharp attack on Lincoln's career up to that point. He said Lincoln had tried everything and had always been a failure. He'd tried farming and failed at that; tried flatboating and failed at that; sold liquor in a saloon and failed at that; tried law and failed at that; and now he had gone into politics and was doomed to the worst failure of all.

Lincoln simply sat there and laughed. He seemed greatly amused by it.

At length he rose to reply. He came forward and said he was very much obliged to Judge Douglas for the accurate history he'd taken the trouble to compile. It was true, every word of it.

"I have," said Lincoln, "worked on a farm; I have split rails; I have worked on a flatboat; I have tried to practice law. There is just one thing that Judge Douglas forgot to relate: He says I sold liquor over the counter. He forgot to tell you that, while I was on one side of the counter, he was always on the other.

"The difference between us now is this: I have left my side of the counter, but Judge Douglas still sticks to his as tenaciously as ever."

From Lincoln's life story, which we all

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

know so well, we can draw an analogy for our times which is encouraging and significant for today's woman.

Abe Lincoln is the American success story. He escaped from the depths of poverty to reach the highest office in the land, and provided us with matchless leadership in a great crisis.

Today—American women are escaping from the stereotyped mold of centuries past, assuming a full role in every element of our society, and providing their brand of leadership in a crisis of the 1970's.

If he were alive today, would Lincoln espouse our cause?

I don't doubt it for a minute.

He hated tyranny over the human spirit; he took delight in deflating stuffed shirts, and he exposed cant and hypocrisy wherever he found it.

Also, I'm pretty sure he liked women; he neither put them on a pedestal nor descended to them. I heard a story recently that, for me at least, demonstrates this.

He once left his hat on a chair, and a lady of considerable proportions sat on it. When she arose, Abe surveyed the wreckage and said, very mildly, "Madam, I could have told you it couldn't have fitted."

We know Lincoln had a deep devotion to his stepmother, Sarah. He was unstinting in his praise of women for their contributions to the war effort.

It is a matter of record that he wasn't particularly surprised when a woman asked to be appointed Chaplain to a Wisconsin Regiment; he passed the request to the Secretary of War with the notation that he had no objection to it.

Lincoln was a logical man.

I think he would have appreciated a speech I recently noticed. It was given by Edward D. Eddy, President of Chatham College. He undertook to answer the pseudo-arguments advanced by the opponents of equal rights for women in business.

President Eddy said that women must fight against six myths. I shall give only a few of them. You will be able to guess the others, I'm sure:

Myth Number One: You can't keep a woman in the job. She'll leave to get married or have a baby. Untrue. Statistics show men leave jobs just as frequently as women.

Myth Number Two: The independent, self-directed woman is a homewrecker. As soon as she begins to think of herself, she loses interest in her husband and family. This is false, too. A study of divorce rates discloses that divorce is more common among housewives than career women. A bright, active woman usually finds her whole life more fulfilling if she has a chance "to be somebody" outside the narrow confines of the home.

Myth Number Three: A woman just can't wear two hats and do a decent job. How can she be a mother and a top lawyer, an executive and a happy wife? This is a cruel question, but it's easily answered. How can a man be a decent father and husband if he is a busy lawyer or a top management executive?

I can almost hear Abraham Lincoln making short work of these myths—because, in so many ways, he was ahead of his time.

We know Honest Abe liked the company of the ladies. Don't you think he'd thoroughly appreciate the fact that today 16 women sit in the House of Representatives, and others hold powerful posts in the White House, and in every agency and component of the Federal Government?

I'm proud of the fact that in my tenure at the Department of Defense, I have seen women reach flag rank in each of the military services. At the other end of the scale, women

are serving as crewmen (or is it crewpersons?) on Navy ships.

In our States and communities, thousands of women are combining legislative and government executive careers with their family lives.

In the business world, a recent survey of national job patterns found more women, employed in a wider variety of jobs, and at higher levels of responsibility than ever before.

In education, women have had a profound influence on the youth of America through their numbers in elementary and high school teaching posts. Also, women are rising to increasingly more important jobs at the junior and senior college level.

It's no contradiction to say that Abraham Lincoln was also old-fashioned in many ways. He was in favor of old-fashioned virtues, like honesty and hard work—and he exemplified these in his life.

Young people today would "relate" to Abe Lincoln too, because he ridiculed hypocrisy and false dignity; and he recognized, when the crisis came that, and I quote: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present."

Lincoln would be one of the first to perceive that the real crisis confronting our Nation today comes not from a shortage of oil or gas; it is an energy crisis of the human spirit.

We must energize ourselves!

In business, in the classroom, in the home—women must help resolve the crisis by establishing our integrity; and by recognizing, as Lincoln did, the merits of values like honesty and hard work;

By being prepared to express cogent opinions and views on relevant and vital issues; by recognizing and bearing witness to the fact that America's ideals are intact, and her goals are basically good and credible; and by reviving the do-it-yourself spirit which characterized our forefathers as they built America.

We in politics and in public service may tend to look to government for the answer to our national problems. There are some things, though, that government can't and shouldn't do.

Lincoln said, "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community whatever they need to have done, but cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capabilities."

But he added this wise caveat: "In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, the Government ought not to interfere."

We know Lincoln faced many crises—in private life, he suffered among other things the loss of his young son; in his political life, he carried the burden of the most tragic war in our history.

How he mustered the courage and the resources to face his crises, therefore, might be of surpassing interest to Americans today.

Let me conclude by reading what he said on another Friday day in 1861, in a speech at Pittsburgh:

"My advice is to keep cool. If the great American people can only keep their temper on both sides of the line, the troubles will come to an end, and the question which now distracts the country will be settled, just as surely as all other difficulties of a like character which have originated in this government have been adjusted."

"Let the people keep their self-possession, (and) this great Nation will continue to prosper as heretofore."

In short, long before we moderns took up the phrase, Lincoln, the man for all times, told us: "Don't blow your cool."

I know of no better time for all Americans to take that advice.

March 18, 1974

CYRUS EATON CALLS ON THE  
UNITED STATES TO END ITS BOYCOTT OF CUBA

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I reprinted in these pages two reports on Mr. Cyrus Eaton's recent visit to Cuba.

It is my honor today to submit his own report on that visit. I urge my colleagues to pay special heed to his words. It is time for the United States to end one of its continuing foreign policy fiascos. The report follows:

SAYS CASTRO IS READY TO MEET—CYRUS EATON CALLS ON UNITED STATES TO END ITS BOYCOTT OF CUBA

(By Cyrus Eaton)

Starting 150 years ago, my ancestors in Nova Scotia were engaged in the shipping industry between Halifax and Havana. Personally, I had substantial investments in Cuba before the revolution, and have been going there for more than 50 years.

I have just returned from another visit to Cuba. Prime Minister Fidel Castro and I have met on a number of occasions, and during this most recent trip to Havana I found him in excellent spirits, confident of his own and his country's future and considerably encouraged by the additional extension of credit arranged by Soviet Communist Party chief Leonid I. Brezhnev on Brezhnev's visit to Cuba a few days prior to mine.

In addition to meeting with Prime Minister Castro, I also had important discussions with Dr. Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, vice prime minister and minister of foreign affairs, with President Osvaldo Dorticos and with Jose Fernandez, minister of education, Ramon Castro, the prime ministers' brother, spent a day with me inspecting various agricultural facilities in the Cuban countryside about 75 miles from Havana. Every detail of my visit was handled efficiently by competent and well-trained individuals—despite my being an American.

Over the years, the U.S. government has not been sympathetic to the revolutionary government and has believed all along that it could overthrow Castro and bring Cuba to its knees through economic pressure. This not only closed American markets to Cuba, but also halted the flow of American products into Cuba. The embargo meant, among other hardships, the virtual overnight cutoff of Cuba's entire supply of fuel, including coal and oil from the United States.

As a result of the embargo, Cuba has had support from the entire Communist world, with a continuing supply of necessary goods and products. Cuba's allies have also lent her vast amounts of money at low interest rates.

Cuba has been fortunate to develop a worldwide market for all the products of her land. The world demand for sugar has driven the price from 1½ cents per pound at the time of the embargo up to the current price of about 20 cents.

In my talks with Cuba's leaders, I learned some of their plans for the future. There is an immediate program to expand and develop its electric power generating facilities by 50%. They want to increase their nickel production and bring about the mechanization of sugar-cane harvesting, to expand their sugar refining industry, to increase their port facilities and to reconstruct and mod-

ernize their railroads. (Seventy diesel locomotives have just been purchased from the Soviet Union.)

Plans are also under way to construct more roads and improve telephone and radio communications. Educational facilities, from the elementary level to the university, are being expanded greatly, and low-cost housing is being constructed on a mammoth scale. The Cubans plan, in addition, to construct more airfields and to improve computer technology.

In agriculture, Cuba has made great strides and has wisely improved the quality and quantity of both dairy and beef herds of cattle, through the importation of foundation stock from Canada and Europe.

The boycott—quite clearly—is not working, and the United States should put an immediate end to it. Our government should allow American companies to supply the raw materials and technology now being obtained from the Soviet Union, China, Germany, England and Canada.

In addition to this economic step, the United States should change its political approach to Cuba.

My uncle, the late congressman Charles A. Eaton (R-N.J.), was one of the five Americans who participated in the conference which set up the United Nations in 1945. I think the Cuban problem, from the beginning, should have been referred to the world body. Our government should make more use of the United Nations in all international questions.

The embargo could be terminated swiftly, handled directly either by President Nixon or Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger. A couple of days spent by the President or Kissinger with Fidel Castro at some neutral spot such as Nassau or Jamaica should produce an immediate and satisfactory solution and lay the groundwork for friendship and understanding with the little nation whose progress, since its discovery by Columbus in 1492, has been affected by outside countries, including Spain, England, France and the United States.

As far as the government of Cuba is concerned, it appears prepared to act at once. The ball is now in our court.

#### THE TIME TO DEMAND LESS GOVERNMENT SPENDING!

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, if the public opinion polls are correct, Americans feel that they are paying more for government and getting less than ever before.

Yet, despite this fact, they have been presented with the hugest budget in

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American history. In addition, new plans are being introduced for national health insurance and welfare reform which will cost additional billions of dollars.

In a recent advertisement which I believe captures the public mood and attempts to point it in the proper direction, the Warner and Swasey Co. asks: "How long are you going to put up with having your taxes double in 10 years?"

The cure, this advertisement points out, is simple:

Cut spending, especially for those pet projects whose objective is votes. There are too many government bureaus. There are too many government programs—bitter resistance against excessive taxes is long overdue.

I wish to commend the Warner and Swasey Co., for their advertising campaign which is attempting to make Americans aware of the dangerous growth in power of the National Government.

At this time, I want to share with my colleagues the advertisement of the Warner Swasey Co., which appeared in the February 4, 1974 issue of U.S. News & World Report and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

#### INSTEAD OF MEETLY PAYING MORE TAXES WE'D BETTER DEMAND LESS SPENDING

How long are you going to put up with having your taxes double in ten years? That is what they have done—and will keep on doing, as long as you permit your Federal, State and Local governments to spend 410 billion dollars a year (up 11% from the year before) up year after year after year.

Estimated taxes are \$5,070 per American household.

The cure is simple and sure—cut spending, especially for those pet projects whose objective is votes. There are too many government employees. There are too many government bureaus. There are too many government programs. And why should Federal civilian employees be paid an average of \$11,749 a year in contrast to an all-industry wage (the people who do the producing) of \$8,440?

Bitter resistance against excessive taxes is long overdue. If you agree, let's say so. Loud and clear.

#### THE COST OF THE ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

#### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been great interest in recent months regarding the cost of the volunteer military.

CHART I.—TOTAL DOD MANPOWER COSTS

[Dollars in billions]

	Fiscal year 1964		Fiscal year 1967		Fiscal year 1973		Fiscal year 1974		Fiscal year 1975	
	Dollars	Percent								
Military personnel appropriations	12.3	24	19.1	25	22.1	28	22.6	26	22.9	25
Civilian compensation	7.3	14	10.3	14	13.0	16	13.8	16	14.1	16
Reserve and Guard personnel appropriations	.7	1	.9	1	1.6	2	1.7	2	1.7	2
Retired pay	1.2	2	2.1	3	4.4	6	5.2	6	5.7	6
Contingency fund									2.2	2
Personnel support costs	2.4	5	3.9	5	4.6	6	5.2	6	5.9	6
Total manpower costs	23.9	47	36.3	48	45.7	57	48.5	56	52.5	57

One of the most incisive and comprehensive discussions of this issue was given today by Andrew Uscher, a systems analyst in the office of the Secretary of Defense, before the Operations Research Society.

I commend Mr. Uscher's remarks to all Members of the Congress and all others interested in a factual description of this matter:

#### THE COST OF THE ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

(By Andrew Uscher)

I would like to start off by giving you some good news and some bad news. The good news is that the All-Volunteer Force is continuing successfully. The bad news is that the All-Volunteer Force is continuing successfully. All this proves is what is good news to some people is bad news to others.

This kind of controversy especially applies to the cost of the All-Volunteer Force. Depending on your point of view, the All-Volunteer Force can be said to be extremely expensive or it can be said to exert only a minor influence on total Defense costs. In discussing this subject, it will soon become apparent that there is no single, correct cost of the All-Volunteer Force and there is no one, single, correct framework for viewing this issue. But even within this flexible mode of evaluation, I think that many of you will be quite surprised, as I was, at some of the conclusions about the cost of the All-Volunteer Force and especially the opportunity cost.

There has been much discussion and debate over the true cost of achieving and maintaining the volunteer force. Recent statements have been made in the Defense Department, by the press, and in Congress to the effect that the All-Volunteer Force has been the primary cause of rising manpower costs in DOD, which in turn have caused America to be placed at a relative disadvantage in competing with the Soviet Union in vital R&D efforts and in weapons systems procurement. Even more extreme statements have been made claiming that the All-Volunteer Force is bankrupting the Defense Department.

The true cost of the All-Volunteer Force is dependent upon what elements or programs from the total Defense budget one chooses to include as costs directly attributable to the decision to end reliance on the draft. For this reason, I will present no single figure for the AVF cost; but, instead, several cost cases will be explored with various underlying assumptions clearly presented.

The first AVF cost case takes the following point of view: Since the volunteer force effort involves total Defense manpower, it can be argued that all DOD manpower costs are really AVF costs. This may be an extreme view but it does put an upper bound on the problem and presents a framework of total manpower costs in which more realistic AVF cost cases can be viewed.

Chart I presents the total DOD manpower costs over time.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 18, 1974

Here total manpower costs are divided into six categories:

- (1) Military personnel appropriations which consist primarily of military pay.
- (2) Civilian compensation.
- (3) Reserve and Guard personnel appropriations.
- (4) Retired pay.
- (5) A contingency fund representing expected increases in military and civilian pay levels.
- (6) Personnel support costs which include Defense family housing, individual training, medical support, and other programs.

Chart I reveals that total manpower costs have increased from their FY level of \$23.9 billion, which represented 47% of the total Defense budget, to the current FY level of \$48.5 billion, representing 56% of the total Defense budget. However, it is not sufficient to look only at these statistics and draw final conclusions such as: manpower costs have increased too rapidly, or manpower costs are too high or represent too high a percent of the total Defense budget.

In order to clarify this issue, I have analyzed the economic causes of increased DOD pay costs, both military and civilian, over the last ten years. A summary of my findings is presented in Chart II.

CHART II.—RELATIVE IMPACT OF EACH ECONOMIC FACTOR IN INCREASING PAY COSTS, 1964 TO 1973

	Civilian cost increases <sup>1</sup>		Military cost increases <sup>2</sup>	
	Cost (billions)	Percent	Cost (billions)	Percent
Private industry wage matching	\$2.0	56.6	\$6.4	55.2
Catch-up comparability	.2	4.6	4.5	39.0
Labor force changes	1.0	28.4	-.3.3	—
Grade distribution changes	.4	10.4	.7	5.8
Total	3.6	100.0	8.3	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Only includes the basic pay of general schedule employees.

<sup>2</sup> Includes the cost increase of regular military compensation.

Here, the increase in military pay costs of \$8.3 billion over the past ten years was calculated by deriving the change in Regular Military Compensation, which consists of basic pay, food allowances, housing allowance, and tax advantages. This figure of \$8.3 billion tracks rather closely with the increased cost in Military Personnel Appropriations in Chart I. The increase in civilian pay costs of \$3.6 billion over the past ten years includes only the basic pay increases for General Schedule civilian employees, and this represents only about one half of the increased cost in total civilian compensation presented in Chart I, with the remainder largely consisting of the pay of Wage Board employees.

There are four variables which influence DOD pay costs. First is private industry wage matching which is the annual comparability process of matching military and civilian wage increases to those in corresponding occupations in the private sector. Second, is catch-up comparability which occurred because in FY 1964 civilian and military wage levels were not comparable to wage levels in the private sector and thus some special wage increases were necessary to achieve comparability. Third are changes in labor force size. Since FY 1964 military forces have been reduced 14% which in turn has caused pay costs to decrease, whereas the General Schedule civilian labor force has increased by 13% over this period causing pay costs to increase. Finally, there are grade distribution changes which include the effect known as grade creep.

Two important inferences can be drawn from Chart II. One is that the first two items on the chart, private industry wage matching and catch-up comparability, consist of the portion of increased pay costs due to the comparability effort. It can be seen that the comparability process is responsible for almost 95% of the increased military pay costs and about 60% of the increased civilian pay costs over the past ten years. Certainly, it is hard to argue that these increased expenditures represent poor or inefficient management of manpower resources. The second point is that grade creep, an area for which we have often been criticized, represents only 5-10% of the total increase in pay costs.

On close examination, this first AVF cost case does not seem reasonable. First of all, what do civilian costs, retired costs, or most support costs have to do with the All-Volunteer Force effort. Second, even in the military pay cost category, certainly not all costs are related to the decision to end the draft.

The second AVF cost case considers from an historical perspective what new programs were created or old programs expanded because reliance on the draft came to an end. Project Volunteer is the special budget category created to track this effort. The use of the funds for Project Volunteer began in FY 1972 and represented funds set aside for programs or initiatives the Secretary of Defense approved to assist in rapidly reducing reliance on the draft. Chart III presents the Project Volunteer budget for FY 1974.

CHART III.—*Project Volunteer (FY 74)*.  
(in millions)

Items	
<i>Administrative Programs</i>	\$432.2
Recruiting (Active)	117.4
Advertising (Active)	51.7
Recruiting & Advertising (Reserve)	36.0
Travel Entitlements	59.5
Quarters Improvements	5.1
Education Programs	52.6
Special AVF Initiatives	109.9
<i>Enacted Legislation</i>	2,522.6
Bonuses	66.4
Combat Arms	(62.9)
Nuclear Enlisted	(3.5)
Scholarships	73.8
ROTC (and subsistence)	(35.8)
Health Profession	(38.0)
Special Pay (Optometrists)	4.7
Recruiter Out-of-Pocket Expenses	4.9
Basic Pay and Allowances	2,376.8
<i>Armed Forces Enlisted Personnel Bonus Revision Act*</i>	77.8
Total	3,032.6
Percent of FY 74 DOD Budget	4.0

\* This represents a projected FY 75 annual cost.

Project Volunteer consists of administrative programs, enacted legislative programs, and the Armed Forces Enlisted Personnel Bonus Revision Act; the latter consisting of authorizations requested from Congress to pay enlistment and reenlistment bonuses in critical skills. I do not think it would be helpful or interesting to go into the details of these Project Volunteer programs. However, there are several points about this chart worth emphasizing. First, notice that the total cost of Project Volunteer programs is about \$3 billion which is the figure most of you are probably familiar with as the annual cost of the All-Volunteer Force. Second, it is interesting to note that enacted legislation programs account for more than 80% of the total Project Volunteer cost. Finally, one single program in Project Volunteer, basic pay and allowances, accounts for almost 80% of the total Project Volunteer cost.

This item consists of the total annual cost of the November 1971 pay raise for lower grade military personnel. The chief purpose of this increase in compensation was to raise the pay of lower ranking military personnel to a level which was more comparable to civilian sector pay levels. It is important to emphasize that the principle of keeping military wages roughly comparable to civilian wages was operative long before the decision to abandon the draft. The November 1971 pay increase, by eliminating the large pay inequities for lower grade military personnel, can logically be viewed as an action taken primarily to achieve pay comparability. An additional effect was to help in making the All-Volunteer Force a workable concept.

The Gates Commission recognized that their recommendations for greater pay and benefits for military personnel should be implemented even if conscription were discontinued. They stated:

"Because conscription has been used to provide raw recruits, the pay of men entering the Services has been kept at a very low level. . . . Regardless of the fate of the draft, the Commission strongly recommends elimination of this discrimination against first termers."

Cost case 3 assumes that the cost of the 1971 pay raise should be attributed to the pay comparability process and not the All-Volunteer Force. Although the AVF effort certainly provided the needed political pressure for passage of the 1971 pay raise, it seems highly likely that even if the draft had continued to operate, equity considerations alone would have eventually led to the passage of this pay increase. It is especially interesting to note that F. Edward Hébert Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who opposes the All-Volunteer Force, was the single most important supporter of the 1971 pay raise.

By subtracting from the \$3 billion cost of Project Volunteer, the annual cost of the 1971 pay increase and with several other minor adjustments, the annual cost of the All-Volunteer Force can be said to be \$733.6 million. From an historical perspective, I feel that this is the best estimate of the cost of the All-Volunteer Force.

However, none of these previous cost estimates cover the most relevant cost from a decision framework, that is the opportunity cost of the All-Volunteer Force. This opportunity cost can be represented by the annual budget savings which would occur if we returned to the draft. I feel that this final cost case, the opportunity cost of the All-Volunteer Force, is the most relevant and most interesting cost case. Chart IV presents the Project Volunteer programs which could be reduced if the draft were reinstated.

CHART IV.—*Project Volunteer Cost Decreases Under a Return to the Draft*

(In millions)

Action:	Decreased Annual DOD Costs
Eliminate Health Profession Scholarships	\$38.0
Reduce ROTC Scholarships to Pre-AVF Level	4.2
Eliminate Special Pay for Optometrists	0.7
Reduce Active Duty Recruiting Expenditures	131.1
Reduce Active Duty Advertising Expenditures	45.6

Total Annual Savings 305.7

This amount of potential savings, \$350.7 million, which is mostly reductions in recruiting and advertising programs, may seem intuitively low, but one crucial assumption is in operation here. The assumption is that pay comparability levels would continue for

all military personnel. This is a reasonable assumption given the political infeasibility of reducing pay levels once comparability levels have been established as the norm. Without the possibility of reducing pay expenditures, only a few, relatively low cost programs, could be reduced in a return to the draft.

However, Chart IV does not tell the entire story because by returning to the draft there would also be large cost increases which must be included in the calculation of the opportunity cost. This is a crucial point which many AVF critics have missed.

During the high draft years (FY 1966 to FY 1969), each military accession contributed an average of 3.0 trained man-years. Today, and over the next several years (FY 1973 to FY 1976), each accession will contribute an average of 3.7 trained man-years. This represents a 23% increase in manpower utilization. This increase in productive man-years per accession is a result of the interaction of three variables. First, the distribution of initial terms of service have changed within each Military Service. During the high draft years, two-year terms of service dominated the accession picture, whereas, over recent years, three-year, four-year, and six-year terms of service have become increasingly more common. Second, Service loss rates have decreased with the introduction of the AVF. Especially important are first-term re-enlistment rates which have increased substantially from their level in the late 1960's. Third, lower proportion of DOD accessions are now entering the Army, a Service with relatively low expected man-years contributed per accession. The combined effect of these three variables increases the expected utilization rate for DOD manpower.

If the draft were immediately reinstated and the high manpower turnover rates which the Military Services experienced before also returned, it would require an additional 39,000 training man-years to support the current trained strength. This translates into an increased annual DOD budget cost of \$515.2 million. However, as I previously explained, this increased cost figure includes the effect of three variables: longer initial terms of service, lower loss rates, and proportionately fewer Army accessions. These first two factors are clearly AVF-related savings areas. However, I feel that the lower proportion of accessions entering the Army is primarily related to the end of the Vietnam War and not to the introduction of the All-Volunteer Force. By excluding this variable from consideration, the additional annual DOD training cost which would result in a return to the draft is reduced from \$515.2 million to \$374.3 million. Which cost one chooses to accept as more relevant to the AVF is debatable, but I would choose the lower figure. This amount of annual increased DOD cost in a return to the draft, \$374.3 million, must be compared to the potential cost savings in a return to the draft, \$305.7 million, presented in Chart IV, in order to derive the opportunity cost.

Two points must be stressed about these opportunity cost calculations. The first point is that these figures are only preliminary estimates and are currently being studied in more detail. The second point is that other potential AVF-related cost savings areas, such as reduced transients, which could result in substantial increases in expected DOD costs in a return to the draft, have not been included in these preliminary estimates, and are currently being evaluated.

The final conclusion is rather startling to some. A return to the draft will likely not result in any savings. In fact, these preliminary estimates indicate that the elimination of the All-Volunteer Force could result in additional annual DOD expenditures of over \$50 million. The opportunity cost of the All-Volunteer Force appears to be small or possibly negative. This is why the statement that the

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

All-Volunteer Force is bankrupting the Defense Department seems almost ironic in retrospect. Perhaps it is the draft, not the All-Volunteer Force, that we cannot afford.

### FRED MILLER: A GEORGIA GIANT IN PEACEFUL TRANSITION

#### HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, Nicholas von Hoffman has written a perceptive appreciation of a little-known man who has made a major contribution to the cause of human rights and dignity in the South.

Fred Miller is, indeed, "a Georgia giant in peaceful transition." Many times I was privileged to view his quiet, effective work and to enjoy his abiding friendship.

I submit this richly deserved tribute to Fred Miller for the RECORD:

#### FRED MILLER: A GEORGIA GIANT IN PEACEFUL TRANSITION

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

Fred Miller would never let any of us write about him. He used to say it would make his job with the United States Community Relations Service more difficult. He felt what he needed was anonymity, not glamor, to do the work of justice and reconciliation between races and people.

Bad health is forcing Fred to retire so we may now tell you about this Jackson, Ga. man, 6-feet-5, 280 pounds, bald, jug ears, and looking like the quintessential redneck behind every gas pump in the South. Fred, of course, knew that no matter where he went in Georgia, Alabama or Mississippi he looked like he came from just down the road, and, as he said, "It was one of the things in my favor. I could use it to get to the people. I would let it ride and wouldn't try to stop it until the right time and all."

It wasn't just looks with Fred, any more than it was his accent. I think we Yankee reporters loved his speech because it is a sweet Georgia melody, a singing murmur, not dramatic, not histrionic, so soft on the ear, but what counted was that Fred was the most trustworthy man any of us had ever met. There are a lot of people who speak the truth but aren't accurate and a lot of people who are accurate but don't speak the truth. Fred does both and does it all the time.

All sides trusted Fred. They had a retirement banquet for him in Atlanta the other day and I'm sure that ex-antagonists remembered how in days of riot and storm Fred had brought them together to begin the work of reconciliation.

We reporters remember in our own special way, like him picking us up when we were dead drunk in the Tally Ho restaurant outside of Selma and carrying us back to the Hotel Albert. Gene Roberts, then of The New York Times and now editor of The Philadelphia Inquirer, remembers taking refuge from the local hostiles in the Baker County Court House in southwest Georgia: "The sheriff and everybody slammed their doors and I was surrounded in the hall by five or six guys. One had a pistol, and then there was Fred banging up against the water cooler and almost knocking it over. 'Oops,' he said, 'I better not do that again or I'll knock my gun loose.'"

Fred saved me once, too. It was the day they integrated Veterans State Park in that same part of Georgia. After the civil rights people left I made the mistake of staying too long, and I was soon encircled by a number of white nasties. Fred came up in time to hear a local Alley-Oop announce. "We're gonna git yuuuu." Fred looked back at him and stuck a hand inside his coat jacket before replying. "Well, six of you ain't."

If Fred ever carried a gun in those days we never saw it, but Georgia produces fighting men and Fred enlisted in the Army in 19 and 40, as he would say it, to win a battlefield commission, two Bronze Stars, two Silver Stars, the Distinguished Service Cross and two Purple Hearts. "They gimme the others, but those two Purple Hearts I won."

Fred came home to Georgia where he grew a few peaches, coached football at Gordon Military College and, in the 1950s, integrated the 4th VFW District where he was the commander. How he did you can't understand if you don't know Fred. He is the ideal Southerner, strong in war, gentle in peace, humorous, inviting and never, never pushy.

When asked why he went into this work which took him to the Pettus Bridge at Selma and the Memphis motel room five minutes after Dr. King's murder, Fred doesn't give a big speech. "Knowing the situation in our area of the country, I felt like I'd be of some help in keepin' down violence. I certainly didn't go into it as a do-gooder, but so we could move along into a peaceful transition."

There were funny times and sad times, and horrible ones and scary ones, but one of the times I remember best was Fred outside that same Baker County courthouse. There had been a lot of trouble and it was a hot, hot afternoon in this place where the sheriff had even run state troopers out. Fred and I went into the local cafe, where the deputies were, to get a drink of water, but they wouldn't serve us. They said it was a private club.

Fred turned around and walked out into the street, and in the dusty, hot sun, he called them out, he dared them to come out, this Georgia giant, this white man, this son of the South, a singing voice of angry justice in a summer street, and inside they were too ashamed to come.

### REISS-DAVIS CHILD STUDY CENTER

#### HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to the Reiss-Davis Child Study Center, a nonprofit treatment center for emotionally disturbed children in Los Angeles. This center was founded in 1950 by a group of interested citizens to provide quality treatment for those children and their parents unable to afford private care.

Over the past 23 years, Reiss-Davis has expanded its facilities to include comprehensive training programs for child care professionals, major research projects in the field of mental health, and workshops and seminars conducted for the benefit of parents and community groups. The center is among the largest of its kind in the Nation and the only institution in the West to provide all of these services.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Reiss-Davis is now accredited by the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association and by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology. Its Anna Freud Research Library is recognized as the largest and most outstanding psychiatric library in southern California.

Reiss-Davis has truly made an outstanding contribution in the area of mental health, both locally and nationally, but there is much remaining to be done. Out of the 10 million children in the United States in need of psychiatric care, only 1 million are receiving any care at all. In addition, there are still only 600 qualified child psychiatrists in the Nation, 6 percent of whom were trained at Reiss-Davis. By its 10th anniversary in 1960, 2,300 patients had received treatment, and by 1967, the number of patients treated had increased to 5,000.

Approximately 70 percent of the Reiss-Davis operating budget comes from private sources. Only 7 percent is raised through patients' fees. The remaining 23 percent is derived from training and research grants by the National Institute of Mental Health, which are due to expire in June 1974.

As Reiss-Davis approaches its 25th anniversary date in 1975, it will be launching a major fund-raising drive to meet expenses incurred by its ever-expanding services. The center serves as a fine example of a community working together to provide care for its most helpless citizens. Through its research, training programs, and public education service, its voice has been heard throughout the Nation in the field of mental health.

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69

## HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with House Resolution 963 providing for the consideration of H.R. 69, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer the following amendments to H.R. 69:

Amendment to H.R. 69, as reported, offered by Mr. DE LUGO.

Page 28, line 15, strike out "1" and insert in lieu thereof "2".

Page 29, beginning with line 1, strike out everything after the period down through the period in line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The Commissioner shall allot (A) 50 per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for grants under this part, and (B) the remaining 50 per centum of such amount so appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior (i) to make payments pursuant to subsection (d)(1), and (ii) to make payments pursuant to subsection (d)(2).

Amendment to H.R. 69, as reported offered by Mr. DE LUGO.

Page 28, line 15, strike out "1" and insert in lieu thereof, "1½".

Page 29, beginning with line 1, strike out

everything after the period down through the period in line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The Commissioner shall allot (A) no less than 50 per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph among Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for grants under this part, and (B) the remaining per centum of such amount so appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior in the amount necessary (i) to make payments pursuant to subsection (d)(1), and (ii) to make payments pursuant to subsection (d)(2). In making the allotments under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall take into account any increase in the proportion of the number of children to be served by the allotment under clause (A) relative to the total number of children to be served by the allotments under clauses (A) and (B).

## NEED MORE FEDERAL FUNDS FOR EYE RESEARCH

## HON. BO GINN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. GINN. Mr. Speaker, one of our most important personal possessions is the gift of sight. For many Americans, however, disease and accidents impair this precious sense.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the need for more Federal research funds on the eye disease called toxoplasmosis. The Georgia House of Representatives has read and adopted the following resolution which I would like to share with the Members of the Congress:

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA—H.R. No. 648 A resolution requesting the President and the Congress to participate in the fight against diseases of the eye; and for other purposes

Whereas, countless citizens of this State and of the United States are afflicted in each year by diseases of the eye, and especially the disease Toxoplasmosis; and

Whereas, the causes of almost all diseases of the eye are unknown to science, causing incorrect diagnoses and leading toward a lack of proper treatment which in turn may facilitate blindness and even mental retardation; and

Whereas, it is more feasible to appropriate money for research to prevent blindness than to appropriate money to provide for the blind whose sight might have been saved through research; and

Whereas, even when funds are appropriated by the Congress for this vital research into the causes and cures of eye diseases they are often impounded or vetoed by the President for reasons which are not related to the crying need for eye research; and

Whereas, it is absolutely imperative that research into diseases of the eyes be continued and expanded in the most rapid and most thorough fashion possible.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia that this body respectfully requests the President and the Congress to immediately act for the support and expansion of research into the causes and cures of eye diseases, and particularly of the eye disease Toxoplasmosis.

Be it further resolved that the Congress is urgently requested to appropriate funds to the National Eye Institute to enable such research to be conducted.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary

March 18, 1974

of State is authorized and directed to transmit an appropriate copy of this Resolution to the President of the United States; the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Governors of the states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas; to the Director of the National Eye Institute; to Secretary of the Army, Howard "Bo" Callaway; to Undersecretary of Agriculture, Phil Campbell; and to the members of the Georgia Congressional Delegation.

Be it further resolved that Senator Herman Talmadge and Congressman Bo Ginn are respectfully requested to read this Resolution to their respective Houses and, thereafter, to insert this Resolution into the Congressional Record.

Be it further resolved that the Governors and Legislators of our sister states are urged to join with us in our urgent request for action to find the causes and cures of diseases of the eye.

## EDUCATION'S NEED FOR METRIC CONVERSION LEGISLATION

## HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be debating a most important and far-reaching piece of legislation, the Metric Conversion Act. This bill is the best kind of legislation—the kind that causes minimal social and economic disruption and yet has profound and progressive consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I may speak for my other colleagues who have sponsored H.R. 11035 when I say that we have been aware of and impressed by the interest and forward action of the California education system relative to metric conversion. Educators in California have been farsighted in recognizing the coming reality and in preparing young Californians now for the future in which they will be adults.

I have received today an excellent statement by Dr. Wilson Riles, the superintendent of public instruction and director of education in California, regarding the value of and need for a unified national education effort to implement metric conversion. I commend his perceptive remarks to my colleagues during their consideration of this important legislation. These remarks once again support the urgent need for H.R. 11035 and once again demonstrate why all those who have had the singular pleasure of coming to know Wilson Riles hold him in such high regard.

The statement follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
Sacramento, March 8, 1974.  
Hon. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House of Representatives,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: I have been following the progress of HR 11035 for several months. Last week it was voted out of the Rules Committee for consideration by the House of Representatives. I encourage you to support this measure for a 10-year transition to a metric standard of measurement.

Enthusiasm for changing over to metrics runs high in California where many schools have already implemented metrics in their

math, science, industrial arts, home economics, and P.E. programs. Literally hundreds of metric inservice programs for teachers have been conducted to prepare the way for metrification. While many questions about metrics are directed to the California State Department of Education, nearly all of them ask for suggestions about what to teach and how to teach it. Very few are critical of a metric standard for measurement. Teachers, students, and parents all recognize the benefits of a changeover to a less complex, more easily understood system, and most are committed to the efficacy of a metric system.

Federal action for implementing a metric standard for measurement is of immediate importance for many reasons. If the United States acts now, we will have some say in decisions which impact on industrial and technological standards. Further, action now will get the nation moving together to effect a transition. The longer we wait, the more difficult it is for publishers of educational materials and others to participate in a smooth shift to metrics. Delay is the enemy.

My concern for metrics relates primarily to educating children and adults for productive lives in our society. I believe that the passage of HR 11035 is consistent with sound economic and educational goals. In commerce, metrics hold promise for improving our trade posture abroad, and at home. In education, a metric standard for measurement will facilitate the acquisition of measuring skill, and computational skills which involve measurements. The chance of measurement error is much lower when using metric units than when using U.S. customary units because of the decimal design of metrics. That benefit alone will improve both educational outcomes and commercially related outcomes, substantially.

America's greatest resource is its school children. They will soon manage business, industry, education and government. We owe them the advantages of a standard of measurement which allows efficient communication both at home and abroad.

Again I encourage you to vote yes in support of HR 11035.

Sincerely,

WILSON RILES.

#### PRIDE IN AMERICA

#### HON. EDWARD YOUNG

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Jaycees of the United States have rendered much valuable service over the years. Today, they are concerned over the cynicism and pessimism that seems to be so popular today. I commend them for their program known as "Pride in America."

I insert the following resolution by the Jaycees of the United States

#### 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

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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!

Adopted: February 16, 1974, The United States Jaycees, Executive Committee.

THE UNITED STATES JAYCEES,  
Executive Board of Directors.

#### RESEARCH AND TREATMENT FOR THE PROBLEMS OF HUMAN GROWTH

#### HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, frequently in our rush to help our constituents and to represent them, on the floor and in committee, we may fail to stop and ponder the full effect of all that we do. In this way, a constituent's recent call to my district office to express to her view on the need for proper funding and better balance in health care research focused my attention on the fact that funds to train new doctors and to conduct research also results in the treatments of patients and the alleviation of suffering.

As my constituent, Mrs. Bill J. Schneider, so poignantly put it—

You don't know what it's like to be told your son will never be more than three feet tall nor weigh more than thirty pounds. You don't know what it's like to be told, "There is no hope!" and, worse, to be given the feeling that no one cares.

One of my reasons for asking that Mrs. Schneider's letter to me be reprinted in the RECORD is her conviction that more doctors in general practice should know that there is hope—treatment is available. Mrs. Schneider's son received treatment as part of a research and training program funded by the National Institutes of Health in St. Louis, Mo.

Mrs. Schneider pleads for others whose children may be similarly afflicted, since her own son has now received help. She pleads not for more money, but that within the total amount available that not all of it be given to research and training in cancer and heart disease just because of the attention, publicity and fear they arouse. Let us not respond just to political popularity. Surely, the diseases of children and the problems of growth are just as important. Few people have spoken to me so convincingly on that subject and I commend her comments to my colleagues. I know many older people who, if asked

personally, would cheerfully sacrifice their treatment for little children—for their children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, another reason for calling this matter to my colleagues' attention is my pride in my constituent, Mrs. Schneider. She not only got help for her son, but she reached out and shared what she found with others. Mrs. Schneider was the unpaid but full-time national director of the Human Growth Foundation, which has now been established to help in this area. I wonder how many of us have such unsung, but dedicated people, unnoticed until something like this comes along, among our constituents.

The letter follows:

HUMAN GROWTH FOUNDATION,  
Baltimore, Md., Jan. 14, 1974.

Congressman JIM JONES,  
Cannon-House Office Bldg.,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONES: It is virtually impossible for me to tell you what I would like to in a few short words, so I'm afraid this may very well turn into a lengthy dissertation. It would mean very much to me if you would stick with me to the finish.

First of all, my reason for writing is a very personal one. I am very concerned about the research project that is allowing one of my three sons to grow up, literally. With that, I'm concerned about other "little" children who may never be given this opportunity that he has had through research which, I believe, has been government funded for the most part.

Thirteen years ago, when my husband was a young new architect, I was asked by a young new physician if anyone had ever told me that my second son might be a dwarf . . . to which I responded with no . . . and went home in a state of shock. I looked in a reference book for information and found under DWARF . . . "Used to entertain the Kings and Queens of England in the seventeenth century—see Tom Thumb". No medical explanation was given! For three years, I did not know what a dwarf was and searched for any information I could find, finding very little and being totally confused. Finally, my pediatrician assumed the physician was correct and sent us to Oklahoma City for further testing and then, from there, we were sent on to St. Louis Children's Hospital to be a part of a then relatively new research program. Little did I realize then that researchers had reported the first successful results of administration of human growth hormone to dwarfed hypopituitary children, only the year before my son was born.

Stan was selected as one of the first 100 children in the U.S. to be a part of this program which has extended to some 200 children now, I believe. Many others could benefit if enough hormone were available, though! In one room, they were working with rats . . . in the other room with Stan! Admittedly, the decision to let him be a part of something that I had never heard about . . . and just the fact that it was research was the most difficult decision I have ever made in my life and I turned to God for an answer that was beyond my comprehension as a young mother. With God's help, a decision came immediately and Stan and I headed for St. Louis where he has spent ten weeks off and on in an effort to help research, to train pediatric endocrinologists, and to, hopefully, help him!

I don't think I would be incorrect if I were to say most all of the 100 children are now over five feet (or normal) in height. Stan was one of the youngest to start treatment at the age of 4—32" tall? and weighing 22 lbs. He cooperated through very difficult tests after I explained to him why we were there. From the ages of 1 to 4, Stan had gained 3 lbs. and his growth rate had

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

slowed down more each year. At the age of four, he was the size of an 18 mos. old baby.

As a result of human growth hormone treatment, he has now grown 22 inches and gained 60 lbs. and is now 4'6" tall and 82 lbs. at age 14. He is still growing rapidly and we are hopeful that he will reach five feet. We feel he would have already attained this height but he had a bone problem from an unrelated problem and was off hormone for a two year period, during which his growth remained at practically a standstill. It seems very probable that he would have grown no more than 5-7 inches during this time with a weight gain of 10 lbs., making him almost a candidate for the Guiness Book of Records! Thanks to eight years of treatment with human growth hormone through research, his growth rate has been normal those eight years!

I've been informed that if the Rogers-Kennedy Bill does not become reality that training for pediatric endocrinologists cannot go beyond July 1974. What I'm not sure about, but think, is will this be the end of Stan's growth rate as well? Will others not be given the opportunity he has been given? Are we throwing in the towel?

The source of Stan's hormone is from pituitary glands of deceased persons. 800 of these glands came from Oklahoma in 1972. I'm not sure of the '73 count! The National Pituitary Agency, under the direction of the National Institute for Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, has been providing him with hormone through his researcher during this period. Will NPPA be phased out? Would all the programs concerning growth research be discontinued? What is being done under the National Institute for Child Health and Development? This may be the source of our funding . . . ?

My husband and I have spent over \$20,000 for medical care in addition to what our son has received from insurance or through research funding. Research has spent \$1,000's of dollars on him I am sure. I am aware that the costs of research are phenomenal. I know that they are not nearly as extravagant now as they were when the programs first started because we now pay for many of our services . . . x-rays, etc. We also are able to fly Stan to St. Louis for his periodic checkups. I don't know how many people could afford this. Nor do I know if we will be able to forever with inflation rising as rapidly as it is!

In writing this letter, I'm not wanting to ask that more money be spent for research. In fact, there might be ways that less could be spent more efficiently. Perhaps, only four centers in the U.S. should be training pediatric endocrinologists . . . maybe just one . . . but certainly not the elimination of all of them! Perhaps, if certain areas of research were given significance at different medical centers, then researchers could work cooperatively, sharing expensive diagnostic equipment, and the people could come to them (which doesn't do a lot for the energy crisis) and with more children being evaluated at one place, perhaps, an answer would be found more quickly and more data would be accumulated!

Equally important, is the need for practicing physicians to be aware of the latest developments in research via *continuing medical education* and to make this information available to their patients.

*Please don't cut all research for cancer and heart disease!!!*

Because of my concern for my small child, I became a member of Human Growth Foundation in 1965. I was a charter member of the only organization that is concerned with "helping medical science better understand the process of growth". In 1969, I became a national director for this foundation and

I worked full-time for them for three years, without pay! As a director, my work resulted in corresponding with parents of children with growth problems from all over the U.S. and Canada.

My correspondence related to me that there were many parents that felt as I had earlier . . . completely lost with no one to turn to for help. I was able to refer them to researchers in different areas. Or, at least to comfort them with the knowledge that there were, indeed, researchers trying to find answers for the many and varied causes of dwarfism!

In our organization, our work has been done almost entirely by volunteers, although we are in the process of raising funds for our first full-time executive director. We have no paid staff and have only been able to raise, nationally, what the American Cancer Society raises in Tulsa alone! This leads me to believe that the American Cancer Society is doing fairly well without governmental help!!

Please don't think I'm opposed to cancer research. My best friend died of cancer and there's much heart disease in my own family, but to stop all research in other areas for these two is unrealistic . . . completely unrealistic!

I know there are no easy answers for these problems, but I think if researchers would work cooperatively, sharing equipment, and practicing physicians were made aware of existing services for patients and that this information were then shared with our general population, optimal, exciting results in research could be reached!

I would appreciate it very much if you could inform me about what the future of growth research will be. As I am now serving as Oklahoma Coordinator of Human Growth Foundation, I am still counseling parents of "little" children. I am concerned about all of them, as well as others throughout the U.S., in addition to my own small son who has been an honor student his first fourteen years, but he is becoming more sensitive about his small stature daily. However, he has been very fortunate indeed!

I appreciate the time your aide gave me on the phone in Tulsa. It was his suggestion that I write this letter to you.

Most cordially,

Mrs. BILL J. SCHNEIDER,  
Oklahoma Coordinator.

## SEATBELT DATA

## HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, many resent the invasion of privacy involved in mandatory seatbelts, and seek to repeal laws and regulations requiring such regimentation. Meanwhile, those favoring mandatory seatbelts cite the great gains made because of their use in Australia. Accordingly, it may be of value to compare traffic problems in the United States and Australia before reaching any hasty conclusions.

## STATISTICS

1. Number of vehicles registered: USA, 118,000,000. Aus. 5,271,900.
2. Number of yearly traffic fatalities: USA, 56,300; Aus. 3,422.
3. Number of yearly traffic accidents: USA, 16,800,000; Aus. 65,750.
4. Total Population: USA, 208,000,000; Aus. 13,091,300.

March 18, 1974

5. Miles of paved highways: USA, 3,789,000; Aus. 119,729 bituminous concrete.

These are the statistics for 1972, the latest year for which complete figures are presently available.

Much emphasis is given to a 20-percent reduction in motor vehicle occupant deaths in Australia. It is important to note that these statistics apply only to the states of Victoria and New South Wales, which account for some 5 million of the nation's 13 million people, as data is not yet available for the other four states or New Zealand.

Another interesting comparison with U.S. highways, which in 1972 generally featured a 70 miles per hour speed limit, in Australia, the speed on Sidney's main highways was 60 miles per hour and on other outside areas, from 40 to 50 miles per hour.

## UNITED VETERANS COUNCIL OF LONG BEACH OPPOSES CLOSURE OF FORT MACARTHUR

## HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense's announced intent to close Fort MacArthur—the only Army installation in the eight-county southern California area—has completely ignored the needs of the people in the area, many of whom located in the San Pedro vicinity in order to utilize the facilities at this historic post.

And such a disregard for the needs of the people in the Los Angeles area—which 1 out of 12 servicemen call home—adversely affects not only the retired military personnel, the dependents of servicemen, and the local economy, but it also adversely affects the efforts to achieve a Volunteer Army. Obviously, without the support of the community, the Volunteer Army cannot attract the kind of personnel needed to maintain a defense posture second to none.

Mr. Speaker, one such community organization, the United Veterans Council of Long Beach, under the able leadership of its Comdr. Raymond Krinsky and its Adj. John Doran, has taken a strong stand in opposition to the closure of Fort MacArthur. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I place their views in the RECORD:

FEBRUARY 6, 1974.

Hon. GLENN M. ANDERSON,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: The United Veterans Council of Long Beach, California, would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your efforts in behalf of the retention of the Fort MacArthur Army Base at San Pedro, California.

In an emergency meeting of our Executive Council today, February 6, 1974, on the matter of the impending closure of Fort MacArthur Army Base, our delegates voted unanimously to support your position on this issue.

Our interest in this matter increased when a proportionate amount of our members, or

members of their families, were found to be working at Fort MacArthur. In addition, many of the older military retirees living on fixed incomes who settled in this area many years ago with the expectation of utilizing the Post Exchange and Commissary which is a part of their retirement benefits, are deeply concerned.

With the closure of the Long Beach Naval Station slated for June 30, 1974, and the reduction of exchange facilities and over-crowded commissary, the burden on the military retiree in the San Pedro area and Long Beach area indicates a lack of planning or indifference by the Defense Department.

Our recommendation is as follows; if the proposed closure is for economy reasons, as we are led to believe, then why not move present Army Reserve and National Guard units in the Long Beach/Signal Hill areas to Fort MacArthur and any other governmental agencies in the surrounding areas? This would increase our security on government property and equipment at no additional cost at a time when these activities are vulnerable to revolutionary attacks. This could then release this land for development and placement on tax rolls.

In the event that this closure proceeds as planned, we would hope you realize the need for recomputation of military pay for retirees.

We would appreciate your comments and hope for a prompt reply on this matter.

Sincerely,

**RAYMOND KRINSKY,**  
Commander.

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

American Gold Star Mothers of Long Beach.

American Gold Star Hospital Corps.

American War Mothers, Chapters 43 and 61.

Blinded Veterans Association.

Canadian Legion, Chapter 14 and Auxiliary.

Disabled American Veterans, Chapter 17 and Auxiliary.

Daughters of the Union Vets, Chapters 15 and 58.

Fleet Reserve Association, Branch 43 and Auxiliary.

Jewish War Veterans, Post 593 and Auxiliary.

Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Chapter 44.

Military Order of the Purple Heart, Chapter 210 and Auxiliary.

Military Order of the World Wars.

Marine Corps League.

Spanish War Veterans, Chapters 23 and 94.

Spanish War Veterans, Auxiliary Chapter 71.

Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 1746 and Auxiliary.

Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post 279 and Auxiliary.

Veterans of World War I, Chapter 154 and Auxiliary.

Veterans of World War I, Chapter 599.

Women's Relief Corps, Chapter 93.

Widows of World War I, Chapter 4.

**BAN THE HANDGUN—XXXII**

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, armed with a pistol, any man can suddenly become a menace to his friends, neighbors and even innocent passers-by. The following article, reprinted from the

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

March 12 edition of the New York Post, shows once again that indiscriminate possession of handguns too often leads to indiscriminate killing by handguns:

**PROSECUTOR SHOOTS THREE AND KILLS HIMSELF**

OREGON, ILL., March 11.—Ogle County's chief prosecutor, armed with two revolvers, killed himself in the sheriff's office and after slaying his son and wounding his former wife and a deputy sheriff, the authorities said.

Sheriff Jerry Brooks said that Richard Caldwell, 44 years old, in his first term as chief prosecutor, entered the sheriff's office Saturday carrying the pistols.

The sheriff said that Mr. Caldwell announced: "My name is Richard Caldwell. I have just shot my wife and I have killed my son, David. I am going to finish dictating this statement and then I am going to kill myself."

Mr. Caldwell held one gun at his head and pointed the other at Deputy Melvin Messer, the sheriff said. But deputy Messer escaped through a door into the lobby.

Sheriff Brooks said that a shot was fired and Robert Whipple, a detective sergeant who was in the office, was wounded in his stomach.

The sheriff said that Deputy Messer re-entered the office with gun drawn, there was another shot and Mr. Caldwell fell to the floor, shot in the head. Deputy Messer then fired two shots at Mr. Caldwell, Sheriff Brooks said.

Coroner Robert Personette said that Mr. Caldwell was wounded three times, but the fatal injury appeared to be a self-inflicted gunshot wound in his head.

**THE SAD FACTS ABOUT THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM**

**Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN**  
OF NEW JERSEY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, last week I made my first report to the House on the impressions I gathered during my recent visit to the Republic of Vietnam. At that time I placed my main emphasis on the continuing need for the United States to provide assistance to that beleaguered ally. By far the greater part of Vietnam's need is for economic assistance—assistance to add emphasis to reconstruction efforts; to offset the effects of worldwide inflation; to provide for vital imports of petroleum products; and to help compensate for the violent, disruptive efforts by North Vietnam which have continued unabated despite the signing of the Paris accords.

Once again, I wish to urge more Members of Congress to visit Vietnam for a first hand review of the situation. In the meantime, I would like to draw your attention to a most revealing article entitled, "The Shocking Sabotage of the Vietnam Truce." This article, which appeared in the latest issue of the Reader's Digest, summarizes Hanoi's flagrant, systematic violation of the peace agreement signed by North and South Vietnam 1 year ago. The writer, Charles J. V. Murphy, has authored several books and has had a long and distinguished journalistic career, much of it with Fortune magazine. His specialty is foreign affairs and strategic analysis. He is a seasoned

observer whose factual appraisals of foreign policy developments have won praise on numerous occasions. Mr. Murphy is clearly disturbed by what he has seen. His assessment of North Vietnam's actions and possible intentions is well worth your persual:

**THE SHOCKING SABOTAGE OF THE VIETNAM TRUCE**

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

South Vietnam, early 1974: Automatic-weapons fire rips through the night as North Vietnamese troops, backed by Soviet-built T-54 tanks, overrun an army outpost in the Central Highlands. In the Mekong Delta, a village chief is led into the town square and assassinated by a communist terror squad. Just outside Saigon, well-trained North Vietnamese sappers flee into the jungle as their explosive charges trigger an ammunition dump into an awesome eruption of smoke and flame.

On the cease-fire record to date, it is depressingly plain that South Vietnam remains, as it has been for nearly two decades, an arena of vicious combat in communism's implacable effort to achieve hegemony in Southeast Asia. After a year of the bloodiest truce in history, these are the gruesome statistics:

More than 12,000 South Vietnamese village and hamlet chiefs, policemen, school-teachers and civil servants have been murdered, wounded or kidnaped by communist terror teams.

Thousands of clashes have occurred between North and South Vietnamese troops, with more than a dozen full-scale battles involving tanks and heavy artillery.

Thirteen thousand South Vietnamese soldiers have been killed and 50,000 wounded. North Vietnamese casualties over the period may be twice as great.

Today, even those American and foreign observers who once refused to believe that the Paris cease-fire wouldn't work now soberly admit that there is scarcely a section of the agreement that has not been flagrantly violated. Consider the main points:

**TROOP BUILD-UP**

Article 7 of the Paris agreement prohibits the communist forces in place at the time of the cease-fire from strengthening themselves by introducing fresh "troops, military advisers and military personnel" except for purpose of rotation or replacement. The expectation on the American side was that if the truce lasted, the forces on both sides would be progressively drawn down. Instead, as U.S. troops departed, some 75,000 fresh communist conscripts entered the battle zones during the first ten months of the cease-fire. Only a handful of sick and wounded were withdrawn, and perhaps 25,000 to 30,000 more were lost in battle. The net result has been to raise the combat strength of the communist forces inside South Vietnam by 40,000 to 50,000 troops.

**WEAPONS REPLENISHMENT**

The same Article 7 limits both sides to the periodic replenishment of weapons and other fighting gear and matériel destroyed, damaged or worn out, but only on the basis of "piece for piece, of the same characteristics and properties." In blatant disregard of this constraint, the communists have tripled their armored forces by sending from 350 to 400 new Soviet and Chinese medium tanks into South Vietnam, and as many as 350 pieces of heavy artillery (twice as many as they had when the cease-fire went into effect). These heavy weapons include large numbers of Soviet 130-mm. guns—extremely accurate, highly reliable field pieces that far outshoot the U.S. 105-mm. and 155-mm. cannon on the South Vietnamese side. (In contrast, the Saigon government has been

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

replacing supplies at less than the "piece for piece" rate, and all foreign troops have left South Vietnam.)

In the past, the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN) relied heavily on U.S. air support to negate the communist big guns. Now the U.S. aircraft are gone, and there are grave doubts whether ARVN's own jets can restore the balance in the battle equation—especially in the northern and western parts of South Vietnam where the communists now have heavy anti-aircraft guns and even some surface-to-air missiles.

## RESUPPLY ROUTES

Because the 1973 cease-fire agreement fixed communist forces in the positions they then occupied, scattered in pockets down the entire length of South Vietnam, resupply has been for them a major burden. To prevent them from simply transforming the demilitarized zone (DMZ) into a handy transmission belt for war gear, Article 15(b) of the Paris agreement required that communist equipment and supplies be moved south only through predetermined points of entry.

The communists have totally ignored this understanding. A dozen usable roads have been bulldozed through the wooded hills of the DMZ, and columns of troops and long truck convoys make regular use of them, mostly in support of a massive communist buildup of infantry and armor in the northernmost provinces of South Vietnam, possibly for another fierce assault against the old imperial capital of Hue. One of the best roads has become the departure point for an ambitious new north-south route inside South Vietnam which parallels the famous Ho Chi Minh trail network for 300 miles. When finished, the all-weather road will provide the communists with a second major supply corridor all the way to the jungle strongholds near Cambodia, within a day's march of Saigon.

## EXPLOITING CAMBODIA AND LAOS

Under Article 20 of the Paris agreement, Hanoi promised to withdraw its forces from both Cambodia and Laos; to refrain from starting up or supporting any new military adventures in either country; and to give up the sanctuaries there that have long served as bases for operations against the South Vietnamese government.

The North Vietnamese have unabashedly broken all three stipulations, sending men and supplies down the Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos and Cambodia without interruption. Some of these reinforcements have already gone into combat—in the struggles for control of the Central Highland road system, the Cambodian approaches toward Saigon, and the rice paddies of the Western Mekong Valley.

## PRISONER INFORMATION

Articles 7 and 8 of the Paris agreements required both sides to cooperate in obtaining all possible information about missing civilian and military personnel. Although more than 1300 Americans are still unaccounted for, all attempts to obtain communist assistance in confirming the death of these men and bringing their remains back to the United States have been blocked. By wrangling over procedural details, North Vietnam has circumvented requests to allow any outsiders, including the International Red Cross, to make on-site inspections either in the North or in communist-controlled areas of South Vietnam and Laos. This is particularly cruel for numerous families who must live in a state of agonizing doubt, not knowing for sure whether their loved ones have perished.

## SABOTAGING TRUCE INSPECTION

The North Vietnamese have reduced to near futility the functions of the International Commission on Control and Super-

vision (ICCS). At the start of the truce, four countries (Poland, Hungary, Canada and Indonesia) assumed responsibility for policing the cease-fire and investigating the communist claims that they had stopped the infiltration of troops and weapons into the South. Under the Paris agreement, the communists are legally bound to allow the commission teams to be positioned in pre-determined sites, and to accord the inspectors all reasonable freedom of movement, assistance and courtesy. It has not worked out that way.

Communist gunners have shot down one of the commission's helicopters, killing all aboard, and fired upon others. Two Canadians officers were seized, roughly handled, and held incommunicado for 18 days. So far, the truce force has taken up residence in but one of the five localities that the communists agreed to open up for observation.

Moreover, the Hungarian and Polish members have behaved like the loyal communists they are—opposing, obstructing, filibustering and in diverse ways defeating every attempt by the commission to expose what is really going on. Last July, after Canadian members had protested the "massive" and "unrelenting" infiltration of North Vietnamese troops across the border, Canada withdrew its delegation in disgust. The only serious violations it had found during its tenure were committed by the North Vietnamese. (In fact, Saigon has cooperated fully with the ICCS, abiding by the troops and resupply provisions of the Paris agreement to what—given the situation—must be considered an extraordinary extent.) The Iranians have taken the place of the Canadians, but the obstructionism of the Hungarians and Poles has worsened. In truth, the ICCS is all but dead.

All-Out War Ahead? There is no debate among intelligence analysts about the renewed capacity of the North Vietnamese to launch yet another full-scale offensive, should such be Hanoi's intention. Will it happen?

President Thieu and his senior generals are by-and-large convinced that recent intense and costly preparations on the part of Hanoi presage an imminent return by the communists to an all-out offensive. General Giap launched the 1972 offensive on the mistaken assumption that the ARVN could be ground down to helplessness as U.S. infantry drew back into reserve position. Now the fear in Saigon is that the absence of both American air and ground forces may tempt the Hanoi strategists into yet another try for a knockout blow—all the more so because of the unexpected decline of President Nixon's prestige and influence.

At the U.S. embassy in Saigon, and in the intelligence community in Washington the prevailing view is somewhat more sanguine. This hopefulness derives in some degree from a widely based judgment that neither Peking nor Moscow, for all their incessant jockeying for political and strategic advantage in Asia, is disposed at this juncture to arouse American sensibilities on the issue of South Vietnam's continued survival. An equally important factor for optimism has been the stout behavior of the South Vietnamese armed forces under fire.

In the ascending sequence of battles since the start of the cease-fire, the ARVN has demonstrated repeatedly that it will stand and fight. Thus there has been no significant loss of territory or seeping of population into communist hamlets, and no discernible erosion of the government's authority. Instead, the central government in Saigon has come into effective control of all but five percent of the population.

Finally, Thieu himself has emerged from the cease-fire testing period as a strong leader. He has been the driving force in assembling the generally competent admin-

March 18, 1974

istrative elements which now permeate the countryside and have all but shut off the Delta's rice deliveries to the communists. Given his expanding performance, and the now established battle competence of ARVN, many U.S. observers are persuaded that the communists will stop short this year of another all-out assault. They see Giap limiting himself to a creeping, tentative campaign, the purpose of which will be to probe, test, deplete and wear down the South Vietnamese resolve and resources, as prelude to a climactic blow to be struck when circumstances are more favorable.

Thieu is acutely aware of the situation, and of the pressure upon him. And Americans who remain sensitive to the meaning of a free Vietnam also feel pressure. As Graham Martin, our experienced ambassador to Saigon, recently put it: "The Republic of Vietnam is finally functioning on its own. It will go on to become a vigorous, self-supporting and friendly society if we Americans only have the good sense to continue to give it the economic and material support we have promised."

## ENERGY RESEARCH: A TECHNICAL OVERVIEW

## HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recommendations for alleviating the Nation's energy crisis by applying the technology transfer techniques used by the U.S. Army Missile Command Research, Development, and Engineering Laboratory at Redstone Arsenal in Huntsville, Ala., were presented recently by Dr. John L. McDaniel, director of the laboratory, at a "Development of Energy Resources" seminar at Athens College, Ala.

Because his remarks have meaning for each of us as we seek solutions to the need to develop more energy resources, I include his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

ENERGY RESEARCH: A TECHNICAL OVERVIEW  
(By John L. McDaniel)

The background on energy research is now. In fiscal year 1973, the total federal funding level for energy research was only \$622 million, and this includes nearly a dozen federal agencies.

This funding level is infinitesimal considering the vastness of the problem and the projected energy demands for the future, when the vast problem of today will be considered minuscule.

For the last 100 years energy consumption has increased steadily. In the 1940's, the rate of increase began to change rapidly. Since 1960 energy consumption has taken an even greater rise in the rate of increase. The amount of energy used in the United States in 1975 will be almost twice the amount used in 1960. A conservative estimate of the energy needed by the year 2000 is almost five times what was used in 1960.

One reason for this dramatic increase is the tremendous growth in per capita energy consumption. Per capita consumption of electrical energy almost doubled every ten years from 1930 through 1970. Combine this with the population increases during the same period, and we have a skyrocket effect on energy demands.

The reason for this is the increasing affluence which we enjoy in the United States.

The Gross National Product more than doubled between 1950 and 1970. With this increase in Gross National Product (and per capita income), there was a corresponding increase in per capita energy use.

Energy supplies face astronomical demands at present, and these demands will increase. This is unfortunate, because the problems of supply have been very close at hand for all of us during the past year.

Virtually all of our energy sources at present are fossil fuels. The problem here is immediate and obvious: Once the supply is gone, that's it. M. K. Hubbert's Energy Resources, predicts that domestic crude oil production by the year 2000 will be well below the 1940 level. By this time all the easily-obtained oil will have been used up, and production will depend on sources now considered economically unfeasible.

Different problems exist for alternative energy sources. Nuclear power plants have elicited sometimes strident opposition based upon concern for the environment or the safety of the nearby population. Also, nuclear fuel has the same limitation as fossil fuels; it can be used up.

Hydroelectric power has very definite geographic limitations, as well as the problem of space. Even when a river and suitable terrain exists near large population centers with the most urgent demands for power, flooding the required number of acres is impossible from both economic and sociological standpoints.

Solar power, at its present level of development, costs 100 to 1000 times that of conventional power generation methods. Each thousand megawatts would require four square miles of collection equipment, which introduces the problem of space. Also to be considered would be the problem of rainy days.

Geothermal power is more theory than possibility at the moment, although a geothermal plant is in operation at the Geysers, 90 miles north of San Francisco. This plant is possible only because natural geothermal phenomena existed to be tapped.

Also each of these methods have faced opposition from ecological or environmental groups. There seems to be no doubt that both the production and consummation of energy creates an adverse effect on the environment.

So vast are the ramifications of energy that its totality is difficult to comprehend. Moreover, the related R&D is pursued at so many levels and in so many different types of institutions that it is not easy to derive a composite picture of *what is being done, what is being neglected, and what should be started now* if a possible future disaster is to be averted.

In contrast to a field like defense, no Government agency has primary responsibility for the civilian energy sector—let alone energy R&D. Very recently (earlier in 1973) Executive Order 11726 established the Energy Policy Office. Under ideal conditions, this Office could be established sufficiently within six months to a year to play a significant role in shaping or developing a national energy program. Under worst conditions, the Office could become so entangled in separate emergency facets of the energy crisis that all potential for overall guidance would be negated.

If we are to have a complex of energy resources that can meet constantly changeable needs and choices, the energy planning for the future must provide a dynamically balanced program that makes optimum use of the various energy resources, that maximizes the potential of this country's diverse R&D apparatus, and that encompasses R&D efforts at different levels of technological advancement.

Before such a system can be achieved, it is imperative to recognize the existence of several conditions that, unless corrected or

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

adjusted, would hamper or inhibit a long-term R&D program for civilian energy:

A dearth of R&D talent in many areas. It is futile to urge initiation or intensification of specific research and development if a body of trained scientists and engineers is not available. For years, young research workers gravitated toward jobs in the more prosperous areas of space, defense, or the life sciences. Structure and scope must be given to energy R&D—so that young minds will be encouraged to contribute to those fields that desperately need the stimuli of imagination and ideas. Far-sighted planning for the education of sophisticated energy technologists must be instituted.

Until recently, the glamor of certain disciplines and the relative ease of funding tend to accentuate space- and defense-oriented energy R&D. Although some colleges and technological institutions are engaged in some education and research for energy, the efforts are widely dispersed and diffused.

Government needs to readjust in those areas where it supports research and to revitalize those agencies involved in energy R&D that have lost ground in the face of modern developments. Such experience and talent could be capitalized upon if given cognizance over new or expanded programs—or made responsible for major feasibility analyses.

The Government needs to sponsor certain kinds of basic research that are difficult to fund privately.

A major deficiency is the lack of communication and of data interchange between and among energy research groups in different fields. Findings in one area are not necessarily available to another, nor is there productive cross-fertilization among activities. No single professional society is broadly concerned with energy—no technical journal serves as a clearinghouse for energy information. These communication gaps should be plugged.

However, if all these suggestions were implemented yesterday, we would still be late. We cannot avoid the energy crisis, since it's already upon us, but we can lessen the impact. Wise management and utilization of energy research can result in decided improvement, but ignoring the need for this research can result in catastrophe.

This research must be centrally coordinated, departing from the piecemeal and probably duplicative efforts which now exist. Research priorities must be established to solve the long-term problems. To solve the immediate problem we may face the necessity for establishing consumer priorities. Nationwide gasoline rationing has already been mentioned, and there's a possibility that electricity could be rationed.

Solving the energy problem will require a great deal of technological effort. Fortunately, this is a commodity with no acute shortages in the foreseeable future. Also, the supply of technological know-how can be replenished, which is not the case with fossil fuels. In the past, virtually all technological efforts have resulted in developments which consumed energy, with no thought given to conserving energy. If all of this effort could be rechanneled or transferred to the task of conserving or locating new sources of energy, there is little doubt that the problems would be speedily solved.

Some technology transfer has already taken place. Automotive engineers rechanneled their knowledge of building higher performance engines into efforts to decrease the pollutants which these engines expelled into the air. Unfortunately, the pollution control devices used even more energy, or gasoline, which did nothing to help the energy situation. Thus it appears that one additional transfer of objective might be desirable in this case.

Technology transfer has received increasing interest in the Federal Government recently, and several Federal agencies now have specific budget items for the transfer and maximum utilization of technology. In 1972, the General Accounting Office recommended:

- 1) A Government-wide policy for technology transfer with guidelines issued to Federal agencies to implement a formal, active technology transfer process;
- 2) that the Secretary of Defense establish policy and procedures to encourage more extensive application of existing defense technology to civilian problems; and
- 3) the establishment of a technology transfer consulting team as a central focus to assist Federal agencies in the matching of technological resources with pressing national needs.

Although technology transfer is not new, the urgency of current requirements calls for much more comprehensive and cohesive action than has been taken in the past. The traditional means of transferring technology—such as the intersectoral movement of people, organizational diversification, conventional library systems, technical journals, and college classrooms—while still important, are no longer wholly adequate.

At the Missile Command, we've been deeply involved in technology transfer since we've been in business. Some of the technology which evolved from development of the now-obsolete Redstone can be found in virtually every missile system in existence today.

Our technology is directed toward missile system development, but the method used is a good illustration of the concept of technology transfer. We have more than 1300 people involved in research and development support for over 30 missile systems. This support stays with a missile system throughout its life cycle, and the transfer of technology takes place in all directions. The knowledge gained in developing older systems is utilized in the development of newer systems, but the reverse is also true. Improvements discovered in developing new systems may be incorporated in older systems even though they've been in the field for years.

One organization charged specifically with the responsibility of transferring technology is the Redstone Scientific Information Center, which also supports NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center.

The Independent Research and Development (IR&D) program is another area in which MICOM has greatly expanded its technology transfer capability. The system consists of analyzing and indexing the tasks being performed by approximately 125 companies or profit centers under the Government's \$600 million annual investment. Bibliographic information on each task is stored in a computer, and each month new entries are selectively disseminated to the functional activities of the laboratory—depending upon technical interest profiles.

In addition to IR&D, our Laboratory has on-line access to the Defense Documentation Center and NASA Library of Research and Technology Résumés. As in the case of IR&D each year before we forward our proposed tasks to higher headquarters for approval, we check our tasks against on-going DOD and NASA tasks to assure ourselves that we are not duplicating the efforts of others.

AMC's terminal homing data bank was established at MICOM in January 1971 to provide an Army-wide target signature measurements data base that will accelerate the development of unique and effective terminal homing weapon systems.

Though we have and use transfer mechanisms to check our in-house tasks against those being performed by Army, Navy, Air Force, NASA, and Industry, no convenient mechanism for checking against other departments of the Government exists. We are working on this problem now.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Another example of effective technology transfer is our development of a laser scalpel for the National Institute of Health. The National Cancer Institute requested the Army's assistance in conducting experiments to assess the potential of a high energy laser to destroy cancerous tumors in experimental animals. Although we were pursuing only military missions, the fact that we possessed a capability to deliver large amounts of laser energy made us a unique source for such experimental equipment.

The laser scalpel was built in-house for the cancer research experiments. The beginning of this effort was made possible by the effective transfer of Army laser technology.

MICOM's parent organization, the Army Materiel Command (AMC) has established 10 lead laboratories to cover specific technologies. For example, MICOM has been designated lead laboratory for guidance and control/terminal homing and high energy laser technology. Seven other AMC laboratories have lead responsibility in various technology areas. One of the essential functions of the lead laboratory is to assure technology transfer from the bench scientist to the developing system.

You may already be wondering what relationship this has to the energy crisis. The point is that we as a nation have the ability and the resources to solve our energy problems on a long range basis. However, the available technology must be guided into the most effective channels. The decision which we must be prepared to face is how determined are we to solve these problems.

To solve the problem on a long-range basis, I recommend that several points be considered:

(1) That we, as a nation, redirect our thinking so that conservation of energy is a top priority item.

Auto engineers can place a higher priority on efficient gasoline utilization if the public so demands. Until very recently, gasoline consumption was not a major selling point for an automobile, but recent commercials indicate that the auto manufacturers have already gotten the message.

The same holds true in other areas. It's a safe bet that you didn't think to check on power consumption the last time you bought a clothes dryer, and you probably wouldn't have been able to, even had you thought about it. Efficient power consumption just hasn't been a major selling point in the past.

(2) That we determine the trade-offs or expense necessary to achieve the desired results.

We must first determine what the desired results are, and the acceptable trade-offs or expense could especially have a pronounced effect on the short-term energy situation. At current consumption levels, coal is by far our most plentiful fossil fuel. In addition to increasing expense, however, additional problems have arisen in connection with coal production and the environment. Strip mining increases the availability of coal, but restoring the land to its pre-mined state adds to the expense. And the question also arises as to what is an acceptable approximation of the pre-mined state.

And of course this isn't the end of the environmental problem. Coal-burning power systems are among the biggest contributors to air pollution, and controlling this pollution consumes more energy. For example, just one air pollution control system employed by Bethlehem Steel takes as much electric power as 1,700 average homes.

(3) That we establish a national clearinghouse or coordinating point for the effective dissemination and transfer of energy technology. This responsibility could be assumed by the recently-established Energy Policy Office.

This "Energy Center" could prevent the duplication of effort which would be more likely to occur as the nation became more energy-conscious and more work was initi-

ated. The same methods used at MICOM in the IR&D transfer process would prove highly effective. Such a center could evaluate energy research programs and recommend priorities for those which appeared most promising, using what we at MICOM call the "Systems Approach." We could develop an equation to indicate the total weighted score of such a program by considering such factors as planned funding for each project, average weighted score per project, and the number of projects. To determine the average weighted score per project, we consider the objective, approach, and available resources. Such an equation would add a degree of concreteness to the abstractions encountered in planning any type of research program, and is a first step to the systems approach.

(4) That we encourage and provide additional funding, if necessary, for the most promising energy research programs.

This may be relatively simple if the most promising program happens to be conducted by a Federal agency. However, there is little doubt that industry will be conducting individual research programs aimed at conserving energy resources. If one of these appears to have exceptional promise, a Government contract could be awarded to conduct this program on an intensified level.

The energy crisis has been caused, in large measure, by ignoring facts which were known, but which were thought to be problems of the future. The future may have been the past summer for some of you, if you traveled in certain sections of Florida or Colorado where the gasoline shortage was especially severe. The future could be this winter, when there may not be enough gas or electricity to keep our homes at a comfortable temperature.

Along with the gloomier signs there is optimism. We are waking up on the national level to the magnitude of our problem. If the full resources of America technology are pitted against the energy crises, there is no doubt in my mind that technology will win.

## THE DEDICATION OF THE WILLIAM B. WIDNALL TOWERS

## HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to have an opportunity to pay tribute to one of my Republican colleagues who is being singularly honored in his home district.

Today a bright new future for senior citizens in Hackensack, N.J., begins with the dedication of William B. Widnall Towers. This 100-unit, 13-story building will provide modern facilities for elderly persons most in need of care.

It is the first development of its kind in the public housing program—located and designed specifically for the needs of senior citizens. Nearby is a county hospital within walking distance. A doctor's office and infirmary are within the project. Visiting health care personnel will emphasize preventative health care.

Security measures will include an individual call system and a TV monitor—soon to be expanded into a transmitting facility to serve the elderly within a 50-mile radius.

The project will feature central dining, and individual kitchens. Rooms for community gatherings are provided. The accent is on bright, airy units, offering safety, convenience and total care.

March 18, 1974

Too seldom in this world is a man honored for his achievements while still at work. BILL WIDNALL has been tireless in his efforts to secure good legislation for the elderly. It is most appropriate that in the place of his birth, he is being honored in this manner.

I join my colleagues in congratulating WIDNALL—and the good people of Hackensack for their wisdom in paying this homage to a man who has given so much of himself on behalf of others.

## CHAIRMAN POAGE SPEAKS ON REA ACT OF 1973

## HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, 1974, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Mr. POAGE, addressed the NRECA Convention at San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. POAGE's remarks trace the legislative history of Public Law 93-32, the REA Act of 1973. It is a good account of the proceedings, and, therefore, I am inserting it into the RECORD for all the Members to read.

Chairman POAGE's address follows:

**SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN W. R. POAGE**

It has been a number of years since I have had the pleasure of speaking to a convention of the N.R.E.C.A. I am pleased and honored to again have that opportunity. NRECA is an outstanding organization and has had a great influence on legislation that not only deals directly with the financing of electric cooperatives, but on legislation that deals with all the problems of rural America. I recall how helpful NRECA was in obtaining the passage of the Rural Development Act of 1972. Representatives of NRECA were most effective not only in making sure that Members of the House were aware of the merits of the Rural Development Act, but in suggesting a number of important points which were included in the bill.

It wasn't long ago that all of us were dealt a stunning surprise by the sudden cancellation and termination of the 2 percent loan program for electric and telephone borrowers. It didn't take NRECA long to begin an offensive to restore this program. It was not an easy job. I believe your convention was meeting in Dallas and I know you adopted several strong resolutions. Tempers were short and patience was thin, but after all the smoke cleared, NRECA was most helpful in formulating our current REA loan program which, in my opinion, is far more likely to remain viable than the old 2 percent loan program because there was considerable pressure to raise the interest rates and it was becoming more and more difficult to obtain adequate funds from this program to meet the tremendous need for rural electric and telephone service.

I would like to look back for a few minutes on what happened beginning with the Department's most unfortunate announcement terminating the old program.

As the year 1972 drew to a close, those of us on the Agriculture Committee knew that we had a reasonably busy year ahead of us because of the expiration of the Agriculture Act. We also knew that we would be dealing with the always controversial Food Stamp Act, but, in all of our wildest dreams, we never visualized just what type of bombshells the administration was about to throw at us.

I suppose we first realized what we were

dealing with when on December 26, 1972, the administration coldly announced the termination of one of our most sound and helpful conservation programs, the rural environmental assistance program. The next victim was the emergency loan program for farmers who had been wiped out by natural disasters. These announcements were terrific blows, of course, but I must admit that December 29, 1972, yielded perhaps the most shocking of all the administration's offenses against long-standing programs that had so long benefited our farmers and ranchers and rural people in general.

This, of course, was the announcement that the rural electrification program as we had known it for many years was being cast aside and that the interest rates and loans for rural electric and telephone systems would be increased two and a half times. Not only did this strike fear throughout rural America but it raised deep questions as to the sincerity of the administration's professed interest in the people out in the country.

I must admit that I was especially dismayed and shocked by the reason given for terminating this vital program. That reason, as stated, was that there was a new source of financing which had been made possible by the enactment of the Rural Development Act of 1972. In the future, the administration said, rural electric and rural telephone loans would be known as community facility loans and would carry an interest rate of 5 percent and would be made out of the fund created specifically for rural development projects, the rural development insurance fund.

Just after I heard this sad news, I issued a press release from the committee in which I denounced this action as underhanded and I pointed out that as an original sponsor of the Rural Development Act of 1972, I never thought that its provisions would be "construed as legal basis for boosting REA loan rates." I felt sure I spoke for everyone else who had any type of interest in developing rural America.

It did not take long for the Congress to react to the administration's ill-founded attempt to dismantle the REA program. On January 16, 1973, Senator Humphrey introduced legislation to force the administration to continue the REA program as we have known it. Just two days later, Congressman Frank Denholm, who is a distinguished member of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced similar legislation in the House. In fact, between January 22 and February 17, 21 bills identical to the Humphrey and Denholm bills, with a total of 113 co-sponsors, were introduced in the House.

Of course, through the years I have learned that an exact count of co-sponsors is not always an accurate way to predict a vote, especially if the vote is one to override a presidential veto. Neither can you rely on the vote by which a bill is passed in the House or Senate as a predicate for determining whether these supporters are going to vote to override a veto. Remember, we passed the revised Poage-Aiken Rural Water and Sewer bill by a vote of 297 to 54—almost 6 to 1—but when we tried to pass it over President Nixon's veto, we failed to get the needed 2 to 1 vote. Lots of members who were willing to vote for a bill which they believed to be good simply will not vote to directly challenge the President by voting to override his veto.

It was my opinion, therefore, from the very beginning that we needed to try to work out a reasonable compromise with the administration, if we were to have any REA loan program. As I was attempting to hold meetings and negotiate, the Senate was acting—and acting in a way which I feared could do nothing but assure us a political issue. Senator Humphrey had been busy and by the time the Senate Agriculture Committee reported his bill to the Senate on February 15, there were 52 Senators sponsoring this legislation. Just six days later, on February 21,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senator Humphrey's bill which would have restored the old program, passed without amendment by a vote of 69 to 20 and his bill was referred to our committee. I was of the opinion that the bill could easily pass our committee and probably pass the House, but I realized that it could never become law without the President's signature—which it simply could not get.

I wanted a bill—not an issue. I wanted a program which would get us some money, so we did not delay, and we had three days of hearings before our committee on February 26, 27, and 28. These were lengthy and emotional hearings. There was a great deal of pressure to rush out a bill to the floor along the lines of the Humphrey-Denholm bill, but there was also a growing feeling that perhaps there was an answer which would in the long run prove more fruitful to those who had always relied on the REA program. I met daily with Representatives from the Department of Agriculture, NRECA and the Office of Management and Budget. I negotiated with Secretary Butz and even personally spoke to the President.

At this point, we fortunately received the untiring and sincere cooperation of one of the men who has contributed so much to the Rural Electric and Rural Telephone programs; Congressman Anchorage Nelsen. As you know, Congressman Nelsen was at one time the Administrator of the REA and I would not begin to try to count the number of times we met. Finally, Congressman Nelsen and I, with the help of a dedicated staff, worked out what we thought was a reasonable compromise which would establish an insured and guaranteed loan program for those borrowers who could afford to pay more than 2 percent. However, we made certain that we had provided direct 2 percent funds for those who simply could not pay any more and still stay in operation.

Congressman Nelsen and I, while we differed on some details, had the same goals in mind and we presented our ideas to the House Agriculture Committee. Up until that time we could not get the Department of Agriculture to put anything down on paper. We did not know what they had in mind but I believe the fact that with Mr. Nelsen's cooperation, we had been able to shape up a reasonable and workable compromise, lit a match under the Department's foot and, on March 13, they actually, though not formally, asked Congressman Nelsen to introduce their proposal, which he did that day. I felt we could not live with what they submitted and refused to join, but we were glad to at long last have their views in black and white. I know that it sounds unreasonable, but one of the hardest things in Washington is to get an agency, any administrative agency, to take a real clear stand on a controversial question.

Our committee continued its deliberations and, on March 15, the committee voted by a vote of 32 to 4 to instruct our colleague, Congressman Denholm, to introduce a bill which was substantially the compromise Congressman Nelsen and I had originally suggested. The bill provided insured loan funds at 5 percent from a newly-created rural electrification and telephone revolving fund. Borrowers meeting certain criteria would receive 2 percent loans. In addition, our rural telephone bank was strengthened.

I want to point out that our bill in addition did not point an accusing finger or try to single out generation and transmission cooperatives for punitive treatment as the administration had sought to do. In other words, the administration wanted to specifically provide that no G and T's could get 2 percent money. We realized that very few G and T's could qualify by meeting the criteria but I was unwilling to say that if a G and T met the other requirements that it should be disqualified simply because it produced electricity. As I see it, the real purpose of the administration's proposal was to

make a legislative finding that REA should not be concerned with financing generation plants. I think we still need the means of providing our co-ops with generation in many instances.

This new bill passed the House on April 4, by a vote of 317 to 92. We went to conference with the Senate which had passed the Humphrey bill which would have simply forced the President to restore the old program and which certainly would have been vetoed. After a cooling-off period, the Senators had decided that we needed a program more than we needed an issue so we reached agreement. Of course, the agreement was substantially what the House had passed. The conference report was agreed to in the Senate on May 9, by a vote of 93 to 3, and on May 10 in the House, by a vote of 363 to 25. On May 11, 1973, the President signed the bill and it became law—Public Law 93-32. May 11—REA's birthday.

None of us felt that a law this complex would be perfect and we expected that some changes would be necessary from time to time. This past week, on February 4, I introduced legislation, H.R. 12526, designed to help CFC participate in the guaranteed loan program. The bill has three main provisions:

1. It would exempt from Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) regulations CFC bonds or securities which are fully secured by or which represent beneficial ownership in loans guaranteed by the REA.

2. It would add statutory language to the REA Act to expressly authorize the assignment of REA guarantees.

3. It would clarify the provisions of sect. 308 of the REA Act which provides for incontestability of the government guarantee "except for fraud or misrepresentation of which the holder has actual knowledge."

While our committee will be extremely busy for some time to come, I do plan for us to consider this bill at the earliest opportunity. If enacted, it will give our loan program additional flexibility.

Another matter in which you must be vitally interested is the energy crisis. I know that the energy administrator, Mr. Simon, was to have appeared on your program tonight, but he has been detained. Let me, therefore, offer just a brief comment.

As you know, the Federal Energy Office (FEO) came out with revised regulations on January 15 which in effect said that agriculture and agriculturally related activities should receive 100 percent of their fuel requirements. As originally drafted, these regulations had some wholly impractical provisions, such as giving farmers an allocation of diesel oil equal to 100 percent of a fixed monthly base period in 1973. We had FEO administrator William E. Simon come before our committee at a night session just as he was taking over his duties in that office. We convinced him that changes in the proposed regulations were imperative. The changes were made, and we now have the 100 percent of requirement allocation.

Now that sounds fine, and I want to express my appreciation to Mr. Simon, but we have to keep in mind that having priorities which Mr. Simon can and has given us and having the gasoline or diesel fuel which simply is not always available might sometimes be a wholly different thing. In fact, our committee is continually receiving calls from farmers who have failed to get fuel for one reason or another—sometimes because their local supplier himself is out of gasoline or diesel oil. We are continuing to work on that particular problem, and we are hopeful that the situation will get better as every individual in the entire distribution chain comes to realize that agriculture is entitled to and must get all the fuel it needs.

Now these same regulations provide that utilities which happen to generate and/or distribute electricity produced in hydroelectric or nuclear plants will get 100 percent of their current gasoline and distillate fuel

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

needs for the operation of their maintenance and repair vehicles whereas all other electric utility systems shall get only 100 percent of their base period vehicular uses.

I have protested this to administrator Simon.

To me it makes no sense to make a distinction between vehicles which service a system that transmits electricity generated by water power, and the same kind of trucks or other equipment servicing a line moving electricity originating at a steam generation plant.

The immediate explanation of FEO officials with whom my committee staff discussed this problem was that if they should make some kind of exception for the utilities, this would open the door for a wide range of exceptions that could wreck the allocations program.

When it was pointed out that a power line breakdown on an REA system could throw a hospital or a firehouse in the dark, there was a long pause in the explanation offered by these FEO officials, then a feeble suggestion that the REA should then turn to authorities for help under the emergency set-aside allocation each State is assigned. That is likely to take two weeks to two months. Meanwhile, I suppose, the hospitals will be expected to function with some kind of standby power generating equipment until orders can go out from the State capital and the needed gasoline gets delivered to your line repairmen's trucks. At any rate, I will keep trying to drive the point home.

Well, that's just a glance at one of the many problems we're wrestling with in Washington these days. We have shortages in fuel and in fertilizers and in chemicals that go into cattle feedstuffs, and when we get some relief in these shortages, we have soaring prices to contend with—in all the items that go into the production of food and fiber.

But with all these problems, America's farmers and ranchers will do their part. We should harvest some record crops this year.

It has been a pleasure to be with you. I look forward to continue working with you and the REA program. I've been around the REA program and those associated with it for a good long while. No program or group of people have been more of a blessing to the folks out in rural America.

Thank you again.

---

JOHN HUNT: AN ARDENT  
CONSERVATIVE

---

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

MR. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the rating of the Congress has degenerated to an all-time low, it is refreshing to read an article in one of our prominent papers setting forth the virtues of one of our colleagues.

He is not a shrinking violet by any stretch of the imagination, nor does he swing back and forth like a pendulum. He is on one side or the other and it never becomes necessary to turn up one's hearing aid to learn where he stands. You may not agree with him but prepare to defend your position if you disagree.

I commend for your reading the article on Congressman JOHN HUNT that appeared in the March 3 edition of the New York Times:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 3, 1974]

JOHN HUNT: AN ARDENT CONSERVATIVE

(By David C. Berliner)

WOODBURY.—"When I first ran for sheriff here in Gloucester County," John Hunt re-

called with a hearty laugh last week, "some people who were against me said that my election would put a 'gunslinger' into office. They even called me—'The Fastest Gun in the East.'"

The descriptions, while colorful (Mr. Hunt is, in fact, an avid hunter and an expert marksman), were more stylized than accurate and, so far as the local electorate was concerned, proved less intimidating than amusing.

Today, 15 years after that first successful bid for public office, Mr. Hunt is serving his fourth term as the Republican Representative from New Jersey's First Congressional District.

John Hunt is a "John Wayne American." If "The Duke" created a prototype for the "patriot's patriot," the design seemed custom-made for the Congressman. While the movie star has portrayed countless rough-and-ready heroes on the screen, the politician has filled the roles in real life.

AN ILLUSTRIOS CAREER

In his 65 years, Mr. Hunt has not only been a sheriff, Congressman and a State Senator twice, but also a hard-punching mid-weight boxer, a State Police officer and a decorated veteran of World War II.

Time has been kind to Mr. Hunt, as his trim physique, tanned, lightly lined face and full head of charcoal-gray hair will attest. And if little of his appearance has changed measurably over the years, his political philosophies seem to have been diverted even less. In surveys conducted in 1972, the liberally oriented Americans for Democratic Action gave the Congressman a zero rating, while the conservative-based Americans for Constitutional Action awarded him an 89 per cent mark.

Considered one of the most ardent conservatives in the House of Representatives, Mr. Hunt's hard-line approach to issues has enthralled followers and dismayed opponents.

"The experts say that mine is one of the most diversified districts in the United States," he observed during an interview in his office here. "It includes all of Gloucester County and a good part of Camden County, and we've got a major seaport, oil refineries, the world's largest record factory [Columbia], Corning Glass, a shipyard, light industry, huge asparagus, tomato and blueberry farms. And lots of apartment complexes are going up all around, turning us into a bedroom community as well."

It is this mixture—the hard hats and the inner-city blacks, the conservative homeowners with roots dating back to the Revolutionary War and the young college students and couples with more-liberal philosophies—that have both challenged and threatened Mr. Hunt's position.

CLEAR-CUT STANDS

His stands on the issues of the day, Mr. Hunt will tell you, are well formulated and clear cut. And, in the same manner that his orders to his Congressional assistants are conveyed in clipped no-nonsense military fashion so are his opinions on current issues:

"I don't care about a person's politics. Everyone should be heard, regardless. But I have no time for militancy or for people who are obnoxious instead of being respectful."

"I'm for neighborhood schools. I don't care if people are white, black, pink or green, as long as they are honest and forthright. Some of my best friends are Chinese, and I've grown up with the colored population. That's a lot more than I can say about some of those phony liberals who talk out of both sides of their mouths."

"We've got to maintain a strong defense posture. [Mr. Hunt is a member of the House Armed Services Committee.] I don't want us to be the policeman of the world—I want a volunteer army—but I always was, and still am, suspicious of the Russians. When I see

March 18, 1974

them building up their military might, let's not kid ourselves. They're not getting ready for a tea party."

In addition, Mr. Hunt is against both foreign aid to nations that "kick us in the teeth" [Look at Peru, which used our destroyers to capture our fishing boats] and a continuing, wide-ranging investigation of "the so-called Watergate case."

"I've known President Nixon since World War II, and I think he's done a fine job on foreign relations, although I can't give him too much of a plus for the people he's surrounded himself with," Mr. Hunt declared during a walk to the center of town, during which his personal appeal and magnetism evidenced itself in countless smiling chats and exchanges with local residents.

"Watergate, to me, was a burglary by overzealous patriots. I've always felt we should convict anyone involved with that burglary.

"But I do think that a segment of the news media has poisoned the minds of many people with respect to politicians and the President. I happen to think that Mr. Nixon has been candid as far as he's gone."

OPPOSED TO RATIONING

When not involved with national issues, Mr. Hunt concentrates his efforts on local problems. Energy and mass transportation, two areas affecting large portions of the nation, interest and distract him the most, he says, and have convinced him that "it is about time that New England and other parts of the country faced reality and realized that we have to build refineries around where they are."

Opposed to fuel rationing, but firm in his conviction that 20 new refineries must be built throughout the nation "as soon as possible," the Congressman said that the next one is scheduled to be constructed in his district by Shell Oil.

With a new campaign fast approaching, political observers are watching with interest how the Congressman will balance the impact of Watergate and the influx of increasing numbers of liberal-voting urbanites into his district before deciding whether to seek a fifth term.

"Until then," he said, slapping his hands together in glee, "I've got a really big day coming up April 1.

"That's when Doris and I make the last payment and burn the mortgage. Now, that's something to look forward to!"

---

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION VIEWS  
ON TRADE POLICY

---

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

MR. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the National Farmers Union has long been active in promoting international cooperation in agricultural trade, which provides so much positive input to our overall balance of trade and payments.

The NFU is fearful that current administration policies may be moving in the wrong direction, away from rather than toward international economic cooperation. This concern has been set forth most recently in an address by Robert J. Lewis, national secretary of the Farmers Union, which I am inserting in the Record at the close of my remarks.

I do not happen to agree with each of the specific points and recommendations in this speech. However, what is of underlying significance to me is the continuing recognition by the Farmers Union of the

inescapable interdependence of a healthy U.S. farm economy with a healthy world economy. "Beggar thy neighbor" approaches will simply wind up beggar-ing ourselves.

The NFU endorses, as I have, the efforts by Secretary Kissinger to bring about a reduction in world energy prices and a stabilization in the terms of energy trade. The only alternative, a cannibalistic competition for scarce resources is a virus that would quickly spread to other sectors of our own and the world's economy.

In my own Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, we have recently completed a set of hearings on foreign direct investment in the United States. This has given us a further insight into the economic distortions that can be produced by isolationist actions such as the export embargoes of last summer. Constructive alternatives must be developed, and I am pleased to see the Farmers Union support for a system of world food reserves as one alternative.

As we pursue these matters, we must bear in mind that this country's farmers have a vital stake in U.S. international trade and economic policy. I therefore invite my colleagues to acquaint themselves with the perspectives of the National Farmers Union.

The address follows:

VIEW ON THE PRESENT U.S. AGRICULTURAL TRADE SITUATION AND THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION TRADE POLICIES

(Statement by Robert G. Lewis, National Secretary of the Farmers Union)

In my view, the Nixon Administration's trade policies are profoundly wrong. But before elaborating on and defending this view, I shall try to describe what the Nixon Administration's agricultural trade policy appears to be.

"Trade liberalization" is the basic theme expressed by Administration spokesmen to characterize their goals. "Trade liberalization" is a familiar term, generally meaning to remove obstacles to the exchange of goods across national boundaries.

The simplest and most direct obstacles are tariffs—taxes levied at the border by Country "A" to make competing goods from Country "B" and all other countries more expensive to buy within Country "A". These tariffs may make the other countries' goods less competitive, or they may price other countries' goods out of the market altogether. Either way, they give a measure of "protection" to the producers of the goods within Country "A". This "protection" makes it possible to maintain higher prices for domestic producers than would be possible if lower-priced foreign goods could compete freely. That's why tariffs are called "protectionist".

The "Kennedy Round" of trade negotiations in the 1960's resulted in sharp reductions in the tariffs remaining in effect on most kinds of goods after about 25 years of reductions under the Reciprocal Trade Act.

By now the "easiest" tariff barriers are pretty well down. Most of those that remain at high levels are of great importance to farmers in the United States, but the Nixon Administration isn't doing much about them. These are the tariffs and other trade barriers that are imposed against *labor-intensive goods*—things like textiles, apparel, shoes, and other things that require a lot of labor to produce. These are of great importance to farmers, because most of the money that is spent for labor-intensive goods creates *purchasing power for food*. Machines don't eat farm products, and machine-made goods don't generate nearly as much food-buying

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

demand as labor-intensive goods. A bigger part of every dollar spent on imports of this kind of goods will return to buy farm products in the U.S.A. than of dollars spent on any other kind of imports.

Yet the Nixon Administration is not concentrating on removing trade barriers against this kind of imports. On the contrary, the Administration has completed negotiation of a "textile agreement" that will keep high tariffs and quantitative restrictions on textile and clothing products on a long-term basis. So it's a mistake to think that the Nixon Administration's top priority is to make changes in trade restrictions so as to help farmers. In the kind of trade liberalization that would do the most to expand demand for U.S. farm products, the Nixon Administration has put the interests of U.S. manufacturers and labor ahead of the interests of U.S. farmers and consumers, and has entered into an elaborate "international commodity agreement" to protect these other interests.

Let's get back now to the Nixon Administration's policy. The easiest tariff barriers were pretty well disposed of by the "Kennedy Round." The really tough ones, which are most important to American farmers have been put "off limits," by the Textile Agreement. The new trade negotiations, therefore, are expected to concentrate on eliminating or reducing "non-tariff barriers" to trade. In the professional lingo, these are called "NTB's."

One kind of NTB is "quantitative restrictions" on imports. The quotas on imports of dairy products are an example. Our quotas represent absolute limitations on the quantity of cheese, or dry milk, or wheat, that can be imported into the U.S.A. each year. So these are among the prime targets for elimination in the forthcoming trade negotiations.

Another kind of NTB is *quality restrictions*. Sanitation requirements are one example. Many of the quality restrictions can be defended as necessary or desirable to protect consumers. But some are only a dodge to stop trade, to keep out foreign goods from competing with domestic production. So quality restrictions will be on the griddle for close scrutiny in the forthcoming trade negotiations.

I want to digress again to point out another curious thing about the Nixon Administration's trade policy. You Wisconsin dairy farmers operate under very strict quality restrictions *right in your own home market*. But the dairy farmers in other countries who produce the imports that are competing with you and depressing your prices right at this hour don't have to cope with the same quality restrictions that you do. Wisconsin Congressman Dave Obey has introduced a bill that would put you and your foreign competitors on an even footing. His bill would require foreign dairy farms, and dairy plants, to satisfy the same sanitation standards as those in the U.S. before their products could be sold in our market. The Nixon Administration has not given encouragement to that bill. It will be interesting to see whether they will advocate either that this "NTB" against American dairy farmers in their own home market be lifted, or that the same "NTB" be applied against their overseas competitors.

Another kind of NTB is the "variable duty" system of the nine-nation European Economic Community. This one deserves special attention. The "variable duty" system is the prime target of the Nixon Administration's entire trade policy. What's it all about?

The EEC countries are sympathetic to their farmers. Farmers comprise two or more times the proportion of the total populations in most of the nine countries that they do in the U.S. There are other reasons as well for this public sympathy for farmers in the European countries, which I won't go into now. The Common Agricultural Policy of the

EEC is a result. The governments of the nine countries, acting through the EEC, have determined that they will support the standard of living of their farm families by maintaining farm product prices at a level that is approximately half-way between our farm prices during the 1950's and 1960's and what 100 per cent of our "parity" would be.

Europe and the EEC do not produce enough food to meet all their needs. In a "free trade" situation, the price of imported farm products would determine the domestic farm price level. Most of the time in the past, import prices would drag down European farm prices. The key feature in the farm price support system of the EEC, therefore, is a "variable duty" provision which is calculated to bridge the gap between lower world market prices and the level at which the EEC has decided to support its own farmers' prices. For example, if the EEC "support price" for wheat is \$2.75, and the price of imported wheat in European ports is \$2.00, the EEC will apply a duty on imported wheat equal to the 75 cents difference plus a margin of safety of another dime or so. This means it would be economically unfeasible for anyone in the EEC to buy Canadian or American wheat until practically all of the European farmers' wheat had been sold at the support price or thereabouts.

Well, what's wrong with that?

The Farmers Union thinks that's a pretty good system. We have recommended that the same kind of thing be adopted here in the U.S.A. for dairy products, wheat, and cotton. We're ready to recommend it for American agriculture generally.

For dairy products, for example, we recommend that a variable duty be applied against any imported dairy products so that the importer would have to pay the difference between 110 per cent of parity and the cost of the product in international trade. This would make it practically unfeasible for any imported dairy products to enter the U.S. while American dairy farmers are getting prices lower than parity for their milk. But if there should be a shortage, then consumers would be assured of free access to imported supplies without restriction, at prices of around 110 per cent of parity.

This "variable duty system" seems to us a better way to make our farm price support programs workable than the quantitative restrictions that we now have. We've found, in the case of dairy products particularly, that our present system is both too rigid, and too loose. It takes months of the Tariff Commission's time and a Presidential Proclamation to let in a little wheat if we should have a shortage in this country, and even more time and bother to shut it out again if imports begin to burden the price support system. Yet the import quotas are continually being evaded by phony butter-sugar concoctions and mislabeled "Monterey cheese" and other shenanigans, as we've learned in the dairy industry.

Surely if we're going to have a price support system for American farmers, we've got to have some way to prevent low-priced imports from coming into the country and bogging it down. There's no way to avoid it—excepting by supporting the entire world market. This variable duty system is an effective and capable piece of machinery for making a price support system work smoothly and well. There is no reasonable argument against a variable duty system as being at least as good, and probably better than anything else that could be devised, for getting the job done—if there is a genuine commitment to making the price support system really work. But that's just the rub. That's precisely why the variable duty system is the main target of the Nixon Administration's trade negotiating policy. For what the Nixon Administration really means by the code word "trade liberalization" is war against the price support programs of the European farmers.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The goal is to force down European grain prices, and drive European farmers off their farms and out of production, so that cheap American grain can take over their markets.

Don't think that I came to Stevens Point to make a defense for European farmers. My real interest is in what it means to farmers in the U.S.A. The point of the Nixon Administration's so-called trade policy is aimed to strike much closer to home. The Nixon Administration is against farm price supports anywhere and everywhere—and probably more here in Wisconsin than even in Holland and France. "Trade liberalization" in the 1970's is the same old enmity against farm price support and stabilization programs that farmers have had to contend against ever since the first beginnings of the agricultural recovery from the Great Depression 40 years ago.

Ask not for whom the bell tolls, my friends. It tolls not alone for the farmers in England, and Belgium, and Germany, and the other countries over the sea; it tolls for thee.

Do you doubt it? Well, let's look at the record:

The Nixon Administration has held dairy price supports down to the lowest level permitted by law, notwithstanding that dairy farmers' present adversities and uncertainty about the future have led to the worst milk shortage in a generation;

Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz recommended to the Committees on Agriculture of both House and Senate that the 75 per cent of parity minimum price support floor for dairy products be abolished, so that dairy supports could be reduced even further, or eliminated completely;

President Nixon, in his farm message just a year ago, asked Congress to eliminate the dairy price support program within three years;

On the recommendation of Secretary Butz, President Nixon has opened up the nation's quotas to the all-time record of nearly four billion pounds of milk equivalent in imported dairy products with the expressed purpose of putting a damper on milk prices;

Only last week, in his statement to the House Committee on Agriculture about new sugar legislation, Secretary Butz declared, "It is now time to consider the elimination of all farm payments."

It seems to me that record should make Wisconsin dairy farmers feel something less than comfortable.

But that's only half of it. Wisconsin dairy farmers have been singled out, in the Flanigan and Atlantic Council reports, for the honor of being the sacrificial goats to be traded away for the Administration's ambitions to take over the European farmers' market for grains.

Tony Dechant, the national president of the Farmers Union, told Secretary Butz last week that many dairy farmers think his deeds correspond to what the Atlantic Council report recommends. Tony gave the Secretary all the encouragement he could to try to prove that conclusion is wrong.

The Atlantic Council report is the one that recommends that price supports on manufacturing milk should be cut, so that manufacturing milk producers will go out of business and let foreign imports take over their markets. In the meantime, it recommends, the dairy farmers in other sections of the country should keep their high prices under the milk marketing orders.

That recommendation, as well as the Flanigan report, should have been blown out of the tub for all-time by the analysis that was made by Professor Truman Graf of the University of Wisconsin's Madison Campus. I strongly recommend to everyone who hasn't read it to write for a copy. Unfortunately, the Administration seems not to have noticed, for it is still following their general direction.

I hope it will console you manufacturing milk producers to know that some of the grain and soybean farmers who were singled

out to be the beneficiaries of the Administration's agricultural trade policies don't feel much better about it than you do about the honor of being its prime victims.

Year-in and year-out, wheat farmers in the United States get lower prices for their wheat than the producers of 80 per cent of all the wheat grown on earth. American farmers are among the very lowest-paid in the world. Yet the Nixon Administration's policy has been to drive down the price of wheat and other agricultural exports in the world market. Wheat prices were kept artificially low in the world market for the Russians, at a cost of \$300 million to U.S. taxpayers in direct subsidies. Additional hundreds of millions of dollars were lost to U.S. farmers and our balance of payments for under-price wheat sold for three years after the Nixon Administration torpedoed the International Grains Agreement in 1969, shortly after taking office.

As for the future, grain and soybean farmers had better not count on today's prices lasting forever. And there's nothing that's more discouraging about future prospects than the explanations of Secretary Butz himself about how today's high grain prices happened, because what he says is out-of-touch with reality for one reason or another.

Mr. Butz has been proclaiming, in speech after speech, that the farm price support and stabilization programs that have been developed in this country since the Depression of the 1930's are, and here I quote directly, "40 years of wandering through the wilderness of artificial price props and irksome production controls". Invoking the names of Moses, Mr. Butz recalls that "it took the Chosen People 40 years to break out of bondage and find their way to the Promised Land". And then he promises, with supreme confidence: "Today the promised land for agriculture is near at hand."

I'm skeptical. Lots of farmers are skeptical. I'm even more skeptical when I hear Mr. Butz' claims for what brought this all about:

Mr. Butz would like us to think that the Nixon Administration's farm policies made the agricultural boom. I quote him again: "The change began . . . under the three-year Agricultural Act of 1970 . . . whereby Congress and the Administration created a refreshingly favorable climate within which farmers could react to market signals to produce the crops needed at home and abroad."

"It was a break with the past—a change from the philosophy of scarcity to the philosophy of plenty," Mr. Butz explains.

"For more than 40 years," says Mr. Butz, "we have operated in an atmosphere of curtailment. In one form or another, our public policies and programs have been largely designed to hold down production or dispose of surpluses."

Well, let's stop, look, and listen before we accept this kind of explanation. In the first place, what Mr. Butz says about 40 years of farm programs simply is not true.

We have had a reasonably well-managed abundance of food and fiber in America, not a "philosophy of scarcity," as Mr. Butz calls it. Our American people have had more and better food to eat, for lower prices, than any great nation in the history of the world.

Mr. Butz says, "For the first time in 40 years, we are being challenged to produce all we can—instead of being threatened not to produce too much."

That's simply not so. Anyone who can remember World War II, and the threatened famine in Europe and Japan afterwards, and the Korean emergency, and the famine in India in the mid-1960's, and the aftermath of the corn leaf blight of 1970 for that matter, knows that's just not so.

We have had an "ever normal granary" for most of the past 40 years. Our reserves of storable farm commodities have saved this nation's neck half a dozen times, and millions of human lives in the process, when

March 18, 1974

we ran into bad weather or emergencies or natural disasters of one kind or another. Year-in and year-out, our reserves of feed grains have helped to stabilize your dairy feed costs, and to protect you against the kind of squeeze you're now going through.

From time to time, we have had to enable farmers to work together, through acreage allotments and marketing quotas and voluntary programs, to check production when supplies began to out-run all conceivable uses. We may very well need to do the same again, some day.

We'd better not be too quick to turn our backs on the past 40 years of experience and the farm programs and the economic philosophy that grew out of it.

The worst thing about what Mr. Butz is saying is the implication that all that's been necessary all along is to take off the farm program wraps and turn farmers loose "to produce all we can". Mr. Butz seems to imply that this is all the farm policy that's needed from now on—to free the farmers "to produce all we can".

You dairy farmers know better than that. Your fathers didn't have any "irksome production controls" when they were being crushed by the Depression of the 1930's. And you didn't either in the 1950's, nor in the 1960's, when low prices drove over half of your neighbors out of the dairy business. Most of you I'm sure know very well that simply getting rid of "artificial price props" as well as being free "to produce all we can" wouldn't have brought you to the Promised Land.

I think the truth of the matter is that the Land is Promised to somebody else, not to farmers. I think the game is to strip away farm price support protection for American farmers, as well as other world farmers, so that when the "bust" comes, as it very well might, the food processors and commodity traders won't have government price support programs getting in their way. This is their game—the game of the international commodity traders and food processors—they profiteer on the farmers in times of "bust" and they profiteer on the consumers in times of "boom" and they don't want interference from price supports and supply management and an "ever-normal granary" food reserve system.

This is the first thing that's fundamentally wrong with the Nixon Administration's trade policy. It's really a policy *against farm price support, not for expansion of trade*.

The second thing that's fundamentally wrong with the Nixon Administration's trade policy is that it works against the things that really cause demand for food in the world to expand.

It's a policy that concentrates on the hole, instead of the doughnut.

Just take a realistic look at where the agricultural export boom of today came from. It didn't happen, as Mr. Butz seems to say, because the Agricultural Act of 1970 turned farmers loose "to produce all we can".

And it didn't come about either by wrecking other farmers' price support programs and driving down their prices and forcing them out of production and taking their markets away.

*Today's farm boom is the direct result of a generation of positive international economic cooperation, led by the U.S.A.*

It was started by the Marshall Plan, right after World War II.

It was given a powerful impetus by the formation and progress of the European Economic Community, which touched off the greatest explosion of prosperity in Western Europe and the Mediterranean Basin that part of the world has ever seen.

It was given further impetus by the Food for Peace Program, which taught the people of Japan to eat American wheat and to drink American milk and to raise chicken meat on American corn and soybeans. Later the process was repeated in Korea and Taiwan and other countries of Asia and South America

and Africa. Soon what started as famine relief advanced to sales for soft currencies and has now arrived at commercial sales for hard cash to the tune of billions of dollars every year.

And don't make it: *Today's farm boom was powerfully speeded on its way by the Kennedy Round of trade agreements in the 1960's.*

It is all too often said that "farmers didn't get anything out of the Kennedy Round".

That's flat wrong. *American farmers were about the biggest winners in the world from the Kennedy Round.*

The trade expansion that resulted from the Kennedy Round stimulated economic growth, and it raised levels of income. It gave higher purchasing power to workers and their families, and that created stronger demand for food and fiber.

These are the reasons why wheat is over \$6 and corn is above \$5 and milk is pushing \$10 per 100 lbs. today.

It's going to take more international cooperation—and a lot of it—to keep farm prices from crashing within months of now.

Some way must be found for both the rich and poor countries of the world to secure adequate supplies of energy, and to pay for it. If that isn't done, the world will be plunged into a massive depression, worse than the 1930's.

If there is depression in Europe, and in Japan, and in the less-prosperous countries which trade with them, then the exporting boom for American farm commodities could evaporate into thin air and crashing farm prices.

The international energy conference held in Washington this month was one of the first hopeful indications that we may escape from a worldwide energy-induced depression.

It's not so much what the conference accomplished, although it was timely and useful. The most hopeful thing about it is what Secretary of State Kissinger said, and is beginning to do, about international cooperation. It represents a 180 degree turnaround from the position that the Nixon Administration has been taking.

One of the most damaging things that's happened in our relations with our traditional allies and trading partners in Europe and Japan has been the Administration has held out for a go-it-alone policy, coupled with an all-out campaign to force other countries' farmers' prices down so we could take away their markets.

This has been a dangerous mistake. Along with bilateral deals with Russia and China, and our export embargoes, and other go-it-alone economic policies, our traditional friendships and alliances and trading partnerships have been seriously eroded. The world has gone far along on a course that is hell-bent for a worldwide economic depression and the American farmers would be the first to be caught in the crash.

Secretary Kissinger's entry on the economic policy scene, as demonstrated in the energy conference, is the first hopeful indication for a long time that we might rehabilitate the pattern of international cooperation that created the longest and richest era of prosperity in world history.

The hopes of American farmers for continuing prosperity ride on the continuation of world prosperity. And it is an ironic thing to have to say, but the hopes for prosperity of American farmers are riding on the back of Henry Kissinger. His principles in the energy conference are precisely the same that the Farmers Union has advocated should be applied in agreements among the trading nations of the world to stabilize and guarantee farm commodity supplies and prices at levels fair both to producers and consumers.

These are the very principles that all of our family of allies and friends among the nations of the world have sought to apply through an international grains agreement,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

an international sugar agreement, and others as needed.

We must hope that Secretary Kissinger will succeed in transforming the Nixon Administration's trade policy into positive action and international cooperation to promote continuing growth of world prosperity and expansion of demand for food.

### PETITION SUBMITTED BY CITIZENS OF 16TH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

#### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a petition just received by me from registered voters and citizens of southeastern Michigan which merits the consideration of my colleagues and the Nation.

#### PETITION

We, the undersigned, as registered voters in the United States, participants in the democratic processes of the State of Michigan and constituents in Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, Washtenaw and Livingston Counties, respectively, submit the following supplication and hope you will approve it in spirit by taking affirmative action.

We have chosen to address our appeal to you as you are our most influential legislator and you speak for us in the day to day portals of democratic government.

Our dilemma is with the energy crisis and the rash of public information, (news releases, editorials, magazines, personal interviews, with experts, personal interviews with non-experts, accusations, counter accusations)—What is truth?

From our own collective experience, we are all in car pools, have lowered our speed, do no pleasure driving—on the other hand, we cannot get normal service such as tire pressure checked, oil checked, battery checked because the line-ups for gasoline are so long that the time involved would cause greater inconvenience to the public in general. If there is a real crisis, why isn't it being handled in an organized, orderly manner, as any other major National crisis would be? Why are we being confused from official sources by the following statements, issued almost back to back.

#### There is a CRISIS

There isn't a crisis, there's a problem  
There is more oil available now than there was one year ago

There is 25% less oil available

There is 10% more oil available

The situation will get better

The situation will get much worse

The oil companies are to blame

The government is to blame

The government had to slow down the economy

The gas station operators are greedy

When gas is \$1.00 a gallon, you can buy all you want anytime

The government is out to get the Auto Companies

The oil companies and the government are in collusion

Michigan's allotment is going to other states (Florida, Illinois, etc)

In the interim, how do you personally suggest we get to our jobs to help keep this economy healthy and avert what looms as a first class depression?

#### LIST OF NAMES

Margaret M. King, Carol Miller, Elaine Sabo, Patricia M. Riffel, Ruth Williams, Shirleen Skrisson, Madonna Campbell, Elizabeth Turemlow, and Mary E. Blackman.

Mary A. Formaz, Patricia N. Knox, Eliza-

beth F. Giorio, Joan Bartlett, Yola Leinart, Darlene Jones, Brenda Learth, Wendy Donnelly, Juanita Sheet, and Ed Lochner.

Jennette C. Gordon, William N. Hunter, Mary K. Burkhardt, Barbara L. Weldon, Doris Miller, Marjorie Sheppard, Mary Gorlewski, Margaret Engel, Marianne R. Hoak, and Celeste F. Druerer.

Eu Heyer, Mary Drift, Marian L. Holloway, Virginia M. Nogel, Mary M. Tata, Davis F. Weinberg, Douglas N. Stimmel, Thomas E. Mells, Fred Karenko, and Henry Haeger.

## AID AND TRADE WITH THE COMMUNISTS

### HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Federal Register, February 6, there appeared on page 4677 a notice by the Department of the Treasury, Office of Foreign Assets Control, that from now on "humanitarian" supplies may be sent to North Vietnam without the requirement that impartial persons observe the distribution of such supplies in accordance with traditional relief practice. Apparently the North Vietnamese Government has refused to admit such impartial observers, and the American Government, in order to aid the Communists, must waive the requirement regarding impartial observers. I include the complete text of the notice in the RECORD at this point:

[Department of the Treasury, Office of Foreign Assets Control]

### HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO NORTH VIETNAM—MODIFICATION OF LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

Notice is hereby given of the following modification in the licensing policies of the Office of Foreign Assets Control with respect to the sending of humanitarian relief assistance to civilians in North Vietnam.

Heretofore, the Office has licensed the sending of medical supplies to these areas for humanitarian relief purposes, provided the assistance was of a type and in an amount designed to fulfill legitimate humanitarian needs. The Office has also required applicants to submit satisfactory assurances that the distribution of such supplies would be witnessed by impartial observers in accordance with traditional relief practice. Applicants have been unable to meet this requirement in most instances because of North Vietnamese refusal to admit impartial observers.

The Office has reconsidered the utility and desirability of this requirement in the current context of humanitarian assistance to North Vietnam, and has decided in this context not to consider such observation to be a general requirement for the issuance of licenses in such cases. However, the possibility of such observation will be considered along with other relevant factors such as the nature and amount of the assistance involved, and the intended end-use, in reaching decisions on applications for licenses of this type.

The unlicensed sending of funds or supplies to these destinations for humanitarian or other purposes whether directly or through a third country, or through an organization in a third country, remains prohibited by the regulations.

STANLEY L. SOMMERFIELD,

Acting Director,

Office of Foreign Assets Control.

[FR Doc. 74-3046 Filed 2-5-74 8:45 am]

## THOUSANDS PROTEST SSI

## HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, thousands of blind, elderly, and disabled men and women are suffering extreme hardships due to the extraordinarily poor implementation of the SSI program by the Social Security Administration. The New York Times ran an article on Saturday reporting on a demonstration, held last Friday, organized by many of these men and women, to protest this unfair treatment. I believe this article, will be of interest to the other Members of Congress and the general public:

THE ELDERLY AND DISABLED PROTEST NEW U.S. PROGRAM

(By Barbara Campbell)

More than 2,000 disabled and elderly people held a rally yesterday in the auditorium at Pace College here to demand emergency funds because, they contended, a new Federal assistance program is not working.

They said that many of them were hungry and afraid they could not pay their rent.

Representative Bella S. Abzug, part of a Congressional delegation investigating the Federal Supplemental Security Income program, which replaced local welfare payments to the elderly, the blind and the disabled, called the program a "bureaucratic nightmare" and a "tragedy for thousands of its intended beneficiaries."

## ARE WE A STIGMA?

Mrs. Abzug, who was received warmly by the crowd—she remained during the entire two-hour rally—said she had introduced four bills to help "alleviate the problems plaguing the operation."

Since the program began, elderly, disabled and blind people have had to stand in long lines in front of Social Security offices, have received checks in the wrong amounts or have received no checks at all. To many, the supplement represents a substantial part of their income.

"How are we older people going to survive?" asked Bella Cutler, who spoke from the floor of the auditorium. "We built this beautiful city, our children fought in the wars and some did not come back. Don't we deserve to live in dignity?"

"As I look around," said another woman from one of the more than 80 different organizations for the elderly at the rally, "I feel ashamed that we have to come here and beg and plead. Are we a stigma on society? Is it a sin to be crippled?"

In a news conference held backstage before the rally, Mrs. Abzug said she would also call for a rent-increase exemption from the city for those receiving Supplemental Security Income, an immediate end to the reductions in Federal payments and an acceleration of "efforts by the Federal Government to locate additional persons who would be eligible for S.S.I. benefits."

Bronx Borough President Robert Abrams and Representative Edward T. Koch also took part in the news conference.

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69

## HON. GUNN McKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 69, the long-awaited education bill, comes

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to the floor of the House, I intend to offer an amendment to title III, the title dealing with payments to federally impacted school districts. It is my understanding that the rule under which this legislation comes to the floor requires only that amendments to title I be printed in advance in the RECORD. However, as a convenience to my colleagues, I am taking this opportunity to set forth the text of my amendment and its purpose:

## AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED

Page 87, beginning with line 18, strike out everything after "provides" down through "resources" in line 19, and insert in lieu thereof "for complete equalization of all local resources on the same support level."

Mr. Speaker, I offer my amendment to correct what I consider to be a problem with the way in which section 304 of H.R. 69 now is written. Section 304 addresses itself to certain problems in the relationship between Public Law 874 payments made to local districts, and State education equalization formulas. However, not all equalization formulas do, in fact, equalize. The bill as written, is too vague to distinguish between those State formulas that provide complete equalization of education, and those that provide only partial equalization. Because of this deficiency in wording, I believe the commendable purpose for which Public Law 874 was amended will not be served.

I believe we will see confusion in State and local governments, and I believe we may see some local districts wrongfully deprived of Public Law 874 moneys which the Congress intended should go to them.

Section 304 of H.R. 69, as reported, provides that—

Payments under this title to local educational agencies in any State may be considered as local resources . . . in computations under a State equalization formula . . . if, as determined by the Secretary, such formula provides appropriate recognition of the relative tax resources per child to be educated which are available to the local educational agencies.

I agree with the intent of this amendment. In States that have equalization of school finance, Public Law 874 moneys which come to the local school district can cause the State formula to be thrown off balance; it can actually result in disequalization of school finance. In such cases, it is appropriate that the State be allowed to consider Public Law 874 payments in computing State aid.

However, as others have pointed out recently, the wording of section 304 is too vague, leaving room for considerable difference of opinion on what constitutes an equalization formula, and what constitutes "appropriate recognition" of relative tax resources. I have had indications already that this vagueness may lead to disputes between local school districts and State education agencies, and may even lead to court action.

Many States have moved ahead with some equalization of their school finances. In a number of these States, certain programs are equalized but the total school program is not equal. In these States, it is inappropriate that the local school districts which receive Public Law 874 funds and rely on them should be deprived of those funds.

March 18, 1974

The State of Utah is equalized with 28 mills for maintenance and operation, which guarantees a certain minimum expenditure per pupil and a minimum local tax rate. There is an additional 10 mill voted local leeway that is partially equalized.

The remaining funds that go into the basic education program, the capital outlay program, and the voted leeway program are not equalized. Thus, there are serious disparities in expenditures per pupil from district to district, with the wealthier districts providing the highest per pupil expenditure. Districts with lower assessed valuations have to make a greater tax effort to generate enough money to educate their students, whereas in districts with greater assessed valuation, a more modest tax effort will generate sufficient funds. A 1 mill increase in the voted leeway raises anywhere from \$3.32 per pupil in Davis County and \$3.84 in Weber County, to \$9.95 in Jordan and \$11.55 in Salt Lake City. The average for the State is \$6.24 per pupil raised through a 1 mill increase on the voted leeway. The districts of Jordan and Salt Lake do not receive much from Public Law 874, but have the opportunity of raising a substantial amount of money through a mill levy, whereas Davis and Weber counties, both heavily impacted, do not have the same opportunity.

The point is, the school finance system in the State of Utah, while being a fine and progressive system, is only partially equalized. It is not equalized according to assessed valuation, that is, local resources. It would be an injustice in such a situation to remove Public Law 874 moneys from the impacted districts with low assessed valuation and distribute them throughout the State. To insure that this does not happen in my State and in other States where State aid to education is only partially equalized, I offer my amendment.

I believe my amendment provides a better definition of equalization and clarifies congressional intent—rather than leaving important determinations to the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I hope my colleagues will join in support of this amendment.

## A SEASONAL RENEWAL

## HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly a year ago I reported to the Members of the House of Representatives on a trip I made to the Congress Heights section of the District of Columbia. I went to learn more about this Federal City, particularly the often-forgotten area of Anacostia across the river. I hoped to increase my knowledge because I had recently become a member of the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

Back in March of 1973 I reported on my visit to a community group then housed in an office on Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue; in a recreation cen-

ter at the Linda Pollin apartments; in a special office with staff working out of rooms at Hart Junior High School. The Mission of Community Concern is the name for this group of professionals and volunteers who then provided and continue to provide special educational programs for dropouts and truants, students with special educational problems; also social services reaching out to the families; athletic, recreational, and enrichment facilities for the more than 1,200 students registered at the Linda Pollin Center. All of this, I was surprised to note, was being accomplished on a meager Federal funding plus a great amount of donated services, facilities, etc. I credited, as I continue to, Father Shane MacCarthy, the president of the mission, with the financial wizardry to accomplish all that was being done. He is ably assisted by Will Hudgins, the executive director.

Last Friday I was honored to participate in the opening of an additional facility for the mission. It was a Giant Food Store, located at Atlantic and South Capitol, SE., and Giant donated it to the mission. Then McDonald's offered to refurbish and renovate. I think the philosophy of both companies cogently put by the McDonald's representative at Friday's opening when he said they thought it time businesses returned to the community some of the money they made there.

So Friday was a special day of celebration. Now the mission can greatly expand the alternative education program they have commenced with 39 students who need, and receive, special, individualized education. Education that does not rely on the textbooks they have rejected or cannot use, but which uses daily materials, like newspapers, to begin and expand their educational experience. Some of these students are sent over by the courts, some are referred from schools, others walk in off the streets. Here is an effort to not only salvage the lives of these young people, but to offer a model throughout the city for alternative education. Ms. Sizemore, superintendent of education, was unable to be at the formal opening on Friday, but she had written me that she wished she could be there and indicated her interest in the alternative education center as well as her favorable impression with what was underway there.

Several hundred people went to the center on Friday to listen to the Hart Junior High School band perform and to enjoy the beautiful and inspiring gospel chorus group from that same school. Following a benediction by the Rev. Aaron McCombs, pastor of Paramount Baptist Church, Father MacCarthy introduced several who spoke briefly. Mr. Michael Dana, special assistant to the Commissioner of the Office of Youth Services of HEW congratulated the mission group on the new center and brought the congratulations and kind regards of Stan Thomas, Assistant Secretary, Office of Human Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. HEW has been the principal financial support of the mission.

Mr. Dana was followed by the Rev. Raymond Kemp, a member of the Dis-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

trict of Columbia school board who was enthusiastic about the promise of the alternative education center as a model for the District. I spoke briefly about the enthusiasm of all those associated with the center and the significance of what was being done there and I was followed by Congressman FAUNTROY who delivered a moving "thank you" to all who had taken interest in making this center and its affiliates happen. Senator BIRCH BAYH, my colleague from Indiana, was back home in Indiana, but he sent a telegram of congratulations and best wishes along with his own praise for what has been accomplished by this dedicated group.

Cosmo Williams, representing McDonald then gave the keys of the center to Valentine Burroughs, social service director and we feasted on McDonald's fried chicken, some of the best I have ever eaten.

At a time in our national history when there is so much pessimism, frustration about us, it is specially satisfying and even healing to visit with people like those with whom I spent the day on Friday. They are people who are interested in the lives of children, and through those children reach into the lives of their parents, and their community. They give their all to this purpose, with no financial reward, but with the reward of knowing that they are changing the future for us all. They have my full respect and support. I find that each time I visit them I sense a renewal. I hope that they will pass this on to our whole community along with their interesting and valuable new program in alternative education, an adjunct to their youth services system.

### DRUG TRIP TO TURKEY

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Congressman LESTER WOLFF and I have just returned from a 4-day trip to Turkey where we discussed the possible resumption of opium poppy production with high Turkish officials. In our meetings with the Foreign Minister and Members of Parliament, we expressed our deepest concern over the potential deadly effects if Turkey once again permits opium cultivation.

It is clear that the ban, in full effect since mid-1972, has reduced both the quantity and quality of heroin available on the streets of America. In exchange for the ban, the United States agreed to pay \$35.7 million to compensate the Turkish farmers and to encourage crop substitution projects. Tragically, much of that money has not been turned over to Turkey yet and little of the money already paid has filtered down to the Turkish farmers themselves.

Following our conferences with Turkish officials, we were assured that there will be no spring planting of poppies this year. But time is fast running out. Seeds are being germinated on Government farms for possible use in the future, and a fall planting is still a dangerous reality.

If action does not soon take place, the insidious "French connection" will be back in full swing, and addiction will again skyrocket in all the Harlems of America.

The truth is that we are on a confrontation path with the newly elected Government of Turkey. That Government came to power only a few months ago, ousting the military regime which originally imposed the ban. This new Government was elected through the support of rural areas and it feels a commitment to help the farmers by allowing poppy production.

The likelihood of this confrontation has grown due to State Department bungling. Until a week before our departure, Congressman WOLFF and I were assured by the State Department that rumors of an end to the ban were simply rumors, nothing more. That was not true. We were allowed to believe that newspaper reports of a shift in Turkish policy were merely campaign rhetoric. That was not true. We were led to believe by the State Department that the Turkish Government was not seriously considering lifting the opium poppy ban. That, too, was not true. This misinformation from the State Department—the very agency responsible for negotiating international agreements—is jeopardizing the chance of successfully renegotiating the American agreement to compensate Turkey for ending poppy cultivation.

To further complicate this delicate situation, American pharmaceutical companies with visions of higher profits have visited Turkey seeking an end to the ban. At the present time, however, India is producing legal opium for pharmaceutical use under the watchful eye of the International Narcotics Control Board. There is no valid medical need for Turkish opium.

We are requesting meetings with the President and the Secretary of State to discuss this most urgent problem. Personal diplomacy by Secretary Kissinger may be needed to insure that Turkey does not resume production of this deadly crop.

In view of the large amount of foreign aid which Turkey receives from the United States, and in view of the requirement that aid be cut off to countries which do not adequately fight drug traffic, we believe that it is in the best interest of both countries to continue the ban on opium poppies.

### WAYNE SHARP RECEIVES DESERVED RECOGNITION

#### HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Wayne Sharp was recently selected to participate in the Federal executive development program. His selection, along with 24 other Federal employees, culminated a rigorous selection process. This was indeed a deserved and an outstanding recognition.

I include a report on the selection of

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 18, 1974

Mr. Sharp, who is a resident of the district I represent. The report follows:

## WAYNE SHARP SELECTED FOR EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Wayne Sharp, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Foreign Commodity Analysis, and former agricultural attache to Guatemala, has been selected to participate in the newly created Federal Executive Development Program, sponsored by the OMB.

The program is a special year-long series of development experiences designed to prepare the participants for executive assignments. The competitive, government-wide procedure for selection included supervisory appraisals, an assessment center exercise, and a thorough review of the employee's record. Wayne is one of 25 Federal employees and the only one from USDA selected for the program.

Born in Dallas and raised on a ranch near San Angelo, Texas, Wayne graduated from Texas A&M in 1962 with a B.S. degree in range management with a minor in economics. He continued his education at Texas A&M, and received an M.S. degree in agricultural economics in 1964. While pursuing his master's degree, he received a Meritorious Research Award from the American Agricultural Economics Association for his master's thesis. In 1968, he was awarded his Ph.D. in agricultural economics from Michigan State.

Wayne first came to USDA in 1965 as an agricultural economist for ERS. After completing his doctorate, he returned to USDA in 1968, this time as an agricultural economist in FAS's Livestock and Meat Products Division. In 1970 he was named an attache to Guatemala. He returned from his post in September 1972 to assume duties as Deputy Assistant Administrator.

Wayne will begin initial training at the Federal Executive Institute, Charlottesville, Virginia, in early March.

## SOCIAL SECURITY CHECK INCREASE TRIGGERS VETERANS BENEFIT DECREASE

## HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced legislation, H.R. 12787, to prevent increases in monthly social security checks from decreasing or totally abolishing pension benefits for veterans and their dependents.

Immediate action must be taken to guarantee recipients of veterans' pensions that they will get both the social security and veterans benefits we in Congress intended. It is cruel and unjust to turn around and slap the veterans in the face with this legal loophole which is forcing them to consider and apply for welfare to survive the crush of soaring prices.

The following letter, from a veteran in Burlingame, Calif., is one of many I have received from the concerned veterans of our Nation confronted by this critical situation. I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time and urge those of my colleagues not cosponsoring my legislation to do so today.

The text follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRINGTON: I am a veteran of War II—having served 39 hard months of my healthier life during the Japanese conflict . . . I returned to my former occupation as landscape gardener, not once

did I take advantage of any veterans' benefits offered me. I worked mostly for millionaires maintaining their large estates without any benefits such as: unemployment insurance, no income taxes withheld, etc.

Incidentally, I was sick after learning that my government refused to sign into law the unemployment insurance and withholding of taxes and all during my working years I could not have enough money each month for taxes due to the high cost of living, and come tax time I was usually forced to a loan shark for money to pay my taxes and forever in debt all because of a few of your fellow colleagues who refused to put the stamp of approval on laws protecting the scores of steadily employed domestics. I wish the government could force the rich to pay their share of taxes and less putting on \$250,000 golf tournaments, etc., maybe we would have to add to the back to help our veterans who gave their sweat, blood, etc., to make this country what it stands for.

Just a year ago I was forced to quit my work because of Chronic Pulmonary Emphysema, arthritis, and bursitis. I applied for my Social Security and Veterans Pensions, since I had to drop my health insurance and life insurance due to the lack of funds and with unemployment insurance or state disability which certainly would have helped me somewhat pay my insurance premiums. I am grateful for the help they have given me, but the pension is far from enough to support my ill wife and myself with my staggering monthly medical bills which usually run about \$100 a month which includes a Mark 7 respirator, oxygen and medicine which I use 7 to 10 times daily. My wife and I reside in an apartment a stones' throw from the busy Bay Shore Freeway with nothing but terrible smog which is worsening my emphysema. We had planned to move to the coast nearer the ocean so I can breathe easier, but due to the very high rental fees am just trapped to die here unless Congress gives us disabled vets more money along with the proposed increase in Social Security. I see no reason why veterans pensions couldn't equal Social Security payments which would really be a tremendous help. With all millionaires paying their fair share of taxes and less large sums of give away money to the rest of the world I am quite sure there is enough money for the financial means for the disabled and the poor.

Thank you, Congressman, for taking your important time to read my letter, and also to thank you once again for your support for the disabled veterans.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR L. HOLTZBAUER.

## ST. FRANCIS COLLEGE MARATHON TEAM

## HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the College of St. Francis in my hometown of Joliet, Ill., has produced the first collegiate marathon team in the United States.

The idea was conceived by Tom Brunick, a 23-year-old rookie coach. In 1 year it has won national recognition and has been hailed by the World Marathon Association as one of the "most innovative running programs in the country."

Mr. Brunick's success is even more impressive if you consider the odds he faced when he became coach in the fall of 1972. At that time, St. Francis had no reputation in men's athletics. In fact, it

barely had men since it had gone from all women to co-ed only 2 years before. The school had no running track, offered no track scholarships, and could not begin to finance a full-scale track program.

To develop a full track program, it would have cost St. Francis \$60,000 for scholarships, travel, and equipment plus the price of building a running track.

Mr. Brunick realized that the only way to beat the cost and still have the national caliber team he dreamed of was to focus on a specialty no other college offered. The answer was a marathon team.

Now, St. Francis offers five half-scholarships, travels first class all the way, and still only spends \$12,000. Its training ground consists of the roads and hills surrounding the campus and costs the school nothing.

Although many collegiate distance programs have used marathons, none has ever carried it to the point of making it a varsity sport. Most coaches have opposed marathons and road races for fear they would detract from their indoor track programs. As a result, a runner is lucky if he competes in one a season.

Mr. Brunick believes there should be a place for the average distance runner who likes to run the roads and marathons but seldom gets the chance on a collegiate basis. His program provides that place.

The program he designed begins with a traditional cross-country season running from September to November. Then instead of a track season, a new marathon season follows comprised of four marathons spaced out over a period from December to June.

In addition, Mr. Brunick launched a new intercollegiate road racing season starting in January and continuing through March. Races are 5 to 15 miles long and are scored like cross-country meets.

As many of my colleagues may know, the first marathon was run in Greece in 490 B.C. and became a classic event. Today, however, many experts feel that marathon events in this country lack the quality and enthusiasm that this classic distance deserves.

Coach Brunick's program, with its special appeal to small colleges like St. Francis, is already creating renewed interest in marathons. Hopefully, his success will lead other colleges to specialize in this event and this classic will be restored to its former place of esteem.

The following editorial from "Runners World," the bible of distance fans, adds substance to that hope:

## NEW SCHOOL OF ROAD RACING

Innovation often comes from unexpected places—like tiny College of St. Francis in Joliet, Ill. This winter, the school's running coach Tom Brunick will add road racing as a varsity sport, in addition to the regular cross-country and track programs.

St. Francis will have a separate road team, thought to be the first of its kind. Brunick says, "I know there have been other collegiate long distance running programs which have used marathons, but none has ever gone so far as making road racing an intercollegiate sport."

Brunick outlines his plans:

"The program consists of the traditional cross-country season which runs from September to mid-November. After that, we will get into something entirely new. Instead of a track season, we will have a marathon

season comprised of four marathons—North Central in December, St. Louis in March, Drake Relays in April and the NAIA championship in June.

"We have set up a period from January through March in which we will take to the roads against other colleges. Races will be 5-15 miles, and will be scored like cross-country meets."

The main reason for the new program the coach says, "is not to attract big names to the school or big publicity, but rather to provide a program for the average distance runner, the guy who likes to run the roads but very seldom gets the chance when he's in college."

The idea's time has come. It was inevitable that colleges would sanction road racing teams. To Tom Brunick's credit, it happened to start at his school, and others are sure to join.

Road training brought it on. College and high school runners have been training on the roads for years. Many of them have raced there during the summer, and have either liked it better or found more success there than on the track.

Cross-country is the common meeting ground for track and road racers. But the winter and spring divide them again into short or long. Until recently, student-runners have had to go shorter to stay with their teams or longer and leave them.

The runners at Fullerton State faced that choice last year. They had won the NCAA college division cross-country championship. Three of the best runners preferred road racing to track. Doug Schmenk and Dave White had run 2:17 marathons, and Mark Covert was just over 2:20.

Schmenk, now the AAU marathon champion, said in the July '73 *RW*, "The coach doesn't dig this marathoning. He complimented our 2:17s with the infamous quote, '2:17 doesn't score points at the nationals.' But our success lies in the marathon, so that must be the direction we take."

Such resistance from coaches, though crudely stated, is understandable. They don't want to lose their most effective point scorers. If they feel that way, though, there's a simple solution. Make the marathon (or other shorter road races) scoring events, held in connection with big track meets.

The small-college NAIA already had done that. The marathon has been part of that group's national meet for two years now. Tom Brunick's St. Francis runners will be racing there next spring at the end of their road running season.

The NCAA hasn't yet come around, but this is not to imply that the coaches in that organization are against the idea. They have been talking for three years of adding a national collegiate marathon championship.

Hal Higdon thinks all the college championships will soon have road races. "This will come about not through pressure from coaches with axes to grind," he writes in a college coaching journal, "but as a natural recognition that this is where a lot of our runners are already at."

Once the NCAA gives its blessing, look out established older road racers! Young students usually train more than older specialists, have more basic speed, more free time, and less fear of distance and pace because of their background and youth.

It shouldn't be long before the national collegiate rulers go with the tide. The USTFF, an appendage of the big colleges, has held a marathon for several years now—the most recent one in Wichita, Kans., in June. The college-oriented Drake and Kansas Relays have had marathons, too. And the Penn and Kansas Relay meets joined the trend.

The change, for the most part, is evolving peacefully and quickly. The main problem has been how to fit this healthy and growing adopted child into the small overall scheme

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of things—to benefit both individual runners and the schools' programs.

In his article on college road racing Higdon made several suggestions. The first was to spread the emphasis around, don't center all the attention on the marathon itself, but give the other long distance a piece of the action. Then give road racing a season of its own.

"The next logical step, or perhaps concurrent one," Higdon writes, "will be the development of road racing a third rate sport, separate from cross-country or track and field."

"Word has it that the NCAA may schedule its inevitable marathon championship in December in a warm-climate state. This certainly is preferable to tossing the race in as an adjunct to the June track and field championships. But the December date would cause NCAA road running to become merely a tack-on to its cross-country program."

There are definite advantages of having a road race attached to track championships, mainly the team scoring aspect mentioned earlier. Making the marathon an event-for-points might break down lingering resistance from coaches.

But Higdon makes a good case for a winter-early spring season. He says, "I think an NCAA marathon championship might more logically come in early spring as a climax to a winter of outdoor road racing. There are several reasons for this.

"One is that racing more than two miles on a small indoor track is an act of insanity. It not only causes blisters, but also boredom. Second, it is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve the volume necessary for success as a long distance runner totally while remaining indoors. The risk of injury from running constantly around in circles far exceeds the risk of frostbite."

Regardless of final format, we have to start by lobbying for road races as collegiate championships. The teams like St. Francis' will follow, with full-scale programs (encompassing all distances above six miles) lasting a full season (at least the winter and early spring).

Then we start working on the high schools . . .

### "IMPACTED" AID NEEDS OVERHAULING

#### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, for all practical purposes Montgomery County, Md., has the highest median household income among the United States' approximately 3,000 counties. Its figure of \$16,708 is exceeded only by Hinsdale County, Colo. Montgomery County has 522,809 people and Hinsdale County only 203—1970 census figures—so the Maryland area is, indeed, the most prosperous in the Nation.

Its figure is so high primarily because thousands of well-paid Federal employees live there, our National Capital having been right next door to it since 1800. Despite the proximity which has attracted such affluent people, who contribute substantially to the tax coffers of the county and its numerous local governments, Montgomery County receives millions of dollars additionally each year because it has been designated as an impacted area.

The impact is not new, sudden, or overwhelming as the District of Columbia as presently constituted was originally a part of the State of Maryland. Every President of the United States except the first one has resided in the District and every Congress from the 7th to the 93d has met in Washington, D.C. The huge growth of the Federal Government that has occurred through the years has been of tremendous benefit to Montgomery County rather than a detriment.

A table that I am submitting for the RECORD shows that Montgomery County, Md., received more money from sections 2, 3, and 4 of Public Law 81-874 than did all the other 17 Montgomery counties put together. Payments to local education agencies cover the following items:

Section 2. Reduction in local revenue by reason of acquisition of real property by the United States.

Section 3. Education of children who reside on Federal property or reside with a parent employed on Federal property.

Section 4. Sudden and substantial increases in the number of pupils in average daily attendance as a direct result of activities of the United States carried on directly or through a contractor.

Payments for financial assistance to local education agencies for the education of low-income families, while a part of Public Law 81-874, are not included in the above-mentioned table.

Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a Federal program which needed overhauling it is the impacted aid program.

The table follows:

TABLE

County	Net payment final 1970-71	Net payment estimated 1971-72
Montgomery County, Ala.	\$794,978	\$909,688
Montgomery County, Ark.	30,640	32,053
Montgomery County, Ga.		
Montgomery County, Ill.		
Montgomery County, Ind.		
Montgomery County, Iowa		
Montgomery County, Kans.	51,480	42,403
Montgomery County, Ky.	14,297	14,754
Montgomery County, Md.	5,598,947	6,289,767
Montgomery County, Miss.		
Montgomery County, Mo.		
Montgomery County, N.Y.	39,384	34,865
Montgomery County, N.C.		
Montgomery County, Ohio	2,791,877	2,933,951
Montgomery County, Pa.	262,810	242,009
Montgomery County, Tenn.	477,205	519,072
Montgomery County, Tex.	38,444	45,105
Montgomery County, Va.	150,642	156,115
Total.	10,250,704	11,220,783
Montgomery County, Md.	5,598,947	6,289,765
Remaining 17 counties	4,651,757	4,931,016

THE PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS DECLARES THE PRINCIPAL AIM OF POLONIA TO BE POLISH INDEPENDENCE

#### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in a speech delivered on September 16, 1973, before the Illinois division of the Polish Amer-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ican Congress on the occasion of the anniversary of the Soviet Union's 1929 invasion of Poland, Mr. Aloysius A. Mazewski, president of the Polish American Congress, discussed the Polish American communities' attitudes toward the Polish nation, as opposed to the Communist Government of Poland.

The Polish American Congress is a highly influential organization among Americans of Polish heritage. We can all be proud of the outstanding work rendered by this organization.

The position expounded by President Mazewski is particularly relevant at this time, due to the significant increase in exchange between the United States and Poland, both on the official and the people-to-people levels. President Mazewski's speech constitutes an important statement, one which should be seriously studied by all Americans, irrespective of descent and heritage.

I commend excerpts of his speech to the attention of all my colleagues, particularly the members of the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs. Excerpts from the speech follow:

## TOWARDS THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE POLISH NATION

(By Aloysius A. Mazewski)

During its tragic yet glorious history, the Polish nation became hardened and developed effective tools to fight for its very existence. One of the most important of them is emigration, which became a national institution. Being beyond the reach of the occupying and partitioning powers the emigration speaks to the world on matters about which the captive nation must remain silent. Thus, consecutive emigrations became the "soul" of the nation.

This division of purposes remains valid, since even though we can visit our relatives in Poland, the country is not independent. The Polish nation does not decide matters affecting its life; it has no influence on the foreign policy and alliances which are made in its name by a government named by the Moscow-controlled Politburo of the Communist Party.

There are those who insist that by speaking about Poland's colonial position and by criticizing the government which has been forced upon the Polish nation, we harm Poland. They are wrong. It's a lie, cunningly planted by the communist propaganda. Our sisters and brothers in Poland want us to tell the world the truth about their fate; they want us to explain that the views of the regime's diplomatic representatives are diametrically opposed to their own views; that Russian economic exploitation causes chronic lack of basic commodities; that the Polish army does not belong in Czechoslovakia or on the Chinese border.

Those who say that we may criticize all Communists except Polish Communists are also wrong. A Communist is a Communist regardless of nationality. Every Communist is an enemy of freedom, wanting to introduce the dictatorship of the Party clique. And Polish Communists are no better than others.

They are Moscow's instruments, they are the Kremlin's quislings in Poland. We may be thankful that not everybody is a Communist.

We can help Poland by a firm anti-communist stand and a critical view of the Warsaw regime. On the basis of my personal experience I can assure you that the President of the United States would not respect demands of people friendly to a government hostile to the United States. However, when critics of the Warsaw government demand, for instance, the removal of the ban on the sale of refinery equipment, the President and

the State Department treat the matter seriously and favorably.

We would achieve more, if in the most important matters we would speak with one voice, if we would not fritter energy and means away. It is not a question of unanimity of opinion, which would be as dangerous as anarchy. We can differ in the selections of ways and methods. However, when a majority reaches a decision, we should conform to that decision, even if it is contrary to our personal viewpoint.

We rejoice in any improvements in Poland, no matter how small. But we may not forget our principal aim—independence. Before we attain it, our obligation is to facilitate the survival of the nation. There are different ways to accomplish this: individual and group help, commercial and cultural exchange, tourism, etc. Those are important means, but the most important is pressure brought to bear on the Warsaw regime to force concessions for the Polish people. For instance: consent for more churches in new suburbs; relaxed censorship of the press and publishing houses; no interference in the religious education of young people; maintenance of historical monuments and art treasures; rescue from destruction and return to the people of the famous Racławice Panorama, which decays in a cellar; discontinued censorship of letters and lowering of the duty on parcels from abroad.

The national temperament and tradition did not adapt us to arduous, everyday work. We prefer heroic deeds, after which we rest on our laurels. But the time for heroism and holocaust is passed. What is left to us is hard work without quick results and brilliant successes. We must do it, however. The Polish nation which waits and watches expects it from us.

We must be victorious in the fight for independence and we will.

## JOBS AND THE "ENERGY CRISIS": TWO EXAMPLES OF IMPACT

## HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we know that the energy crisis—real or contrived—is directly responsible for a rise in unemployment across the Nation.

The Atlanta Inquirer issue of March 9 focuses on two groups adversely affected by the crisis. In one group are the employees of gasoline stations operated by black people in Atlanta. Since last summer, the newspaper observes, dozens of these stations have been forced to close down. At the remaining 134 stations, lay-offs are commonplace. Thus, both the independent black businessmen operating these small enterprises, and many of their employees and their families, are victims of the crisis, and this has a harmful impact on the entire community.

The second group consists of former prisoners seeking work. As the Inquirer article says, in these days it is hard enough to find a job with a "clean nose." "But with a prison record, it comes close to being a miracle."

I submit the following two articles by Ernest M. Pharr and Boyd Lewis for the RECORD:

March 18, 1974

## GAS CRISIS FORCING LAYOFFS AT BLACK DEALERS' STATIONS

(By Ernest M. Pharr)

Gasoline prices continue to skyrocket, dealers are getting about a third less allotments than a year ago, station hours are much shorter, consumers may be paying 65 cents a gallon for regular by May. . . .

And the situation has forced layoffs at the 134 stations currently operated by Blacks in Atlanta. (The number of stations operated by Blacks was higher a year ago but, since summer '73, several dozen that were in operation are now only "shells.")

One Southwest Atlanta owner, out of gas for about four days in December and a week before the end of February, told the Inquirer he has had to lay off some on his evening shift (three persons) and two of six at his auto parts business "and they haven't been able to find employment yet."

Open 16 and a half hours before the "crisis," the owner is now open for about 11 hours "and, for March, 74, I'm getting only 63 per cent of the gas I got a year ago. We've been cut 37 per cent."

That owner, like so many others, is limiting all his customers to \$5 purchases. Some others have \$3 limits and almost everybody with post-1972 cars is scrambling for regular gas, at current prices of 53.9 for regular, 57.9 for premium. One Monroe Drive independent, open last Sunday, was selling premium for 63 cents and regular for 57.

Some dealers say Atlantans will "probably" be paying 65 cents a gallon for regular by May, but speculate the price may "go down a little" this summer with less need for heating fuel and an expected end to the Arab embargo. But, don't expect to see the 35 cents a gallon again.

## IT'S ROUGH

Frank Monteith, who operates a 24-hour Gulf station (no gas on Sundays) at 1-20 and Hill Street and who is president of the Metro Atlanta Service Station Dealers Association, said his group will take a look at the unemployment situation when they meet Sunday.

Dealers, he said, have had to cut back on help "because you're pumping gas all the time and there's little time for other services. We provide employment for people—ex-cons, the unskilled—who can't get jobs other places. They're going to be the first people to commit crimes to make a living."

"It's rough on us," he said. "When our volume is cutback, we have to cut down on our help. Some guys are practically running their stations by themselves; they can't even afford a mechanic. Everybody has had to lay off people."

## UNSYMPATHETIC PUBLIC

The public, Monteith says, is not as "sympathetic to dealers as they should be. If they drive in and we have no gas, they say why the hell don't you close up, (but) you've got to do something to stay alive. Gasoline just barely pay, or does not pay, expenses; it all depends on the volume." Monteith's station gets a lot of night traffic from Grady Hospital and the Police Department.

"But if you don't have gasoline, people just keep on going."

He predicts more stations will be closed "because the oil companies buy by how much volume is being done. They aren't interested in whether a man stays in business or not."

"The price is going to stay up, it's not gonna come down. Oil companies need money to do explorations, they say. The market might even get glutted in a year or so, but the price will stay up."

Stations without gasoline feel the crunch from laying off employees all the way down to vending machines. If there's no gas, people don't stop to buy cigarettes, cookies, aspirin and the like.

Another dealer, in business for more than 20 years said the "economy is worse than I

have ever witnessed. It's affecting many other businesses. Look at the price of milk going up because there's a scarcity of plastics.

"I just hope," he concluded, "Nixon has some sort of feeling for this country and realizes he is no longer an effective president."

## RATIONING

Tuesday, it was announced Georgia may have gas rationing by April 1 on the "odd-even, no gas if over half tank" plan. Gasless stations a week before the end of the shortest month led to thoughts of a ? ? ? March.

And customers complaining during February's dying days: "I had to go to five stations before I found some gas."

ENERGY CRUNCH HURTS JOB-FINDING PROGRAM FOR EX-OFFENDERS  
(By Boyd Lewis)

What with the energy crisis, sagging economy and all, it's hard enough finding a job with a "clean nose". But with a prison record, it comes close to being a miracle.

Assistance to Offenders, Inc., has been trying to open society's doors to readmit the ex-offender in Atlanta for 16 months now.

Jim Pace, director of ATO, knows first hand how society treats the former offenders. He is an alumnus of the Georgia State Penitentiary at Reidsville, Ga.

"All kinds of jobs are available out there," Pace told the Inquirer in an interview Monday at ATO's offices at 848 Peachtree St. NE. "But they're the kind that pay \$2.25 to \$2.75 an hour."

"The job market right now is not too good at all, to put it mildly. A few months ago it was fairly easy if you had any work experience at all to get a job paying \$3 an hour." Pace continued. "But now most of these places are laying off workers."

## CRISIS CUT JOBS

The energy crisis has cut deep into available jobs for ex-cons who use the program as a source of job referrals, the ATO director said.

A tire manufacturing plant said they couldn't hire, in fact they were laying off present workers because their raw materials—made from petroleum products—just weren't getting through. A company which always had hired welders to make transport for new cars at General Motors has also been laying off because new cars aren't selling like they had been.

"Trainee jobs are especially suffering now," Pace said, "because employers can now pick from people who have experience already."

Bill Crawford, ATO's assistant director, said that before the energy shortages became severe late in 1973 that many Atlanta area employers were willing to "bend over a little" to give ex-offenders an employment opportunity.

Businessmen realized that without a steady job, men who spent time in prison would risk going back by returning to criminal activities to survive.

"Of all the companies I've approached, only one flatly refused to hire," Crawford said. "Very rarely do we get a straight out refusal from employers. But there are variations on how far they are willing to go to hire an ex-offender."

Pace said the average person he and ATO assist has limited education, little work experience and spotty work records although some men (who served time for embezzlement and forgery) have outstanding backgrounds.

Jobs for the average person who comes to ATO are mostly in food services at present, Pace continued. "There was only one man we couldn't get a job for within a week. Few of them tell us that if they can't get a job that they would go back to crime and we've never had a man through here who has gone back to prison."

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## NEW HAMPSHIRE'S VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER MISS LISA BONENFANT

## HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as Miss Lisa Bonenfant of Epsom, N.H., so effectively points out in her prize-winning Voice of Democracy Essay, "A Country Is Only as Strong as Her People," one of the strengths of our great Nation is an informed electorate including just such outstanding young people as Miss Bonenfant.

Sometimes we seem to forget that freedom cannot be separated from responsibility without endangering freedom itself. Freedom cannot and must not be taken for granted lest it be lost forever.

In her essay for the New Hampshire Veterans of Foreign Wars contest known as the Voice of Democracy, Miss Bonenfant very effectively set forth the responsibilities that must attend the preservation of freedom in America. That Miss Bonenfant possesses insight beyond her years was recognized in her winning first prize in New Hampshire and I commend her remarks to readers of the RECORD:

## MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

As a citizen, my primary responsibility is to myself and to my convictions. A true citizen does not see one side of an issue and blindly follow it. He must have an open mind and do what his conscience directs. Then, he must build up his convictions and not be afraid to voice his opinion. There are too many people who claim to be faithful citizens because they abide by consensus opinion. With this comes blind patriotism, and above all, a loss of individuality.

Not only is respect for my own convictions necessary, but also respect for the convictions of others. Known as "The Great Melting Pot", America has a mixture of peoples, and along with that mixture comes a mixture of ideas. To reject others' opinions and count them wrong because they don't agree with mine would be taking away another's freedom and would show a closed mind on my part. In order to formulate convictions, it is necessary to listen to the opinions of others and, in that way, my mind will open and my convictions will become stronger, being based on sounder reasoning.

In voting, convictions play a major role. It is hard, in a way, to understand why some people don't vote. Some believe that their vote doesn't count; others refuse to go to the polls out of sheer indifference. I believe there are no valid excuses to avoid voting. Voting is not only an honor, it is a duty. An involved citizen also knows who and what he's voting for. Many people vote for a candidate either on personality or personal appearance. These very same people a few months later, complain the loudest about the very man they voted for. If people actually listened to what politicians say, they would find out that many are noncommittal and rather contradictory. Yes, it is the duty of every person to vote, but it is also the duty of every responsible citizen to understand how big this responsibility is.

Along with my convictions I have an obligation to abide by the laws of the country. But above that, I have an obligation to understand what these laws say. It is the belief of some that laws hinder freedom. I

believe laws preserve freedom. Without these guards the freedom and rights of others would be ignored. A country cannot exist without laws to protect its citizens. Because many people also do not understand the laws which they abide by, they misinterpret the laws and become blind patriots.

It is necessary for a country's citizens to be constantly aware of the importance of unity among her people. Indifference, shirking of responsibility, and prejudice all help to pull a country apart. A country is only as strong as her people, but I think it is better to say a country is only as strong as the bond of unity existing within it. To be able to see a country's weaknesses is good, but that's only a beginning. To realize a nation's assets and take a stand to preserve them is the mark of an involved citizen.

## THE ECONOMICS OF ENERGY

## HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, Interior Secretary Morton, in a recent address to the Drug, Chemical, and Allied Trades Association in New York City has provided a good analysis of some of the economics of the current energy crisis. Secretary Morton outlines a legislative action program which I commend to my colleagues and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD include this address as follows:

## REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ROGERS C. B. MORTON

I want to talk about three things this evening. First, I am going to talk about prices. Second, I want to say something about market controls. And last, I want to talk about some actions needed to deal with the problems of high prices and short supplies in the energy industries.

First, prices. Inflation. The Cost of Living. Whatever the name used to describe the condition, it's about as popular as a case of the flu. Everybody suffers, some more so than others. And, like so many other things, the indignation—and the remedies, very often—are directed to the wrong target.

Price rises perform the same service as pain. They hurt. They announce that something is wrong in the system. And they urgently demand attention.

But the pain is not the basic problem, and neither is the price rise. Both are symptoms of a basic disorder that requires treatment. Price rises are the normal response to any condition where demand exceeds the available supply. More than that, they provide the remedy to the problem by discouraging demand and encouraging supply. But because it is so often a painful remedy there is the temptation to direct the treatment to the symptom rather than the disease, by trying to stop the movement of price. What happens—and we've acquired considerable experience in this—is that very shortly after tight price controls are imposed, shortages and dislocations appear. Eventually these inflict more pain than the prices, so the price controls eventually have to be relaxed. Then you get all the price increases you would have had during the period of controls, plus the price rises that the controls themselves produce—and maybe some more caused by people scrambling to lay in supplies of scarce goods just in case they are taken off the shelves by more price controls in the future.

So we come to lesson No. 1. Our problem is

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 18, 1974

not prices. It is the inability of supply to keep pace with demand.

Right now we are having problems with both high prices and shortages in petroleum products. We can properly blame the high prices on the Arab nations, who are getting something between \$7 and \$9 a barrel for oil that costs them 10 or 15 cents. The tax-paid cost of Persian Gulf oil has quadrupled in the past year.

But we have a lot to answer for on our own account in the case of the shortage. The basic cause of our energy problems today is the decay of the domestic oil and gas industry. There are a number of reasons for this decline, which all come down to the single fact that there wasn't enough return on oil and gas production in the United States to bring out the levels of investment that were needed to find new supplies. This condition was caused by the inability of domestic oil and gas prices to move to levels that would attract the needed amounts of investment. First, there was the imposition of Federal controls on the wellhead pricing of natural gas sold in the interstate market. We attempted to substitute the wisdom of bureaucrats for the wisdom of a free market place in setting the proper value for natural gas. We did the same thing for domestic crude oil, indirectly, by jawboning and political intimidation of producers through most of the 1960's, to the point where the price of crude oil was virtually flat during the whole period. It didn't even rise as much as the regulated price of natural gas.

The result was that the price of oil and natural gas ceased to have any relationship to the rising cost of finding new reserves to replace those being used up. Demand was stimulated by the artificially low prices, and producers found better things to do with their money than to put it into more exploration for domestic oil and gas. Exploration, drilling, discoveries, and additions to proved reserves fell off year after year, and finally we began to have shortages in both oil and gas. When we found we couldn't meet these shortages with domestic supplies, we began rapidly to increase our dependence on the Middle Eastern nations for oil to make good the deficit. So you might say that the Arab embargo and cutbacks precipitated the shortage, but the basic cause was our own doing. The so-called energy crisis ought to have a label sewed to it that says Made in America by Americans.

I have detailed our experience in oil and gas pricing—and its results—because right now, in the middle of a shortage that was caused by price controls, we are being asked to subscribe to more of the same medicine. The emergency energy legislation passed last week by the Congress, despite President Nixon's announcement that he would veto it, would have done even more. It proposed to roll back the price of newly discovered oil to levels well below the current free market prices. Other legislation would extend Federal price controls over natural gas that is used exclusively within the state of origin. It would be hard to imagine any more effective way of discouraging further effort by producers to find more oil and gas.

Lesson No. 2: *You get what you pay for. If you don't pay enough, you don't get enough.* Supply and demand are adjusted to each other by the free movement of price. If you lock the price down to any particular figure, one of two things will happen. If you guess too high, you will get a surplus. We did this with the farm parity prices we supported in the 30's, 40's and 50's, and all during that time one of the nagging worries we had to deal with was what to do with all that surplus wheat, corn, cotton and tobacco. If you set the price too low, you get a shortage. We are living with the shortage produced in domestic oil and gas by our interference with the pricing mechanism of those commodities during the 1960's.

But the shortages are only the beginning of the problem. Once shortages begin to appear, you start to get all sorts of market distortions as people try to work their way around the price mechanism that no longer operates. The marginal buyers get frozen out. Speculators and sharpies move in. Suppliers cut back on the low-profit lines and maximize the higher-profit ones. Some essential needs go unsatisfied. People start running to their State Houses and to their Congressmen for help, and the result in the case of fuels was that by the end of last summer we had placed mandatory distribution controls on propane and distillate fuels.

Which brings us to Lesson No. 3: *One thing leads to another. Price controls lead to shortages which lead to supply controls.*

As I have mentioned, we got into our present predicament because of government interference with the pricing of oil and gas. By last summer we had the demand for further government intervention to allocate the shortages caused by its earlier intervention in the pricing process. But you don't regulate just part of an integrated industry making a variety of products from the same raw material. The Arab cutoff precipitated the imposition of the industry-wide controls that are now in effect, but given the constraints we were already working under, there is a good chance we would have wound up where we now are even if there had been no embargo.

In any event, the Federal government now has control of every basic operating decision the oil companies used to make: who to buy from; who to sell to; how much can be sold and at what price; how much of each product to make; what inventory levels to carry, and where. The industry is literally in a straitjacket. About the only discretionary area remaining to it is the pricing of new supplies of domestic crude oil, plus stripper well production, which together amount to about a third of domestic crude oil supply. And as I mentioned earlier, even this one remaining area of discretion has been threatened by the emergency energy legislation which President Nixon is being forced to veto for this reason.

The problems that badger the Federal Energy Office today used to be solved so quietly and efficiently in the everyday transactions of buyers and sellers in the marketplace that the consuming public never noticed them. Now they have to be solved by some individual sitting in judgment at an adversary proceeding, trying to work within a framework of rules which are inherently disposed to kill competition, stifle initiative, and which lock every entity in the oil business into a status quo that assesses no penalties for failure and grants no rewards for success.

With this kind of track record, you might expect some support for the notion of keeping Federal controls of energy supply and distribution at the bare minimum, and letting the market system carry as much of the load as it can be made to bear. Does it work out that way? No. Amid all the uproar and complaints against the way the fuel programs are being administered, we have proposals—from the same people, by the way—for even greater government interference in the supply and distribution of energy. There are proposals to dismember the oil industry; to reduce its ability to attract the capital it needs; to create Federal corporations to develop energy resources of Federal lands or to conduct research and development on energy-producing systems. Support for nationalization is not vocal at the moment, but it is there.

Hence, Lesson No. 4: *Substituting political decisions for economic decisions is destabilizing in its effects.* Once the Federal government steps in and assumes control of a function—or even part of it—it inherits the responsibility for performance. But because government is a political entity, its account-

ability is exacted in political terms, and the expediency of politics often triumphs over the logic of economics. As performance suffers through these non-logical political judgments on economic matters, the pressure rises for ever tighter and more detailed controls which in turn become self defeating. The end of the road is nationalization.

The point of all this is that we are in a box, and I'm not talking about the energy crisis. I'm talking about a crisis of confidence in the free enterprise system, a crisis in our ability to solve our problems within the traditional guidelines of a free society. The energy shortage—unless we are extremely careful—will tend to go on evoking political responses that will worsen and prolong the shortage and extend the control of the Federal government even farther over the affairs of State and local governments and the individual citizens. This will remain a threat as long as there is a shortage, and its implications go much farther, and run much deeper, than the energy crisis which pre-occupies us today.

This is why it is of such importance that we concentrate on the measures that will increase energy supplies in our country, because adequate supplies of energy are the ransom, not just for the oil industry, but for the whole economy to the extent that critical shortages spur the temptation to substitute government regulations for the activity of the marketplace.

The President's energy programs, which are aimed at restoring our ability to be self-sufficient in energy, provide the framework for the efforts to be made. Among the major new initiatives which he announced in his energy message of January 23 was a directive to the Secretary of the Interior to lease 10 million acres of Outer Continental Shelf Lands in 1975 for oil and gas exploration. This is more than the total OCS acreage that has ever been leased. It is three times the acreage planned to be leased in 1974, and ten times the amount leased in 1973.

The permit to construct the Alaska Pipeline has been issued and we are hopeful that this will go forward without any further delay. If it does, we can expect the initial flow to reach the West Coast refineries in 1977. We can also expect that the construction of the line will stimulate a surge of additional exploration on the North Slope which I am confident will result in vast new additions to reserves in that region.

The President has announced a program for Federal Energy Research and Development which will total \$10 billion in the five-year period beginning 1975. A very substantial part of this total is dedicated to coal programs, including improvement of mining efficiency, mine health and safety, conversion of coal to clean fuels, and the removal of pollutants during or after the combustion process of coal and other dirty fuels.

The President also called for Congressional action on important energy-related legislation which was submitted to the last session. Among these are:

The Natural Gas Supply Act, which would restore free market conditions to wellhead sales of newly-discovered natural gas destined for interstate commerce.

The Drilling Investment Act, which would provide a credit for all exploratory drilling for new oil and gas fields.

The Deepwater Port Facilities Act, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant permits for the construction and operation of ports beyond the three mile limit.

The Mined Area Protection Act, which would establish realistic standards to permit the mining of coal and other minerals with due regard to the environment, and end the confusion which now exists over what is permissible and what is not.

Legislation which would permit limited production of oil from the Elk Hills Naval Reserve in California, and provide funds for

the further exploration and development of that field and for the exploration of the Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, which lies adjacent to the Prudhoe Bay field on the Alaskan North Slope.

These are only some of the measures designed to restore the balance between our energy supply and demand. There are others, running to legislative proposals for the improvement of siting and construction of nuclear power plants and other critical energy facilities; the mandatory labeling of major appliances and automobiles as to their energy efficiency; changes in the Clean Air Act to permit more flexibility in meeting the immediate needs of the current situation; and changes in the tax laws aimed at making investment in domestic energy ventures relatively more attractive *vis-a-vis* foreign investments than they have been until now. The thrust of these programs is specifically to focus attention on developing our own energy potential here in the United States.

The resources are here in abundance: oil, gas, coal, oil shale, and uranium. The problem is that of making them available in the forms and amounts and at the time they are needed. This requires a good deal more attention to exploration, development, research on new forms of energy, and capital commitment than we as a nation have chosen to make. But the job can certainly be done. Time, talent, money, and determination are needed in generous measure. But the return we receive on such an investment will also be generous, not only in terms of material advantage, but in countering the threat which enduring shortages pose to the institutions of a free society.

#### ANTI-NAZI FIGHTER DIES

#### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 8, 1974, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation lost one of their most valiant patriots, Col. Ferenc Koszorus, to cancer. We will miss this great man. His struggle against the despotic forces of Nazi Germany will long serve as a memorial to mankind's love of freedom. This legacy will be a continuous inspiration to those who seek perpetuation of liberty at home and abroad. Colonel Koszorus's remarkable perspective of Hungarian military history offers new insights for historians. I include the following tribute to him for my colleagues who were unaware of Colonel Koszorus' many contributions to his countrymen both in Hungary and in the United States:

[From the Washington Star-News, Mar. 11, 1974]

FERENC KOSZORUS DIES, ANTI-NAZI FIGHTER, 75

(By Richard Slusser)

Col. Ferenc Koszorus, 75, a hero of the anti-Nazi resistance in Hungary during World War II, died of cancer Friday at his home on N. Adams Street in Arlington.

In early July 1944—when most of the Jews in Hungary already had been deported—Col. Koszorus and the First Armored Division he commanded took up a position confronting the Hungarian gendarmerie controlled by the Germans.

Col. Koszorus had been stationed a day's march away when he offered his troops to Adm. Horthy, regent of Hungary, to keep the force of some 5,000 gendarmes from carry-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing out orders of Adolf Eichmann to deport 300,000 Jews from Budapest.

For a day a clash seemed inevitable, but the Nazis gave in and withdrew. The Jews of Budapest were saved because German forces could not be spared from the front in adequate numbers to deport such a mass of people.

Col. Koszorus was captured by the U.S. Army in 1945 and was a prisoner of war for a year. While in Germany from 1947 to 1951 he was the general superintendent of the Hungarian Reformed Church in exile for Germany and Austria.

He came to the United States in 1951 and was naturalized five years later. From 1960 until he retired last year he worked for the Army Map Service. He also was a chief contributor to a multi-volume work on recent Hungarian military history.

He was born in Debrecen, Hungary, and after graduation from the Budapest Military Academy became a lieutenant in the Royal Hungarian 2nd Hussar Regiment. Later he was a colonel in the Hungarian general staff and continued his military studies in Austria, Italy, Germany, France and England.

In the late 1930s he taught fundamental principles of modern strategy at the Royal Hungarian University in Budapest. In 1940 and 1941 he was deputy commander of the Military Academy and helped organize the Hungarian armored forces.

In 1941, when Hungary joined the war against the Soviet Union, Col. Koszorus became the chief of the operational staff of the Hungarian Mobile Corps, thus playing an important role in the battles of Uman, Kiev and Isium. Later he was chief of staff of the First Armored Division and First Armored Army Corps and then commander of the First Army Division.

After foiling the deportation of Jews from Budapest he retook the town of Arad on the Great Hungarian Plain from a Romanian force three times the size of his armored division.

He leaves his wife, Gabriella, and a son, Ferenc Jr., at the University of Chicago.

Services were to be at 1 p.m. today in National Presbyterian Church, with burial in Columbia Gardens Cemetery. The family requests that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to the Bethlen Home, Ligonier, Pa.

#### JOZSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

#### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, an intensely interesting commentary on the life of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty appeared recently in the Washington Post and other publications. The author of the article is Charles Fenyvesi, a Jewish-Hungarian refugee who is currently the editor of the National Jewish Monthly. In the event that my colleagues have not had an opportunity to read the article, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

FEB. 20, 1974.

I saw him once, in 1947 or 48, leading a procession in a dusty petit bourgeois section of Budapest. It was a pageantry of satin church banners of blue and purple and medieval hymns. Under a baldachin was the glass-encased relic of the Right Hand of Saint Stephen—Hungary's first Christian king in the tenth century. The procession moved slowly, impervious to the steady drizzle, in a setting of cheerless apartment buildings pockmarked with bullet holes. Looking at

him from the sidewalk, which was filled with kneeling people, the Prince Primate of Hungary seemed miles and ages away. The burning eyes in the ashen-white face were fixed at some point in the sky. He was swathed in scarlet silks and surrounded by priests in embroidered robes. They were followed by clusters of village women in dull black from kerchief to boots and by city people of all ages in somber grays and blues.

Even in my grade school class we knew that Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty and the new communist regime were locked in a fatal struggle. My elders also knew that there could be but one end to that conflict.

The Cardinal would not bend. There were many Hungarians who hoped that he would throw his weight behind the rivals of the Communist Party—like the Smallholders' Party which won close to 60% of the vote in the free elections of 1945—and search for ways to cope with the overwhelming fact of Soviet military occupation. But Mindszenty refused to play politics. He would only pray and resist. The slightest concession seemed to him a betrayal of principles—fatal weakness, abject surrender, high treason.

He sent a cable to Hungary's first democratically elected, non-communist post-war Premier: "The First Banneret of the Realm stands at the disposal of the nation." The position of the First Banneret—the Prince Primate's feudal rank as the first officer of the kingdom—no longer existed. Hungary was declared a republic in 1946 and all aristocratic titles and privileges were rendered null and void. Mindszenty's cable read more like a challenge than the traditional congratulatory message from the head of the Church.

Mindszenty was as stubborn and determined as the communists; each knew that the other was an enemy with whom there could be no accommodation, no peace.

While the communist leaders were successful in threatening and cajoling their democratic opposition into cooperation, they also felt that they had to dramatize to the restless nation—and to themselves—that no person or institution lay beyond the reach of "the iron fist of the dictatorship of the proletariat." What could have been a more telling demonstration of their power than the humiliation of a Prince of the traditionally conservative, Western-leaning Church.

Many Hungarians who saw newscasts of the trial or listened to it on radio thought that Mindszenty had been beaten and drugged. After five weeks of interrogation, Mindszenty seemed like another person. The strong, rich voice of a spellbinding orator was thin and monotonous; the piercing eyes had a dull sheen. There was an air of unreality about his listless confession to charges of high treason, the gathering of military intelligence and foreign currency speculation. The trial was absurd, macabre. It spread fear throughout the country and it signaled the beginning of a new era in which a few thousand angry, determined men loyal to Moscow would try to undo 1,000 years of Hungarian nationalism.

Next to the mysterious suicide of Czech Foreign Minister Jan Masaryk and the Berlin airlift, it was that trial in Budapest in February 1949 which convinced the Western public that an iron curtain had indeed descended, cutting off the ancient capitals of Central and Eastern Europe from their lifelines to the West.

Twenty-five years later, Pope Paul's removal of Cardinal Mindszenty as the head of the Hungarian Church is just another episode marking the end of the cold war. Mindszenty, the erstwhile patron saint of the Free World, has become an embarrassment to the new partnership of detente. Like Alexander Solzhenitsyn, whose "Gulag Archipelago" was banned not only in Russia but on the airwaves of the Voice of America, Cardinal Mindszenty is an unperson whose voice, like that of the uninvited wedding

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 18, 1974

guest in Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner" disturbs the merry din of the feast.

Mindzenty visited the United States last September, to bless a renovated Hungarian church in New Brunswick, N.J. His three-day stay was played down by Church and State.

Except for Terence Cardinal Cooke of New York, the American Church ignored his presence. President Nixon sent him a cable—assuring him of gratitude and wishing a "thoroughly pleasant stay"—but the telegram somehow did not reach the Cardinal until the day he left. Two weeks after his departure, Sen. Edward Kennedy declared on the Senate floor that Mindzenty reminded the world of "the indivisible nature of man's spirit and the eternal quest for individual liberty." But no government representative visited him; the institutions which once acclaimed him a martyr had no more interest in him.

Mindzenty's ultimate tragedy is that he has outlived the usefulness of his martyrdom.

All his life Mindzenty lived in a posture of defiance and displayed a dogged obstinacy which reminded his class-conscious countrymen of his peasant origin. He never seemed to have talent for conformity or wise compromise. In his 20s, he wrote newspaper articles attacking the police terror of the short-lived Hungarian Commune in 1919. He was first jailed, then deported to his native village. After that first Hungarian communist experiment collapsed, Mindzenty angered many people by denouncing from the pulpit the white terror that followed the red. Then for years he refused to celebrate mass on the name's day of the Regent, Nicholas Horthy, whom he regarded as an usurper. Of German origin himself, he changed his German name Pehm to Mindzenty—the name of his native village—at a time when Hitler called on descendants of German settlers in Eastern Europe to reassert their German identity. In his sermons and letters, Mindzenty attacked Hitler's New Order as inhuman and atheistic. On one occasion, he called the police to remove Hungarian Nazis from a procession he led. In 1941, he interceded with his schoolmate, the pro-German Premier Bardossy, on behalf of Jews in German-occupied Yugoslavia, across the border from his diocese. He also sent a telegram to Hitler to protest massacres of Jews. When Ferenc Szalasi's Nazi regime came to power, Mindzenty was one of the few priests jailed.

Partly because of his anti-Nazi record, he was named Prince Primate shortly after World War II ended. One of his first actions was to denounce Russian soldiers for looting and raping. He began a campaign against the communists. He demanded a referendum on declaring Hungary a republic. He accused the democratic parties of being soft on communism. After the democratic parties were liquidated, he thought it was his historic duty as the head of the Church to resist the communist regime.

He was arrested the day after Christmas, 1948, after all leaves were canceled in the Secret Police and the police force was put on alert.

The communists had offered him free passage to the West. During his American tour in 1947, American churchmen had asked him not to return home.

He was not a man caught in the wheels of history. He chose martyrdom; he prepared himself for it. He thought he would be sentenced to death and hoped that his execution would arouse the world against communism. And he knew that the communists had ways to extract false confessions. A few days before his arrest, he wrote a message declaring his innocence and attributing any confession he might make to the weakness of the flesh.

He served eight years in jail, most of it in solitary confinement. In 1956, the rebels freed him, and then his person served as a

pretext for the Russian intervention which crushed the uprising. Much has been made of a broadcast of his which implied that his ideas had not changed but which stressed the need to return to normalcy and to eschew vengeance.

The intervention would have taken place with or without a sermon. In 1968, the Russians did not need a Mindzenty to prove that they had to rescue socialism in Czechoslovakia.

As Russian tanks rumbled through the streets of Budapest, Mindzenty sought asylum at the American legation; Premier Imre Nagy and his supporters went to the Yugoslav embassy. But for 13 of the 15 years that the Cardinal spent under U.S. protection, the United States, Hungary and Vatican agreed that he must leave the country. All that the Cardinal had to choose was one of the several facesaving formulas negotiated for him.

His argument was that as the Prince Primate of Hungary, he had taken an oath not to abandon his flock; that as a patriot it was his duty to stay in his homeland; that as an innocent man convicted by a kangaroo court he had to be exonerated.

He resisted the steadily increasing pressures of the Holy See and three American administrations—Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson—which considered his asylum a permanent embarrassment and the chief obstacle to improving relations with the Hungarian government. The State Department regarded him as its cross to bear; it was forever apprehensive about his falling sick or walking out in a huff. The handful of U.S. diplomats authorized to converse with him complained bitterly about his anti-communist tirades and his unceasing criticism of the United States for failing to go to Hungary's aid in her hour of need in 1956.

His eventual departure, in September 1971, Mindzenty described as his submission to the will of the Vatican. It removed the most conspicuous symbol of Catholic resistance to communism and it enabled the Church to accelerate its course of peaceful coexistence. For the Hungarian government, it represented a milestone in its search for detente at home and respectability abroad.

There were tears among the faithful. But perhaps the majority of Hungary's six and a half million Catholics was relieved: The Cardinal's self-imposed prison sentence on the top floor of the American legation was a reminder of a tragic revolution that Hungarians would rather not talk about.

"The stubborn old fool," as Hungarian communists called him, is now safely tucked away in Vienna, in a seminary that has belonged to the Hungarian Church for centuries. (The Pope had wanted him to stay in Rome, but the Cardinal insisted on staying as close to Hungary as possible.)

His departure left Hungary so much the poorer. He was the last rebel, locked up in a tower of his own making, while the nation made peace with the regime that turned out to be surprisingly kind and forgiving. He was the last knight errant while his countrymen learned to be cheerful cynics and bon vivants. As long as he stayed at the American legation, his physical presence in Hungary was still a psychological factor to reckon with. In Vienna, he is of no real consequence.

Or so one imagines. But according to the Catholic News Service, talks between the Hungarian government and the Holy See in January of this year centered on Mindzenty. No normalization of relations is possible, it was established, unless the Vatican provided for (1) the selection of a new Primate of Hungary—which was the essence of Pope Paul's announcement in February, declaring Mindzenty's post "vacant"; (2) the "neutralization" of the memoirs Mindzenty has been writing since 1956—whatever that means—and (3) the cancellation of Mindzenty's Vatican passport.

With an eerie vindictiveness—or was it a

gesture to Budapest?—the Vatican announced Mindzenty's retirement twenty-five years to the day he was sentenced to life imprisonment. Mindzenty promptly denied that he had voluntarily given up his post. In effect, he called the Pope a liar. He followed it up with a six-point attack on the Hungarian government's suppression of religious freedom.

Had Mindzenty ever exercised political power, it might have been difficult for most people to live under his rule—except for those who believe in the mission of the Church to educate and to lead. But he never had a chance. He has always been in opposition—as a fighting priest, a gutsy peasant nationalist, a simple straightforward man. Had he not chosen priesthood, he might have become a soldier. Like Charles de Gaulle, he would have been the forever brooding patriot and the likeliest officer to rebel against his superiors in the name of a higher legitimacy—for the promise of grandeur instead of the expediency of compromise.

Hungarian politics always had its fair share of priests. They were usually hearty, gregarious types, outdoing their lay brothers in their appreciation for food, wine and good company which sometimes included women. Mindzenty is an exception. He has always slept on a pallet, and even in the majestic baroque palace of the Prince Primate he kept to his diet of cheese, bread and milk. When traveling, he has always refused the choice food and wine prepared for him; his wish is "only one course," often the soup. He has had no cronies, no close personal friends. From the time he was ordained—in 1915—he preferred a solitary life of meditation, prayer and reading books on theology, philosophy and history.

Mindzenty would have doubtless preferred the fate of murder in the cathedral. But these days peaceful accommodation is imperative. Moreover, his whereabouts and the extent of his activities are still useful items in the arsenals of diplomacy. There is still enough prestige and power in the man to wring out a gesture, to secure an advantage, or at least to score a point.

While the cold war lasted, he was a useful symbol to friend and enemy alike. Now that the last bugle of that crusade has been sounded, he is more of a threat to the new era than the Knight of the Rueful Countenance wandering through the fields of Montiel. The monsters Mindzenty is still fighting are not incorporeal.

But he does not seem to understand that the times call for bargaining, not martyrdom. At 82, the prelate is still fighting.

## WHERE IS THAT COUNTRY WE USED TO KNOW?

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, there are many factors which contribute to the making of a great nation. As citizens of the United States, we can be proud that we have built a tradition of working together for strength and prosperity. The crises of the past have never diminished our characteristic desire to move ahead toward the worthy objectives of the future. I submit that we have the ability to continue to work together for an even greater nation in the years to come.

I believe that the following article presents some interesting thoughts for all of us.

The article follows:

## WHERE IS THAT COUNTRY WE USED TO KNOW?

In the America of yesterday you paid your debts as quickly as possible, and went without things, to do it.

You disciplined your children—but disciplined yourself, first.

You spent less than you earned, and demanded your government do the same.

You went to church, your children to Sunday School, you held daily prayers—and no court would have dared to interpose any law into your private religion.

You would have been horrified at (and quick to change) men in high places who made "deals".

You expected to prosper only by doing a better and better job.

You obeyed the law—but took active enough part in government to see that the laws were just.

You "walked softly but carried a big stick".

And that was the character which brought this country victory in three wars in your lifetime, built it back from a shattering depression, and fed and saved the civilized world.

Is there enough of it left, to do it again?

## PROJECT INDEPENDENCE

## HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of our current energy shortages, I think my colleagues may be interested in the following *Wall Street Journal* article of March 12, 1974, concerning the United States becoming self-sufficient for energy:

## PROJECT INDEPENDENCE

President Nixon wants the nation to have "the capacity for self sufficiency" in energy by 1980. It's not only a good idea, it's well within the nation's capability. It wouldn't mean the United States would stop all imports of energy after 1980. At the "right prices" it would continue to do so, according to Treasury Secretary Shultz. But there would be sufficient reserve capacity here that could be called up if an Arab oil embargo were repeated.

How do we attain that degree of security? As last week's front-page articles by our Mr. Gannon indicate, there is considerable brainstorming already underway in Washington. There are proposals to enact multi-billion-dollar subsidy programs to entice oil and coal companies into developing energy alternatives. Some people want to firmly peg the price of oil high enough to attract investment to shales and coal gasification, then erect tariff walls or variable import levies to protect such investment from predatory Arab oil pricing. Others want to construct huge storage facilities to squirrel away a two- or three year energy supply. And there are proposals for a monumental conservation program, including orders to Detroit to build only autos that average 20 miles per gallon.

In our view, none of these schemes are necessary. The goal of Project Independence would be easily achieved if only the federal government would get out of the way and let the energy industry respond to market forces. Lifting price controls on the petroleum industry would be the first and most important step.

If U.S. prices were freed they would go up, expanding the incentive to look for oil here, and making other forms of energy more competitive. U.S. prices would be unlikely to reach recent world levels, which are not likely to be sustainable as non-Arab supplies increase. Indeed, the proposals for special import levies and such are intended to keep

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the U.S. price up if the Arabs started selling \$2 crude. But having pushed the price up, the sheiks are unlikely to want to flood the world with artificially cheap oil. Even if they tried, they could not meet total world demand long enough at prices low enough to threaten the survival of the U.S. shale-oil operations, for example.

Nor does a mammoth U.S. surface reserve make any sense. Why should oil and coal be taken out of the ground, where it is now stored, and sealed off in containers above the ground? All that's necessary is that it be available as shut-in capacity within several months of a world-wide energy embargo against the U.S., which is a "worst case" contingency that in itself takes a wild imagination to conceive.

When it is free to respond to market forces, industry typically provides precisely such a capacity, by building facilities to meet not only this year's demand but next year's and so on. When oil was discovered on the North Slope of Alaska, crude prices were a quarter of what they are today. Still, the oil companies all but promised to goldplate a pipeline if the government would permit them to add two million barrels a day to the nation's oil supply. This would have covered the present shortfalls.

Finally, with congressional acquiescence, this oil may be available in 1980. But now Congress is doing its best to shut off the domestic coal equivalent of at least 5.6 million barrels of crude per day, an amount about equal to total current petroleum imports. It is doing this by writing strip-mining legislation that would effectively end the surface mining of the nation's most abundant energy resource. Its aim is not to insure reclamation of strip-mined land, a desirable and feasible objective, but simply to prevent strip mining altogether.

At the same time Congress acts to keep coal from competing with oil, and surface mining from competing with underground mining, it refuses to deregulate the well-head price of natural gas. This has the same perverse effects on supply and demand as do the petroleum controls. Instead of exploring for domestic sources of natural gas, U.S. companies arrange long-term contracts to import liquefied natural gas at high prices that are not subject to controls.

The energy industries do not need economic activism by government—the subsidies, tariffs or federal corporations being brainstormed in Washington. In natural resources the U.S. is an energy-rich nation. Energy suppliers, who are no more anxious to be dependent on the Arabs than consumers are, are eager to expand here. Oil companies are out-bidding \$200-plus million for shale-oil tracts. Electric utilities are trying to build nuclear generating plants whenever they are allowed to. They do not need artificial stimulus, only an end to price interference and some reasonable and stable rules on reclamation, safety and pollution.

To achieve the objectives of Project Independence, the government has to do only one thing: get out of the way.

## THE PROBLEMS OF VIETNAM VETERANS

## HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, a Vietnam era veteran, recently wrote to the *Atlanta Journal and Constitution* concerning the problems he and other veterans have experienced with the Veterans' Administration.

I would like to share with my col-

leagues this letter written by R. Ellington McLellan, who received the Navy Cross of Gallantry with V for Valor while serving with the Marine Corps. This article illustrates some of the frustrations which countless Vietnam era veterans must endure, in part because of attitudes they encounter at the VA:

## VIETNAM VETERANS GET NOTHING BUT TROUBLE

The Editors: I am a Vietnam veteran and while serving with the Marine Corps I received a meritorious combat promotion and the Navy Cross of Gallantry with V for Valor.

I received an honorable discharge from the Marines in April 1970 and have gone through many changes and have grown very much since being discharged. I am a lucky Vietnam veteran because I had friends who supported me and tried to understand me and the problems that I had to deal with because of the senseless death and destruction I saw in that war.

I am very upset because of the lack of concern . . . the American people have concerning the Vietnam veteran. It seems that the American people just want to forget about that war and not deal with the problems the war left behind, especially the problems Vietnam veterans face upon returning to the mainstream of society.

The Veterans Administration does not seem to be dealing with the problems that Vietnam veterans face. Figures show the Vietnam veteran has a higher unemployment rate than nonveterans. Around 30 per cent of all the folk serving time in federal pens are Vietnam veterans. Close to 60,000 Vietnam veterans have died since returning to the states and many have died in violent deaths.

Since I have been doing counseling work here at the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, I have come in contact with many Vietnam veterans who say the Veterans Administration is not an advocate for them, and they are very bitter.

The death and destruction of that whole war is relived by tens of thousands of Vietnam veterans every day. . . . I talked to the folk who run the Veterans Administration with a group of other Vietnam veterans while in college and we went away from that meeting feeling that . . . they would never do anything about helping us deal with them through counseling and long term therapy.

Why doesn't the . . . public give the men who laid their lives on the line while in Vietnam the support and help they deserve? There are over 7.5 million Vietnam era veterans.

R. ELLINGTON MCLELLAN.

Atlanta.

## IMPORTANCE OF UPCOMING ELECTION

## HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in the never-ending effort to increase citizen participation in elections, I am communicating to all of the voters of the First District of Michigan the importance of the upcoming election in the statement that follows:

## STATEMENT

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

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

which are critical. On March 19th, Detroiters have an opportunity to vote on a key tax question, shown at the top of your ballot.

This vote has a direct effect on 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 19th on Proposition A at the top of your ballot.

---

KEEP INTERNAL SECURITY  
COMMITTEE

---

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1974

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that we will soon be asked to vote on a number of sweeping changes in the committee structure of the House. One such proposal, unfortunately, calls for the abolition of the House Committee on Internal Security by transferring its jurisdiction to another committee.

I am pleased to note that the distinguished editor, Mr. William R. Hearst, Jr., recently devoted his entire front page column to what is entitled "The Watchdog Committee" in which he explained in convincing detail the continuing need for the existence of the House Committee on Internal Security. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting this column, which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner on March 3, 1974, and in the other Hearst newspapers, at this point in the RECORD:

WATCHDOG COMMITTEE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Since truth consists of provable facts, it is hardly surprising that students of Democratic freedom keep coming up with the same two fundamental observations. One is that liberty has more to fear from internal enemies than from those outside. The other is that liberty can be maintained only by keeping a constant protective vigil against the forces which would like to limit or destroy it.

The twin truisms have been expressed in various words by many different people. The U.S. philosopher William James, for example, said that "The deadliest of enemies are not foreign foes; they always dwell within." Its classic corollary is credited to an Irish judge, John Philpot Curran, who said in a 1790 speech: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Now you might think just about everybody would agree automatically with these principles. After all, U.S. history is full of the disruptions which result whenever groups of our own people start believing that their personal convictions are more important than the freedom of their neighbors. And it certainly stands to reason that a constant, close watch be maintained if the subversive activities of such groups are to be kept at a minimum.

That's what you might think. And that's why it seems important today to tell you what is being plotted in Congress by a small but willful band of lawmakers who have somewhat different ideas. The object of their plotting is the House Internal Security Committee, which until 1969 was titled the House Un-American Activities Committee. Why and how they have made it a target confirms the warnings of William James and John Philpot Curran.

No agency of Congress has had a more stormy history. For more than 40 years the HUAC—and now the HISC—has been exhaustively and effectively probing all manner of subversive activity in this country. For the same length of time, significantly, it has been strongly resisted and regularly condemned as excessive by the usual loud chorus of liberals and left-wing Communist sympathizers.

They accused the committee of having a pathological fear of Communism, of making scarlet mountains out of pale pink molehills, of persecuting harmless political theorists and using the tactics of a bully to do it. They soft-pedaled the simple reality of why the Communists and their many subversive activities got so much attention.

The Communists and their various offshoots, from the labor agitators to organizers of student violence, got most of the committee headlines only because such radicals of the left far outnumbered such radicals of the right as members of the KKK, the German-American Bund and other neo-Fascist organizations. Yet all of the latter were as thoroughly explored as their leftist counterparts, with the same painstaking documentation of leadership, interlinkage, secret plans and actual operations.

The only difference was that the rightists did not have a clique of influential sympathizers to assail the committee and disparage its work.

These attacks have never ceased, nor are they likely to do so. The left never lets up on anything or anybody considered injurious to its efforts, nor do the people who troop along with the idea that it is smarter to be called liberal than patriotic. Patriotism, indeed, is widely considered a bad word today—which is a tribute to the sinister appeal which Communism in its many guises has for certain types of politically and socially-minded persons.

In the case of HUAC, and its less clumsily named successor, the most serious attacks have been the many congressional attempts at downright abolition. It makes no difference to its foes in Congress that the committee is acclaimed by our law enforcement officials everywhere as an invaluable source of continually updated information on radical groups of all description, left and right alike. The committee must go.

Such has always been the rallying cry of its determined enemies in Congress. And it is being sounded again right now.

Emphasizing the persistence of these people is important. It was their concerted attempt to abolish HUAC which resulted in its 1969 name change. And according to the Washington news-weekly Human Events—to which much of this column is indebted—in the 92d Congress alone a total of 37 resolutions to dissolve the committee were introduced with the backing of 67 members. None was acted upon.

Having so repeatedly failed to torpedo the committee by other means, its congressional foes now have invented a new approach—and it's a crafty one. Largely unnoticed by the press, it seems that the House Select Committee on Committees headed by liberal Missouri Democrat Richard Bolling has been working on a master plan to reorganize and streamline such bodies. The plan now has been submitted and you can imagine what it includes.

Sure enough, one of the recommendations would abolish the HISC, this time by transferring its legislative jurisdiction to the House Judiciary Committee. Communist Joseph Alsop, one of the most astute observers of the Washington political scene, recently described this grab-bag committee as "a kind of dumping ground for left-wing Democrats of the more far-out type."

The all-important point is that if the

March 18, 1974

Bolling committee recommendation is adopted, it will almost certainly finish the kind of vigorous continuing probe of subversive activity for which the HUAC-HISC has been noted. Sixteen of the 21 Democrats on the Judiciary Committee have voted against appropriations for HISC in the past. The chairmen of six of its seven subcommittees have done the same. You can imagine the zeal with which they would continue the HISC work.

The legislative ploy aimed at killing the HISC, furthermore, involves an equally devious method of presentation. The recommendation for abolition is all but buried in a mass of other recommendations supported by over 2,000 pages of testimony and analysis. The liberals' hope is that many firm HISC supporters will go along with the generally good blunderbuss reorganization program lest they be accused of blocking progress toward a better and more effective Congress.

The plot COULD work—unless an enlightened public and a wide-awake House of Representatives flag it down before some kind of pressure vote is forced later in this session. And if the anti-HISC minority bloc gets away with the trickery, it will be another really major step in the steady eroding and downgrading of national security in recent years. As noted by Human Events in its issue of March 2:

"Long before Watergate, Sen. Sam Ervin (D-N.C.), former Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark, the American Civil Liberties Union, Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.) and Sen. George McGovern (D-S.C.) were waging open warfare against wiretapping, accumulation of data on subversives, police surveillance of potential terrorists and other security practices.

"In the wake of these campaigns, FBI and military surveillance operations, both here and abroad, have been drastically reduced. The Subversive Activities Control Board has been abolished and the administration has unwisely eliminated the Justice Department Internal Security Division.

"This has created a 'climate of freedom' for all types of subversives. They believe no one is watching them closely—and their natural tendency is to go to even greater extremes in their efforts to undermine the U.S."

If you don't believe this, consider the two political kidnappings featured in all the news media during the past few weeks.

Many years ago my father wrote the following words in his newspaper column:

"The American people have been liberal to the point of lunacy. We have allowed our patriotic altars to be polluted by dirty and desecrating hands . . . by forces which would destroy us with their subversive teachings. And we can hardly blame the alien and hostile agencies and influences for having taken advantage of such public laxness and indifference."

In another column Pop said this:

"In the light of history it would certainly seem that liberty is the most precious possession of mankind. We Americans possessing liberty must exert the eternal vigilance which is necessary to preserve it."

The House Internal Security Committee has long since proven its great value as one of the most effective instruments for government vigilance.

This watchdog committee must not be lost to us now—and you can help save it from the destruction plotted and hoped for by the Bolling committee.

Write your congressman and tell him how you feel. Make it strong and brief and do it right away.

If you don't know the name of the congressman supposedly representing you, call the city desk of this newspaper for the information.

March 18, 1974

**THE GREAT PROTEIN ROBBERY:  
NO. 18: THE STUDDS-MAGNUSON  
200-MILE LIMIT BILL**

**HON. GERRY E. STUDDS**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the United States and Canada would have been engaged in a "haddock war" starting at midnight tonight if Canada had not agreed to withdraw an exception to international conservation regulations on Friday.

In January, the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries—ICNAF—adopted strengthened regulations to protect the declining stocks of haddock from complete destruction. The Government of Canada filed an exception to the new regulations in order to allow certain smaller Canadian fishing vessels to continue fishing for haddock in subarea 4X in violation of the conservation regulations. The Canadian Government agreed to withdraw its exception before the deadline comes tonight, but only after concerted efforts by officials of the State Department and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—and leaders of the U.S. fishing industry.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada took unilateral action on behalf of her fishermen. Because her unilateral action violated conservation regulations, the opposition to that action was great, and Canada agreed to withdraw her exception.

I applaud the Canadian Government's demonstrated high commitment to her fishermen, although I do not believe such a commitment should lead to actions which violate conservation regulations. Passage of the Studds-Magnuson interim 200-mile limit bill would demonstrate that the Government of the United States is also committed to our fishermen, and would do so in a way which will facilitate—rather than violate—effective measures to prevent overfishing and conserve fish stocks.

Mr. Speaker, many people have been asking me why the Congress does not immediately pass this bill to conserve the fish and protect our fishermen. I wish I could tell them the answer.

**11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK**

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, John C. Whitaker is the Under Secretary of the Interior. He thinks H.R. 11500 is defective because it will seriously interfere with the availability of energy from coal without adequate compensating advantages to the environment ethic.

H.R. 11500 runs counter to good sense and administration policy. Whitaker says:

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

It is our policy to encourage industry to produce our abundant coal reserves in an environmental sound manner. About 45 billion tons of coal can be recovered by environmental sound surface mining methods which are generally less wasteful of the coal reserves than underground mining.

He calls attention to administration plans to order oil burning electric powerplants to convert to coal during the energy emergency.

Yet H.R. 11500 would needlessly hamper production of coal where more sensible regulations would facilitate it and at the same time respect the environment.

H.R. 11500 makes just about as much sense as trying to grow bananas on Pike's Peak and that is why I do not understand the editorial pages of the Washington Post and Star-News. When students streak buck-naked through a campus, papers like these indulgently attribute it as a harmless prank. I would not argue that, but why are they so rabid in support of H.R. 11500, the bill that would prohibit topless coal mines and encourage fuelless boilers? Perhaps it is time to recall that whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.

**THE CLARKE SCHOOL  
OF DRESSMAKING**

**HON. LOUIS STOKES**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay special tribute today to a woman and a school which have served my community well for nearly 50 years.

Mrs. Amanda Wicker founded the Clarke School of Dressmaking in 1925. A graduate of Tuskegee Institute, she prepared for her career with 5 years special training at the Traphagen School of Fashion in New York City. What is unique about her own school, however, is that it is designed particularly for teenagers. Every year the Clarke School awards scholarships to junior and high school students who wish to continue their education in the field of dressmaking and fashion design. To date more than 100 scholarships have been awarded.

The Clarke School of Dressmaking offers a challenging variety of courses to young people interested in either pursuing fashion careers, or just making their own clothes. Classes in "ladies' personal dressmaking" and "tailoring men's garments" are particularly suited to the latter. The course in "ladies' costume design," however, is training for would-be professional dressmakers and tailors, designers and patternmakers or patterngraders in the garment industry. A "factory power machine course" is also offered. Instructors Emma Curry and Eloise Brown Hodnett are very capably assisted by student-trainees Gwendoline Nevel, Veda General, and Enner Ree Ray.

From 1940 to 1965 Mrs. Wicker presented the annual "Book of Gold Fashion Show," famous throughout Cleveland.

After a 9-year hiatus, the shows resume this month with the "Jet Set Premier" featuring teenagers modeling clothes made by the teenage sewing class at the Clarke School.

These young men and women exemplify the industrious creativity fostered by Mrs. Wicker and the Clarke School of Dressmaking. In a time of juvenile delinquency and school drop-outs Mrs. Wicker has made a solid and enduring contribution to the youth of her community. I know that the people of my district join me in saluting her. May the next 50 years of Mrs. Wicker's School be even more illustrious than the last.

**UNIONS EYE \$20 MILLION**

**HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions here on the House floor I have pointed out and called the attention of my colleagues to the aggressive and well-planned activities of organized labor in the special elections we have gone through in recent weeks.

This activity is spelled out in even more effective terms in a column by Mr. Victor Riesel appearing in the March 7, 1974, edition of the Hammond, Ind., Times, and I include the column in the RECORD at this point:

**UNIONS EYE \$20 MILLION**

White House strategists predict that America's union leaders, determined to build a veto-proof political labor movement, will spend some \$20 million in cash and millions more in "soft money" (services) to put a union label on Congress in this fall's elections.

These funds will provide the political oil for some of the most lubricated campaign machinery in history.

The machinery, made up of the Committee on Political Education personally "strategized" by AFL-CIO chief George Meany, the United Auto Workers' Community Action Program and a string of other "non-partisan" committees, is gung-ho this year. They're teaching the nation's politicians what a political drive really is—and their goal is to elect 23 more friends to the House and seven more to the Senate.

This would give them the breakthrough they've always sought when added to the already loyal 240 representatives and 56 senators—full labor control of the Congress, not just a Democratic Party majority. It would be the equivalent of a British Labor Party victory. In effect, an American labor party in all but name.

Labor expects few money-raising difficulties. During COPE's operating committee session and quiet hotel suite conferences between sessions of the AFL-CIO high command Executive Council midwinter meeting last month, it was estimated that some \$7 million will be raised during the rest of this year by COPE alone.

Some of this money will be spent by the national COPE headquarters operating under Al Barkan's direction in the international AFL-CIO building on 16th street here. Half the funds will go to the state and local COPE committees such as those which have had practice runs in Vice-President Ford's former arena. Michigan's Fifth, and in the 12th congressional in the Johnstown, Pa., area.

Add to these funds the expensive services

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

such as the movement's computerized list of some nine million union members—replete with memory box recall of addresses, precincts, registrations, etc. One of the nation's top computer specialists estimates the cost of installing such a list at about a million dollars. Maintenance would come to about 11 cents a name change. This would add tens of thousands of dollars annually.

And there is Leonard Woodcock's United Auto Workers' Community Action Program. This, too, is one of the most skilled political operations in history. It moved like a Roman legion into the "Jerry Ford district."

Phone banks were set up. Retirees made the rounds in this heavy General Motors plant area. The Detroit headquarters' Voters Identification round-the-year political education operation paid off among the 15,000 to 20,000 auto unionists.

Obviously this only part of this dramatic picture. But the pattern tells the story of the Republican rout.

It's more dramatic in Pennsylvania's 12th, the Johnstown area in which labor claims 60,000 members. Of these some 6,000 are International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union card carriers.

Johnstown is the Western Pennsylvania regional ILGWU headquarters. The union's staff is comparatively young and some are very bright.

They were motivated by one of labor's most articulate and astute political fellows, the ILGWU's national secretary-treasurer, Chic Chalkin. He's a buddy of the Kennedys' Larry O'Brien—and of the same shrewdness and tradition.

Chalkin reports that he motivated the union's local members—retirees worked during the day and the shop chairladies, stewards and activists operated out of their homes and some ad hoc headquarters during the evening.

National ILGWU President Lou Stulberg sent in additional funds to beef up what COPE was spending.

And working closely with them, all in the interests of building a strong machine for Governor Shapp's re-election, was the state COPE chief Mike Johnson (himself a former ILGWU manager).

Of course, the steelworkers and other unions with smaller memberships were active, too. But in their private councils, the union chiefs say the election would have been lost if it were left to the local Democratic Party.

So there's your pattern. COPE and CAP move in. And if it isn't CAP, then it's some other acronymed labor operation.

They hit hard. They're well equipped—money, manpower, a new movie "Victims of the Veto"—which praises Sen. Henry Jackson and lacerates Richard Nixon.

Politics is door-to-door nitty-gritty—not oratorical rhetoric. COPE and CAP have it—the computers, the huge mailings, the leaflets, the print and electronic media campaigns, the year-round action.

And they have centralized political generalship—George Meany, namely.

Added all up, it may top that \$20 million estimate. Add it up and it comes to the most basic political realism of the era.

Yes, there is a third political party which can motivate its people election after election. It has a built-in machine-organized labor.

## PSRO, MEDICAL CARE RATIONING

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, proposed rationing of gasoline drew an immediate response of indignation from the

American public when it was announced as a measure to curb the energy shortage. When the test balloon burst, proponents of rationing immediately reconsidered the proposal.

Another form of rationing—medical care rationing—began January 1, but the great majority of American people have not realized that this rationing is in force. Professional standards review organizations—PSRO—are the agencies responsible for issuing this Government rationed health care.

When a Government employee, which PSRO inspectors are, can dictate to a medical doctor: whether or not his patients can be admitted to a hospital, how long his patients can receive hospitalization, and what medications, tests, and treatments his patients should receive, we have medical rationing. This is exactly what exists under HEW's PSRO program.

The Louisiana State Medical Society is currently making an effort to provide the public with the facts about PSRO, a subject that the news media has largely neglected. Louisiana doctors are alerting the working people that they will be the losers under rationed medical care, because their physicians will be forced by PSRO bureaucrats to practice medicine from a "medical cookbook" of health care "norms" established by HEW.

Approximately, the cover of the brochure published by the Louisiana State Medical Society bears a striking resemblance to the gasoline rationing coupons proposed by the Federal Energy Office. My bill, H.R. 9375 to repeal the PSRO section of the Social Security Act, would prevent this health care rationing by PSRO, if adopted.

Like all systems of Government rationing, the costs of medical care will continue to go up through increased social security taxes, while the benefits reach an alltime low through PSRO.

I ask that the "Message From Your Physician and the Louisiana State Medical Society" and a copy of H.R. 9375 follow:

## A MESSAGE FROM YOUR PHYSICIAN AND THE LOUISIANA STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY

*Ration Medical Care?* That's right! The same Washington politicians and bureaucrats that brought you the energy crisis are now gearing up for the medical care crisis! Like oil, Washington now considers medical care a scarce and expensive commodity. The government's answer to both of these created crises appears to be the same—Rationing.

*How Can the Government Ration Medical Care?* By enforcing a little known section of a law already on the books, that's how! Section 249F of Public Law 92-603 provides the machinery for rationing medical care for the millions of Americans entitled to Medicare and Medicaid through something called Professional Standards Review Organizations.

*Why Ration Medical Care?* Health care benefits were promised to millions of Americans entitled to Medicare and Medicaid in big, bold headlines. Washington has now found, even by increasing Social Security taxes, that it does not have enough money (your tax dollars) to make good the promises made in those big, bold headlines. The politicians answer to the problem, which they created, is rationing so a lot of people will get a little bit of what was promised.

*How Will Medical Care Rationing Work?* First, the government will spend millions (\$43,000,000.00 in 1974) not for health care, but for establishing 182 rationing systems

March 18, 1974

called Professional Standards Review Organizations. No telling what the costs of PSROs will be by the time the program becomes fully operational in 1976.

*How Can PSRO's Ration Medical Care?* PSROs will control the amount and kind of medical care received by Medicare and Medicaid patients. Already plans are being made to extend PSRO control to all medical care. Under the law, PSROs will have the power to:

1. Tell your doctor if he can admit you to a hospital.

2. Tell your doctor how long you can stay in the hospital.

3. Tell your doctor what medications, tests, and treatment you should receive.

*How Will PSRO's Be Able To Tell Your Doctor What To Do?* PSROs will first develop a manual, many doctors call it a "medical cookbook", of norms and standards of care. As long as a doctor follows the PSRO manual, he will be protected by the law. Unfortunately, PSROs make no such guarantee to the patient. Nothing would be easier for your doctor than to look up your ailment and treat you according to "the book".

*What Can You Do About Rationing Medical Care and PSRO's?*

1. Write your Congressman and Senators. Tell them why the PSRO section (249F) of Public Law 92-603 is a bad law.

2. Tell your legislators that you do not want bureaucrats to ration the medical care you are entitled to and were promised under Medicare and Medicaid. Let them know that you have paid for these benefits through your Social Security tax—and this has not been rationed. The tax has gone up almost annually.

3. Tell them that you want no part of "cookbook" medicine.

4. Ask your Congressman and Senators to support H.R. 9375 and the other bills that have been introduced to repeal PSRO.

## H.R. 9375

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part B of title XI of the Social Security Act (as added by section 249F of the Social Security Amendments of 1972) is repealed.*

*SEC. 2. Title XI of the Social Security Act is further amended—*

*(1) by striking out "AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS REVIEW" in the heading; and*

*(2) by striking out "PART A—GENERAL PROVISIONS" immediately before section 1101.*

## ON THE RAILROAD REORGANIZATION ACT

## HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1974, Secretary of Transportation Claude S. Brinegar, submitted a comprehensive report which contained his recommendations for rail service in the Midwest and Northeast areas of our country. In that report, Mr. Brinegar suggested that rail service to many communities in my congressional district be terminated.

The ICC has begun hearings on Secretary Brinegar's report, which are expected to continue for the next 18 months. It seems to me that we must proceed carefully in order to develop a solid understanding as to what the local economic impact of the proposed recommendations would be. This is an essential measure given the present and

projected unemployment statistics—especially in Massachusetts.

Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Phil Papa, plant manager of Owens-Illinois in Newburyport, Mass. Mr. Papa outlines the economic impact that the proposed termination of service would have on the Owens-Illinois plant in Newburyport. It seems to me that this letter, along with Mr. Papa's testimony before the ICC, is a good example of the kind of information we need to fully understand the circumstances behind Mr. Brinegar's report and act appropriately as dictated by law, in light of the projected economic impact.

Therefore, I insert Mr. Papa's letter and testimony in the RECORD at this time for the attention of my colleagues:

OWENS-ILLINOIS, INC.,  
Newburyport, Mass., February 19, 1974.

Hon. MICHAEL HARRINGTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRINGTON: In one of the local newspapers, a recent article noted that the Interstate Commerce Commission was considering a plan which would eventually result in the discontinuance of the Boston & Maine service to the greater Newburyport area. I would like to formally voice my concern that such action would have a significant financial impact on Owens-Illinois and its employees.

As you know, Owens-Illinois is one of the major employees in the greater Newburyport area. We employ about 235 people on an hourly basis and an additional 25 people on our salaried payroll. In 1973, our total wages and salaries were over \$1,700,000.00 and in 1974, we expect total wages and salaries to exceed the \$2,000,000.00 level. In addition, future growth of Owens-Illinois in the Newburyport area is anticipated.

The Boston & Maine service is an integral part of our entire operation. Virtually 100% of our raw material requirements arrives in hopper cars; last year almost 70 such cars were received and we expect even more in 1974. In addition, our outbound shipments in 1973 totaled 496 cars. These cars either went directly to one of our customers or to an outside warehousing location for eventual shipment to our customers. Overall this represented 25% of our production or almost \$1,800,000.00 in sales. Needless to say, the discontinuance of the Boston & Maine service could have a significant impact on our operation since it would put us at a competitive disadvantage relative to freight costs.

We would appreciate your assistance in pointing out to the appropriate state and federal officials our concern over the possible discontinuance of the Boston & Maine service. As you can see from the above, we are highly concerned about how such a service discontinuance would impact Owens-Illinois and the greater Newburyport area.

Very truly yours,

P. W. PAPA,  
Plant Manager.

**NORTHEASTERN RAILROAD INVESTIGATION REVIEW OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION'S RAIL SERVICE REPORT**

My name is Philip W. Papa. My address is Parker Street, Newburyport, Massachusetts. My telephone number is (617) 462-6696. I am employed by Owens-Illinois, Inc., as Plant Manager of the Plastic Products Division operation at Newburyport, Massachusetts.

**EXCEPTION TO THE REPORT ON RAIL SERVICE IN THE MIDWEST AND NORTHEAST REGION BY THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION**

This statement is restricted to an exception to that part of the Report as it affects rail service to Newburyport, Massachusetts. This is covered in Volume II, Part I, Zone 12.

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

Railroad service to all stations in Zone 12 is now provided by the Boston and Maine Corporation. The report does not include Newburyport, Massachusetts as a point recommended for local rail service. The rail lines of the Boston and Maine Corporation serving our plant at Newburyport, Massachusetts have been designated as "rail lines either not necessary to serve those points recommended for service or which are duplicate feeder lines."

The plant of Owens-Illinois, Inc. at Newburyport, Massachusetts in 1973 generated 566 carloads of inbound and outbound traffic, a substantial volume of which moved in covered hopper cars from rail stations in Texas. It is not known to your petitioner the criteria which was used in the preparation of the Report to reach the judgment that a present station qualifies as a "point recommended for local rail service." We submit to your Commission, however, that whatever these criteria may have been, they have not been uniformly applied. This is demonstrated by the fact that there are a very substantial number of points which have been recommended for local service which the Report shows generate annual carload traffic substantially less than 566. In Zone 14, for example, there are nine of such situations, the lowest one of which generated annual carload traffic amounting to 141 cars.

The anticipated growth in rail transportation service at the Newburyport, Massachusetts plant can be expected, under present service conditions, to increase to exceed 600 cars by 1975. With improved rail service, which is one of the objectives of the investigation by your Commission, it is anticipated that the rail tonnage to and from our Newburyport plant will show a substantially greater increase.

The recommendations contained in the Report by the Secretary of Transportation are preliminary and we submit are arbitrary to the extent that the full circumstances cannot have been evaluated nor can they be until all information has been submitted to your Commission and the full economic effects of the recommendations made in the Report, so far as they apply to Newburyport and the service to our plant at that station, can be considered. The Report recommends that the rail tracks of the Boston and Maine Corporation extend to Salisbury, Massachusetts, a point two miles distant from Newburyport. We submit to your Commission that before serious consideration can be given to the elimination of rail service to Newburyport that it must be shown that the incremental cost to the Boston and Maine Corporation of operating their equipment and maintaining their facilities for the additional two miles to Newburyport would exceed the revenue that is now being generated and will in the future be generated by the volume of carload transportation service now being performed and to be performed in the future.

We cannot in these proceedings develop the economic factors either in the cost of the Boston and Maine Corporation in providing this service or in the revenue lost to them if this traffic is no longer handled, but we do submit that your Commission should take note of this exception and to provide the opportunity for those economic factors to be determined before any further action is taken with respect to rail service at Newburyport, Massachusetts.

We further submit that there is no economic alternative form of transportation which can be substituted for all carload traffic now handled by the Boston and Maine Corporation to Newburyport. This is particularly apparent in the movement of raw material in extremely heavy unit shipments from such distant points as Texas. We submit further with respect to this point, that the use of alternative forms of transportation would be extremely wasteful of fuel and

would be extremely costly to the detriment of our plant operations.

Other economic factors which must be considered is the economic impact upon our operations at the Newburyport, Massachusetts plant. We now employ a total of 270 people with total payment of wages and salaries of over \$1,700,000 in 1973 which will exceed \$2 million in 1974. We further submit that this operation is subject to intense economic competition and that the economy of rail transportation service is an important and necessary factor to maintain our competitive position.

In conclusion we submit to your Commission that the recommendation of the Report which potentially eliminates rail service to Newburyport, Massachusetts is not consistent with the intent of Congress in the enactment of the Rail Re-organization Act of 1973, is not consistent with the recommendation in the Report with other rail destinations to which rail service has been recommended to be continued, would create an unjustified economic hardship and would threaten the continued profitable operation of our Newburyport Plant.

Respectfully submitted.

P. W. PAPA.

**AGAINST "PROGRESSIVE" SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES**

**HON. WILBUR D. MILLS**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

MR. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on March 12 I introduced H.R. 13411, a bill that would amend various titles of the Social Security Act, and which, among other things, would result in the administration of the social security program by an independent agency reporting directly to the President. The bill also would result in the separation of the financial transactions of the social security program from those of the general budget. An identical bill, S. 3143, has been introduced by Senator CHURCH for himself and Senators RIBICOFF and CLARK.

I consider the changes that this legislation would make in the social security program to be of major importance and I urge all Members of the House to study these proposals.

Mr. Speaker, the case for this legislation is well stated in an article appearing in the Washington Star-News for Sunday, March 10, 1974, written by Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security from 1962 to 1973. I commend the article to the Members of the House and insert it at this point in the RECORD:

AGAINST "PROGRESSIVE" SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES

(By Robert M. Ball)

In the name of "tax reform" there is a movement afoot which would seriously undermine the contributory nature of the social security system.

One current proposal is to finance social security by a progressive tax, with complete exemption for low-wage earners. Under this proposal the present flat-rate social security deductions from earnings would be dropped, and the loss of income arising from the failure of low-wage earners to make contributions would be made up by higher payments from middle-level and higher-paid wage earners. As a consequence such earners would be called on to pay more for social security than their protection is worth to them.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 18, 1974

Proposals to finance all or the major part of social security out of the general revenues of the United States are also being advanced.

I believe that such changes would be dangerous to the stability of the system and would threaten contributors' rights to future benefits.

A good argument can be made for direct government assistance to low-income workers, but this can be accomplished without making radical changes in the nature of our popular and successful social security system. Social security is a social insurance system similar to those found in major industrial countries throughout the world and is based on a long tradition of self-help. The fact that those who get protection for themselves and their families pay specifically toward the support of the system, together with the absence of a means test, are the main features of social insurance which sharply distinguish it from "welfare."

The proper financing principles for such a program—really a government-operated, contributory, retirement and group insurance plan—are by no means the same as the financing principles one would want to follow in raising money for the support of general government expenditures. Social security financing should not be considered separately from social security benefits or approached solely as a tax issue.

If the financing principles of social security are changed so that large numbers of people are paid benefits without contributing, while large numbers of other people are charged much more than they would have to pay for obtaining the protection elsewhere, fundamental changes in the benefit side of the program are almost bound to follow. Without a tie between benefit rights and previous contributions, questions would undoubtedly arise about the basis for paying benefits to those who can support themselves without the benefits. If financing were related to ability to pay, it is very likely that benefits would be related to need. Thus as a result of a change in financing, we could find that social security had been turned into a welfare or negative income tax program designed to help only the very poor and that it no longer was a self-help program serving as a base for all Americans to use in building family security.

The analysis of social security financing separately from social security benefits and solely in terms of taxation principles seems to me to be based on a misunderstanding of the nature of social security—a misunderstanding that grows in part out of the fact that social security today is lumped in with other government programs, both organizationally and in the presentation of the budget. I believe it would help make the nature of social security clear if it were operated by a separate government corporation or instrumentality and if social security transactions were kept separate from the rest of the federal budget.

Before considering this proposal, however, it would be well for the reader to have in mind the scope and nature of our social security system as it is today.

During 1974 the social security programs—cash benefits and Medicare—will pay out \$75 billion in benefits.

Approximately 100 million working people will make social security contributions during 1974 and in return will receive credits toward benefits for themselves and their families designed to partly make up for the loss of earned income during retirement, during periods of extended and total disability before retirement age, or because of death. They also will receive credits toward paid-up hospital insurance during periods of extended and total disability and after age 65. Nearly 30 million people—one out of seven Americans—now receive a social security check each month, and practically all Americans are heavily dependent upon the

system for future retirement, disability, survivors', and health insurance protection.

The Social Security system is a compact between the federal government and those who work in employment covered by the system. In return for paying social security contributions while earning, the worker and his family receive certain benefits under defined conditions when those earnings have ceased or may be presumed to have been reduced. As in all insurance, the covered individual exchanges the uncertainty of a relatively large potential loss for the certainty of a relatively small payment.

Social security involves very long-term commitments; not only are beneficiaries paid on the average over many years once they come on the rolls, but contributors today are being promised benefits which may not begin for 40 or more years in the future.

The system is almost entirely compulsory, and the employee contributions which are similar to employee contributions to private pension plans and group insurance are legally a tax—a benefit tax paid by the persons, who together with their families, are protected by the program. By law the income of the system can be used only for social security benefits and the administrative expenses of the social security system.

Unlike individual annuities under private insurance, social security does not, and indeed should not, build up reserves held to each worker's account sufficient to pay off accumulated rights. Social security is financed on a current-cost basis, with nearly all contributions in a given year ordinarily being used in that year to meet benefit payments and administrative expenses. The social security trust funds that do exist are contingency reserves designed to avoid the need for sudden and disruptive contribution rate increases that might otherwise be required by a sudden dislocation in the nation's economy which brought a cut in payroll and consequently in social security income.

Precisely because the honoring of expectations now being built up is dependent on future contribution income, it is essential to establish the inviolability of benefit rights and to guard the financing source from other uses or erosion. To a very considerable extent this has been done. To help make certain that the obligations now being created are honored in the distant future, the management of the system by the Executive Branch and the Congress has been conservative. All costs have been carefully estimated over the long run (for 75 years in the case of cash benefits and 25 years in the case of hospital insurance) and earmarked financing designed to meet the estimated cost has been provided for by law.

But the security of future benefit payments not only derives strength from there being some kind of long-range plan to fully meet cost, but is also greatly reinforced by the concept of a social security tax or contribution *paid by the people who will benefit under the system*. Putting it another way, the moral obligation of the government to honor future social security claims is made much stronger by the fact that the covered workers and their families who will benefit from the program made a specific sacrifice in anticipation of social security benefits in that they and their employers contributed to the cost of the social security system and thus they have a *right* to expect a return in the way of social security protection.

This is true in social security, railroad retirement, civil service, and state and local retirement systems, even though there is not ordinarily in any of these programs—nor, for that matter, in private group insurance—an exact relationship between the amount of protection provided and the contributions made by the individual. Very importantly, the contributory nature of the system helps to make clear that it would be unfair to

introduce eligibility conditions that would deny benefits to people who have paid toward their protection.

I believe it would add significantly to public understanding of the trustee character of social security as a retirement and group insurance plan if the program were administered by a separate government corporation or instrumentality and if its financial transactions were kept separate from other government income and expenditures.

Social security now, with 70,000 employees and some 1,300 district offices across the country, is one of the very largest direct-line operations of the federal government. It accounts for nearly 60 percent of the personnel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and pays out \$1 for every \$3 spent by all the rest of the federal government.

It does not make sense administratively to have this huge program, which intimately touches the lives of just about every American family, operated as a subordinate part of another government agency. The management of social security could be made more responsive to the needs of its beneficiaries and contributors if it were freed from the frequent changes in the levels of service to the public which grows out of short-term decisions about employment ceilings and the varying management value systems which follow the frequent changes of HEW secretaries and their immediate staffs.

Until the fiscal year 1969 budget, the financial transactions of the social security system were kept entirely separate from general revenue income and expenditures, except for purposes of economic analysis. Today they are a part of a unified budget, which lumps together general revenue income and expenditures and the separately financed social security system. This is leading in confusion on just how separate from other government programs social security really is. In the interest of protecting social security's long-term commitments, the separateness of social security financing should be made unmistakably clear.

The purpose of the annual budget is, on the one hand, to make choices among expenditures, giving preference in the budget period to one expenditure over another and, on the other hand, to determine who pays what and how much for the expenditures. Social security promises—stretching into the distant future, resting on past earnings and contributions, and with separate financing—are not a proper part of this essentially competitive process.

The inclusion of social security transactions in a unified budget is bad for other reasons as well. It leads to a distortion of the decision-making process on non-social security programs. Occasional excesses of income over outgo in social security operations in the short run tend to be used as an excuse for financing additional general revenue expenditures since social security income, though legally reserved for social security expenditures, is treated in the budget in the same way as general revenue income and shows up as if it were available money.

Just about every American has a major stake in protecting the long-term commitments of the social security program from fluctuations in politics and policy. The administration of social security by a separate government corporation or instrumentality and the separation of social security financial transactions from other government income and expenditures would strengthen public confidence in the security of the long-run commitments of the program and in the freedom of the administrative operations from short-cut political influence. It would give emphasis to the fact that in this program the government is acting as trustee for those who have built up rights under the system. Such changes would not only help

to preserve social security as our most effective anti-poverty program—keeping some 12 million people out of poverty and doing so under conditions that protect their dignity and self-respect—but would also help to preserve social security as a universal retirement and group insurance plan on which all Americans can rely.

**EMERGENCY ENERGY  
EMPLOYMENT ACT**

**HON. JOE MOAKLEY**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

**Mr. MOAKLEY.** Mr. Speaker, our Nation is currently experiencing severe unemployment. Predictions for the year ahead are very pessimistic. Some economists estimate that unemployment may go as high as 6.5 or 7 percent. Jobless benefits are being paid weekly to more than 2½ million people. And, the numbers are increasing by 25,000 a week.

It appears as though the energy crisis is responsible for much of this unemployment. According to statistics published by the Department of Labor, energy-related layoffs account for 16 percent of nationwide unemployment. For the week ended March 2, of 313,000 new claims for unemployment benefits, 49,600 attributed their layoff to the energy crisis.

These are the exact figures as to energy-related unemployment. Many distinguished economists, as I said earlier, are predicting even higher levels. Wassily Leontief, the Nobel Prize-winning economist from Harvard, predicts a 10-percent reduction in total business activity this year. We have already seen that the gross output of the Nation has fallen for the fourth consecutive month. Recession is a word that must be faced.

And what does this mean?

This means that the American worker is bound to pay. The American worker is bound to be the helpless victim of the energy crisis.

Workers in the airline industry, the chemical industry, the plastics industry, the automotive industry—all are bound to suffer.

We are facing a new crisis. A crisis of unemployment as a result of the energy shortage.

And what kind of response has there been to this inevitable situation? None of significance.

The Nixon administration has proposed an increase in the compensations paid to unemployed. They would provide \$1 billion in additional compensation to begin July 1, with the new fiscal year. While this will help the worker make ends meet, it will not provide a single new job. It will not help the workers whose benefits expire before July 1. It simply does not tackle the question of energy related unemployment.

What we need is a comprehensive plan to confront the problem of energy related layoffs. We need not only to provide assistance to these unfortunate workers, but we need to provide them with jobs.

For this reason, I introduced in the House several weeks ago such a comprehensive plan. The same bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator HUBERT

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

**HUMPHREY.** This bill, the Energy Emergency Employment Act of 1974, is designed to meet the entire needs of the energy related unemployed, in a fair and equitable manner, and at the lowest possible cost to the American taxpayer.

The legislation which I have introduced has three main parts.

First, it establishes an Energy Emergency Employment Board. This Board is to be composed of the Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Federal Energy Office, and five public members. The Board will have five distinct functions—

Oversee the entire program as set up in this bill;

Develop an "early warning system" to anticipate energy related layoffs, and to effectively counter them as they occur;

Establish all guidelines and criteria under which the act is to be administered;

Recommend to Congress and to the President measures needed to combat energy related unemployment; and

Report to Congress and to the President every 6 months, in their success in dealing with energy layoffs, and their predictions as to energy unemployment and underemployment.

Second, the bill would establish a public service employment program. It would provide financial assistance to public service employers to provide jobs for the energy related unemployed. Funds for this part of the program are to be distributed equitably, with 80 percent of the funds being apportioned to States according to their proportionate share of energy related layoffs. The remaining 20 percent would go to areas that are hardest hit by the crisis, as determined by the Board.

This section of the bill would also provide for incentives for private sector employers to hire the energy-related jobless. This would be done in the form of a 15-percent tax credit on the first 12 months of wages paid to a worker formerly unemployed as a result of the crisis. Further, it would reimburse firms for costs incurred for the recruitment and training of such workers.

Finally, this title of the bill provides for a certification procedure, to certify jobless as energy related. This would insure against abuses of the program by workers and by employers.

The third and last title of the bill provides for economic assistance to workers affected by the energy crisis. The "economic adjustment allowance" outlined in this section includes the following provisions:

Readjustment assistance allowance;  
Training and counseling help;  
Relocation expenses; and  
Health insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress enough the importance of this kind of legislation. This type of comprehensive approach is the only way in which we can begin to tackle the enormous question of energy related unemployment.

Already, more than 30 of my colleagues have agreed to attach their names to this bill as cosponsors. This, I believe, is a great indication of the immediate need for a comprehensive plan to help our Nation's unemployed.

I urge the Congress to act quickly but carefully on this matter. We must help

the energy-related jobless fairly and immediately, for their sake, and for the sake of the Nation's economy.

We must give them assistance, and jobs—to replace their unemployment checks with paychecks.

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69**

**HON. JAMES G. O'HARA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

**Mr. O'HARA.** Mr. Speaker, in further compliance with the requirements of House Resolution 963, I include at the conclusion of these remarks, one further amendment to H.R. 69, which I am reserving the right to offer when that bill is called up for reading and amendment:

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED—  
OFFERED BY MR. O'HARA**

**O'HARA AMENDMENT NO. 3b**

Page 28, beginning with line 1 strike out everything down through page 58, line 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

**TITLE I—AMENDMENTS OF TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965**

**DECLARATION OF POLICY**

**SEC. 101.** Section 101 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. In recognition of the special educational needs of educationally deprived children and the impact that the presence of such children have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in the following parts of this title) to local educational agencies serving such children to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

**EXTENSION OF TITLE I PROGRAMS**

**SEC. 102.** Section 1902 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") is amended (1) by striking out "for grants to local educational agencies", and (2) by striking out "1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1977".

**ALLOCATION OF FUNDS**

**SEC. 103.** Section 103(a) of title I of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. (a) (1) There is authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the purpose of this paragraph an amount equal to not more than 1 per centum of the amount appropriated for such year for payments to States under section 134(a) (other than payments under such section to jurisdictions excluded from the term 'State' by this subsection). The amount appropriated pursuant to this paragraph shall be allotted by the Commissioner (A) among Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for grants under this part, and (B) to the Secretary of the Interior in the amount necessary (i) to make payments pursuant to subsection (d) (1), and (ii) to make payments pursuant to subsection (d) (2). The grant which a local educational agency in Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is eligible to receive shall be determined pursuant to such

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

"(2) In any case in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for that purpose are available, the grant which a local educational agency in a State shall be eligible to receive under this part for a fiscal year shall (except as provided in paragraph (3)) be: (A) from two-thirds of the amount appropriated for such year for payments to States under section 134(a) (other than payments under such section to jurisdictions excluded from the term "State" by this subsection), but not more than \$2,000,000,000, the product obtained by multiplying the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in Puerto Rico by 40 per centum of (i) the average per pupil expenditure in Puerto Rico or (ii) in the case where such average per pupil expenditure is more than 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, and from the remaining one-third of such amount so appropriated, but not more than \$1,000,000,000, the amount arrived at by multiplying the number of children counted under subsection (c) by 40 per centum of (i) the average per pupil expenditure in Puerto Rico or (ii) in the case where such average per pupil expenditure is more than 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States.

"(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" does not include Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

## TECHNICAL AMENDMENT

SEC. 104. Section 103(b) of title I of the Act is amended by striking out "aged five to seventeen, inclusive, described in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the first sentence of paragraph (2) of subsection (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "counted under subsection (c)".

## DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF CHILDREN TO BE COUNTED

SEC. 105. (a) Section 103(c) of title I of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) The number of children to be counted for purposes of this section is the aggregate of (A) the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the school district of the local educational agency from families below the poverty level as determined under paragraph (2)(A), (B) two-thirds of the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the school district of such agency from families above the poverty level as determined under paragraph (2)(B), and (C) the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the school district of such agency living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children (other than such institutions operated by the United States) but not counted pursuant to section 123 for the purposes of a grant to a State agency, or being supported in foster homes with public funds."

(b)(1) Section 103(d) of the Act is redesignated as paragraph (2) of subsection (c) and the first sentence thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(A) For purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, from families below the poverty level on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce for local educational agencies (or, if such data are not available for such agencies, for counties); and in determining the families which are below the poverty level, the Commissioner shall utilize the criteria of poverty used by the Bureau of the Census in compiling the 1970 decennial census."

(2) The second sentence of paragraph (2) of such section (as so redesignated) is deleted, and the third sentence of paragraph (2) of such section (as so redesignated) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) For purposes of this section, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, from families above the poverty level on the basis of the number of such children from families receiving an annual income, in excess of the current criteria of poverty, from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act; and in making such determinations the

March 18, 1974

Secretary shall utilize the criteria of poverty used by the Bureau of the Census in compiling the 1970 decennial census for a non-farm family of four in such form as those criteria have been updated by increases in the Consumer Price Index. The Secretary shall determine the number of such children and the number of children of such ages living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, or being supported in foster homes with public funds, on the basis of the caseload data for the month of January of the preceding fiscal year or, to the extent that such data are not available to him before April 1 of the calendar year in which the Secretary's determination is made, then on the basis of the most recent reliable data available to him at the time of such determination."

(3) The fourth sentence of paragraph (2) of such section (as so redesignated) is amended by inserting "(C)" before "When" and by striking out "having an annual income less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c))" and inserting in lieu thereof "below the poverty level (as determined under paragraph (A)).".

(c) Section 103 of the Act is amended by striking out subsection (e).

## SPECIAL USE OF FUNDS FOR INDIAN CHILDREN

SEC. 106. Section 103 of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d)(1) From the amount allotted for payments to the Secretary of the Interior under clause (B)(1) in the second sentence of subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of the Interior shall make payments to local educational agencies, upon such terms as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title, with respect to out-of-State Indian children in the elementary and secondary schools of such agencies under special contracts with the Department of the Interior. The amount of such payment may not exceed, for each such child, 40 per centum of (A) the average per pupil expenditure in the State in which the agency is located or (B) 120 per centum of such expenditure in the United States, whichever is the greater.

"(2) The amount allotted for payments to the Secretary of the Interior under clause (B)(1) in the second sentence of subsection (a)(1) for any fiscal year shall be, as determined pursuant to criteria established by the Commissioner, the amount necessary to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived Indian children on reservations serviced by elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior. Such payments shall be made pursuant to an agreement between the Commissioner and the Secretary containing such assurances and terms as the Commissioner determines will best achieve the purposes of this title. Such agreement shall contain (A) an assurance that payments made pursuant to this subparagraph will be used solely for programs and projects approved by the Secretary of the Interior which meet the applicable requirements of section 131(a) and that the Department of the Interior will comply in all other respects with the requirements of this title, and (B) provision for carrying out the applicable provisions of section 131(a) and 133(a)(3)."

## STATE OPERATED PROGRAMS

SEC. 107. Title I of the Act is amended by inserting the following in lieu of parts B and C:

## "PART B—STATE OPERATED PROGRAMS

## "PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

"SEC. 121. (a) A State agency which is directly responsible for providing free public education for handicapped children (including mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children who by reason thereof require special education), shall be

eligible to receive a grant under this section for any fiscal year.

(b) Except as provided in section 124, the grant which an agency (other than the agency for Puerto Rico) shall be eligible to receive under this section shall be an amount equal to 40 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the State (or (1) in the case where the average per pupil expenditure in the State is less than 80 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, of 80 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, or (2) in the case where the average per pupil expenditure in the State is more than 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, of 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States), multiplied by the number of such children in average daily attendance, as determined by the Commissioner, at schools for handicapped children operated or supported by the State agency, including schools providing special education for handicapped children under contract or other arrangement with such State agency, in the most recent fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available. The grant which Puerto Rico shall be eligible to receive under this section shall be the amount arrived at by multiplying the number of children in Puerto Rico counted as provided in the preceding sentence by 40 per centum of (1) the average per pupil expenditure in Puerto Rico or (2) in the case where such average per pupil expenditure is more than 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States.

(c) A State agency shall use the payments made under this section only for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and, where necessary, the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of such children, and the State agency shall provide assurances to the Commissioner that each such child in average daily attendance counted under subsection (b) will be provided with such a program, commensurate with his special needs, during any fiscal year for which such payments are made.

(d) In the case where such a child leaves an educational program for handicapped children operated or supported by the State agency in order to participate in such a program operated or supported by a local educational agency, such child shall be counted under subsection (b) if (1) he continues to receive an appropriately designed educational program and (2) the State agency transfers to the local educational agency in whose program such child participates an amount equal to the sums received by such State agency under this section which are attributable to such child, to be used for the purposes set forth in subsection (c).

#### "PROGRAMS FOR MIGRATORY CHILDREN"

SEC. 122. (a)(1) A State educational agency or a combination of such agencies, upon application, may receive a grant for any fiscal year under this section to establish or improve, either directly or through local educational agencies, programs of education for migratory children of migratory agricultural workers or of migratory fishermen. The Commissioner may approve such an application only upon his determination—

(A) that payments will be used for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers or of migratory fishermen, and to coordinate these programs and projects with similar programs and projects in other States, including the transmittal of pertinent information with respect to school records of such children;

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"(B) that in planning and carrying out programs and projects there has been and will be appropriate coordination with programs administered under part B of title III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;

"(C) that such programs and projects will be administered and carried out in a manner consistent with the basic objectives of clauses (1)(B) and (3) through (12) of section 131(a), and of section 132; and

"(D) that, in planning and carrying out programs and projects, there has been adequate assurance that provision will be made for the preschool educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers or of migratory fishermen, whenever such agency determines that compliance with this clause will not detract from the operation of programs and projects described in clause (A) of this paragraph after considering the funds available for this purpose.

The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove an application of a State educational agency under this paragraph except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State educational agency.

"(2) If the Commissioner determines that a State is unable or unwilling to conduct educational programs for migratory children of migratory agricultural workers or of migratory fishermen, or that it would result in more efficient and economic administration, or that it would add substantially to the welfare or educational attainment of such children, he may make special arrangements with other public or nonprofit private agencies to carry out the purposes of this section in one or more States, and for this purpose he may use all or part of the total of grants available for such State or States under this section.

"(3) For purposes of this section, with the concurrence of his parents, a migratory child of a migratory agricultural worker or of a migratory fisherman shall be deemed to continue to be such a child for a period, not in excess of five years, during which he resides in the area served by the agency carrying on a program or project under this subsection. Such children who are presently migrant, as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner, shall be given priority in the consideration of programs and activities contained in applications submitted under this subsection.

"(b) Except as provided in section 124, the total grants which shall be made available for use in any State (other than Puerto Rico) for this section shall be an amount equal to 40 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the State (or (1) in the case where the average per pupil expenditure in the State is less than 80 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, of 80 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, or (2) in the case where the average per pupil expenditure in the State is more than 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States).

"(c) A State agency shall use payments under this section only for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of such children.

as provided in the preceding sentence by 40 per centum of (1) the average per pupil expenditure in Puerto Rico or (2) in the case where such average per pupil expenditure is more than 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States. In determining the number of migrant children for the purposes of this section the Commissioner shall use statistics made available by the migrant student record transfer system or such other system as he may determine most accurately and fully reflects the actual number of migrant students.

#### "PROGRAMS FOR NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT CHILDREN"

"SEC. 123. (a) A State agency which is directly responsible for providing free public education for children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children or in adult correctional institutions shall be eligible to receive a grant under this section for any fiscal year (but only if grants received under this section are used only for children in such institutions).

"(b) Except as provided in section 124, the grant which such an agency (other than the agency for Puerto Rico) shall be eligible to receive shall be an amount equal to 40 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the State (or (1) in the case where the average per pupil expenditure in the State is less than 80 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, of 80 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, or (2) in the case where the average per pupil expenditure in the State is more than 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States, 120 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States).

"(c) A State agency shall use payments under this section only for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of such children.

#### "RESERVATION OF FUNDS FOR TERRITORIES"

"SEC. 120. There is authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for purposes of each of sections 121, 122, and 123, an amount equal to not more than 1 per centum of the amount appropriated for such year for such sections for payments to Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under each such section. The amounts appropriated for each such section shall be allotted among Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for such grants, based on such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title."

## USE OF FUNDS BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES; PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS

SEC. 108. (a) Section 141(a)(1) of the Act is amended by striking out so much thereof as precedes clause (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) that payments under this title will be used for the excess costs of programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment, payments to teachers of amounts in excess of regular salary schedules as a bonus for service in schools eligible for assistance under this title, the training of teachers, and, where necessary, the construction of school facilities and plans made or to be made for such programs, projects, and facilities (A) which meet the individual needs of children demonstrating the need for remedial education, and such payments shall be used only for such needs of such children, without regard to race, sex, religion, national origin, family income, or any other socio-economic criteria, and".

(b) Section 141(a)(2) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) that the local educational agency has provided satisfactory assurance that section 132 will be complied with;".

(d) Section 141 of the Act is amended by striking out subsection (c), by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) It is the purpose of the Congress to encourage, where feasible, the development for each educationally deprived child participating in a program under this title of an individualized written education plan (maintained and periodically evaluated) agreed upon jointly by the local educational agency, a parent or guardian of the child, and when appropriate, the child. The plan shall include (1) a statement of the child's present levels of educational performance, (2) a statement of the long-range goals for the education of the child and the intermediate objectives related to the attainment of such goals, (3) a statement of the specific educational services to be provided to such child, (4) the projected date for initiation and the anticipated duration of such services, (5) objective criteria and evaluation procedures and a schedule for determining whether intermediate objectives are being achieved, and (6) a review of the plan with the parent or guardian at least annually with provision for such amendments as may be mutually agreed upon."

## ADJUSTMENTS NECESSITATED BY APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 109. Section 144 of title I of the Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "If the sums appropriated for any fiscal year for making the payments provided in this title are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all local and State educational agencies are eligible to receive under this title for such year, the amount available for each grant to a State agency eligible for a grant under section 121, 122, or 123 shall be equal to the total amount of the grant as computed under each such section. If the remainder of such sums available after the application of the preceding sentence is not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all local educational agencies are eligible to receive under part A of this title for such year, the allocations to such agencies shall, subject to adjustments under the next sentence, be ratably reduced to the extent necessary to bring the aggregate of such allocations within the limits of the amount so appropriated. The allocation of a local educational agency which would be reduced under the preceding sentence to less than 90 per centum of its allocation under part A for the preceding fiscal year, shall be increased to such amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allocations of the remaining local educational agencies,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allocation to any of such remaining local educational agencies from being thereby reduced to less than such amount."

## PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN ENROLLED IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

SEC. 110. (a) Sections 142 through 144 of the Act (and all cross-references thereto) are redesignated as sections 143 through 145, respectively (and will be further redesignated under section 110(h) of this Act), and the following new section is inserted immediately after section 141:

## PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN ENROLLED IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

"SEC. 132. (a) To the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such agency shall make provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment) in which such children can participate and meeting the requirements of clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 131, paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of such section, and clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of said section.

"(b) (1) If a local educational agency is prohibited by law from providing for the participation in special programs for educationally deprived children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools as required by subsection (a), the Commissioner shall waive such requirement and the provisions of section 131(a)(2) and shall arrange for the provision of services to such children through arrangements which shall be subject to the requirements of subsection (a).

"(2) If the Commissioner determines that a local educational agency has substantially failed to provide for the participation on an equitable basis of educationally deprived children enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools as required by subsection (a), he shall arrange for the provision of services to such children through arrangements which shall be subject to the requirements of subsection (a) upon which determination the provisions of paragraph (a) and Section 131(a)(2) shall be waived.

"(3) When the Commissioner arranges for services pursuant to this section, he shall, after consultation with the appropriate public and private school officials, pay the cost of such services from the appropriate allocation or allocations under this title.

"(4) (i) The Commissioner shall not take any final action under this section or section 807 (d), (e), or (f) until he has afforded the State and local educational agency affected by such action at least 60 days notice of his proposed action and an opportunity for a hearing with respect thereto on the record.

"(ii) If a State or local educational agency is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action after a hearing under subsection (a), it may within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(iii) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court

March 18, 1974

the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(iv) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code."

## TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF ESEA

SEC. 111. (a) Section 141(a)(4) of title I of the Act is amended by striking out "section 145" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 433 of the General Education Provisions Act".

(b) Sections 141(a)(1)(B) and 144(a)(2) (as redesignated by section 109 of this Act) of the Act are each amended by striking out "maximum".

(c) (1) Section 143(a) (as redesignated by section 109 of this Act) of title I of the Act is amended by striking out "described in section 141(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "provided for in section 122".

(2) Section 143(a)(1) (as redesignated by section 109 of this Act) of title I of the Act is amended by striking out "section 103(a)(5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 121".

(d) Section 144(a)(2) (as redesignated by section 109 of this Act) of title I of the Act is amended by striking out "or section 131".

(e) Section 144(b)(1) (as redesignated by section 109 of this Act) of title I of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 1 per centum of the amount allocated to the State and its local educational agencies as determined for that year under this title; or".

(f) The third and fourth sentences of section 145 (as redesignated by section 109 of this Act) of title I of the Act are each amended by striking out "section 103(a)(6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 122".

(g) Sections 146 and 147 of title I of the Act are each amended by striking out "section 141(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 122".

(h) Part D of title I of the Act (and any cross-reference thereto) is redesignated as part C, section 141 of the Act (and any cross-reference thereto) is redesignated as section 131, sections 143 through 145 of the Act (as redesignated by section 109 of this Act) (and cross-references thereto) are further redesignated as sections 133 through 135, respectively, sections 146 through 149 of the Act (and cross-references thereto) are redesignated as sections 136 through 139, respectively, and section 150 of the Act (and any cross-reference thereto) is redesignated as section 141.

(i) Section 403 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(16) For purposes of title II, the 'average per pupil expenditure' in a State, or in the United States, shall be the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made (or if satisfactory data for that year are not available at the time of computation, then during the most recent preceding fiscal year for which satisfactory data are available), of all local educational agencies as defined in section 403(6)(B) in the State, or in the United States (which for the purposes of this subsection means the fifty States, and the District of Columbia), as the case may be, plus any direct current expenditures by the State for operation of such agencies (without regard to the source of funds from which either of such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to

whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year.

(17) For the purposes of title II, 'excess costs' means those costs directly attributable to programs and projects approved under that title which exceed the average per pupil expenditure of a local educational agency in the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available for pupils in the grade or grades included in such programs or projects (but not including expenditures under that title for any comparable State or local special programs for educationally deprived children or expenditures for bilingual programs or special education for handicapped children or children with specific learning disabilities)."

#### STUDY OF PURPOSES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 112. (a) In addition to the other authorities, responsibilities, and duties conferred upon the National Institute of Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Institute") by section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act, the Institute shall undertake a thorough evaluation and study of compensatory education programs, including such programs conducted by States and such programs conducted under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Such study shall include—

(1) an examination of the fundamental purposes of such programs, and the effectiveness of such programs in attaining such purposes;

(2) an analysis of means to accurately identify the children who have the greatest need for such programs, in keeping with the fundamental purposes thereof;

(3) an analysis of effectiveness of methods and procedures for meeting the educational needs of children, including the use of individualized written educational plans for children, and programs for training the teachers of children;

(4) an exploration of alternative methods, including the use of procedures to assess educational disadvantage, for distributing funds under such programs to States, to State educational agencies, and to local educational agencies in an equitable and efficient manner, which will accurately reflect current conditions and insure that such funds reach the areas of greatest current need and are effectively used for such areas;

(5) experimental programs to be administered by the Institute, in cases where the Institute determines that such experimental programs are necessary to carry out clauses (1) through (4), and the Commissioner of Education is authorized, notwithstanding any provision of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, at the request of the Institute, to approve the use of grants which educational agencies are eligible to receive under such title I (in cases where the agency eligible for such grant agrees to such use) in order to carry out such experimental programs, and

(6) findings and recommendations, including recommendations for changes in such title I or for new legislation, with respect to the matters studied under clauses (1) through (5).

(b) The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children shall advise the Institute with respect to the design and execution of such study. The Commissioner of Education shall obtain and transmit to the Institute such information as it shall request with respect to programs carried on under title I of the Act.

(c) The Institute shall make an interim report to the President and to the Congress not later than December 31, 1976, and shall make a final report thereto no later than nine months after the date of submission of such interim report, on the result of its study conducted under this section. Any other provision of law, rule, or regulation to the contrary notwithstanding, such reports shall not

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

be submitted to any review outside of the Institute before its transmittal to the Congress, but the President and the Commissioner of Education may make to the Congress such recommendations with respect to the contents of the reports as each may deem appropriate.

(d) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the study under this section the sum of \$15,000,000.

(e) (1) The Institute shall submit to the Congress, within one hundred and twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a plan for its study to be conducted under this section. The Institute shall have such plan delivered to both Houses on the same day and to each House while it is in session. The Institute shall not commence such study until the first day after the close of the first period of thirty calendar days of continuous session of Congress after the date of the delivery of such plan to the Congress.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

(A) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die; and

(B) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computations of the thirty-day period.

#### SURVEY AND STUDY FOR UPGRADING NUMBER OF CHILDREN COUNTED

SEC. 113. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, expand the current population survey (or make such other survey) in order to furnish current data (for each State with respect to the total number of school-age children in each State to be counted for purposes of section 103 (c) (1) (A) of title I of the Act. Such survey shall be made, and a report of the results of such survey shall be made jointly by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Congress, no later than February 1, 1975.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Commerce shall study the feasibility of updating the number of children counted for purposes of section 103(c) of title I of the Act in school districts of local educational agencies in order to make adjustments in the amounts of the grants for which local educational agencies within a State are eligible under section 103(a) (2) of the Act, and shall report to the Congress, no later than February 1, 1975, the results of such study, which shall include an analysis of alternative methods for making such adjustments, together with the recommendations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Commerce with respect to which such method or methods are most promising for such purpose, together with a study of the results of the expanded population survey, authorized in subsection (a) (including analysis of its accuracy and the potential utility of data derived therefrom) for making adjustments in the amounts paid to each State under section 134(a)(1) of title I of the Act.

(c) No method for making adjustments directed to be considered pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) shall be implemented unless such method shall first be enacted by the Congress.

#### CONTINUATION OF MILITARY DEPENDENTS SPECIAL EDUCATION IN HAWAII

##### HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

##### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, under a recent policy change proclaimed by the

Department of Defense, Federal funds would no longer be provided for children's special educational needs who have severe learning disabilities. For years, these children have received benefits under the civilian health and medical program of the uniformed services—CHAMPUS—which provides financial assistance for medical services obtained from civilian health care providers. Now, the DOD has decided to discontinue cost-sharing for educational services where that kind of service is essentially the only one being provided.

On its face, the Department's policy switch is patently unfair. What difference should it make if only one kind of service is provided to any particular patient? Funds are not being cut off if a CHAMPUS participant is treated solely for measles, cancer, or a broken leg. The distinction adversely affecting children afflicted with learning disabilities appears to have no basis in fact.

According to the Department's statement on this matter, CHAMPUS payments for special education are being withdrawn because the problem is primarily one of education rather than medical treatment for which the program is intended. Yet the cutoff of funds is being imposed "even though a beneficiary may have an approved medical diagnosis and a recommendation or order from a medical professional that educational services should be provided for the treatment of the condition diagnosed."

This is certainly a heartless means of achieving budget cuts. In the State of Hawaii, one of the institutions most severely affected will be the Armed Services Special Education and Training School—ASSETS—a private, nonprofit school for elementary level children—dependents of active duty military personnel—who have learning disabilities and whose academic needs cannot be adequately met in public or other private schools in Hawaii.

The primary goal of ASSETS is to offer instruction, learning and academic therapy for those dependent children who have a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language—spoken or written. Such a disorder can manifest itself in an imperfect ability to think, listen, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations.

These disorders include such conditions as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunctions, dyslexia, developmental aphasia, and other similar handicaps. Certainly these come under the category of medical conditions and special education is a form of treatment. CHAMPUS payments have been provided as such for years and only by twisted logic can it be suddenly discovered now that such payments are not authorized by the law.

Because it is heavily dependent on CHAMPUS funding, Hawaii's ASSETS and the military families who will need these services in the future will suffer greatly because of this shortsighted and discriminatory change. Accordingly, I am introducing today, legislation in the House, as a companion to that offered previously by my colleague Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE to require the Armed

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Forces to continue to provide special education services to physically handicapped dependents of members serving on active duty. This will be accomplished by amending section 1079(d) of title 10, United States Code, to specify the eligibility of children in need of special education for learning disabilities.

I hope this legislation will receive early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

## CETA IN PERSPECTIVE

## HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in signing the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 into law last December, the President hailed it as one of the finest pieces of legislation to have reached his desk that year. The act represents a significant shift in intergovernmental responsibilities and is, in a very real sense, the cutting edge of the new federalism. However, as is true of any piece of legislation, the proof of its value will lie in its implementation.

I commend to my colleagues the following article by Sar A. Levitan and Garth L. Mangum, the current and past chairman, respectively, of the National Manpower Policy Task Force. This article represents a constructive addition to the continuing policy debate surrounding our efforts to develop an effective national manpower policy.

The article follows:

AN OLD BUDGET FOR NEW LEGISLATION:  
IMPACT 1974

(By Sar A. Levitan and Garth L. Mangum)

The developments in manpower policy and priorities over the past year have left significant and lasting changes in our nation's manpower efforts. The signing of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) on December 28, 1973, was potentially the most far-reaching change. Hailed by the administration as a "substantial achievement in the movement toward special revenue sharing goals of decentralized and decategorized domestic programming," the act marks a departure from federal dominance in the manpower field.

## CETA IN PERSPECTIVE

Many observers of the manpower system as it evolved during the past dozen years have agreed that the federal establishment has dominated the design, planning, and delivery of manpower programs at the expense of state and local involvement. The rhetoric of decentralization and decategorization promised more efficient and effective utilization of manpower resources—less time wasted in securing federal approval and less money diverted to national emphasis programs that do not meet local needs.

Given the conflicts between the Nixon administration and Congress over the past three years and the oft-noted deterioration of the bipartisanship which prevailed in manpower policy until about 1970, it is easy to forget that the administration and both parties in Congress have been pursuing essentially the same objectives. The differences were largely in detail and in rhetoric.

March 18, 1974

The rhetoric in particular might lead the casual observer to believe that a radically new concept—manpower revenue sharing—had been introduced and had prevailed in a remarkably short time. Actually a consensus on the need for decentralization and decategorization had been building for a decade and the concepts had no serious opposition left. As early as 1964, the Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower recommended the formation of manpower advisory committees in every major labor market area, which were to include representatives of each public and private agency and target groups in the community with substantial manpower interests. Committees were "to consider the full range of manpower problems and needs in the community for the present and future" and were to have their counterparts at the state and regional level.

On the legislative front, the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act designated Community Work and Training Programs (CWTP) as single sponsors for local manpower programs and authorized Concentrated Employment Programs (CEP) to develop one-stop manpower service centers. The 1968 amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act gave states the authority to approve all institutional projects as long as they conformed to a federally-approved state plan.

Administratively, the Department of Labor initiated the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMP) to encourage local decision making in manpower policy and shifted more of its contract approval decisions to regional offices. George P. Shultz, the first Secretary of Labor under President Nixon, indicated support of manpower decentralization and decategorization when he served as chairman of a pre-inauguration manpower task force.

The key policy decision was to consolidate responsibility for planning and delivery of manpower services in the hands of elected officials in the states and localities—not with the professional bureaucrats who earlier dominated local manpower operations. In 1972, manpower planning councils were reconstituted under the chairmanship of mayors and governors. Building on the 1967 "Green Amendment" to the Economic Opportunity Act (which authorized local governments to assume sponsorship of community action agencies and antipoverty manpower programs), the Department of Labor funded nine pilot projects in 1973 to consolidate authority for MDTA and EOA programs under the auspices of local government.

It took the new law, however, to give final approval to the choice of elected officials as manpower sponsors and more significantly, to clarify the relative roles of federal, state, and local governments and community organizations. The law gives the states a role both as sponsor for areas not covered by direct federal grants and as coordinator of state agencies—the employment security, vocational education and welfare agencies—and localities. Involvement of community groups, at least in the planning process, is assured. And, the federal government is left with oversight authority—that could be exercised as strictly as it chooses—to approve the sponsors' plans and to assure that CETA's standards of serving the "economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed" are met.

Though the "new" manpower policy embodied in CETA is really a decade old, this does not minimize the achievements of those who brought CETA into being. Nearly all groups recognized the desirability of assigning greater responsibility to state and local officials for manpower programs, but there were many objections to the comprehensive

legislation. Some opponents were merely protecting their vested interest in some categorical programs or arguing for political purposes. Others questioned the extremeness of the administration's "put the money on the stump and run" language at some points, and feared that "revenue sharing" was a blind for cutting manpower budgets. None of these disagreements, however, go to the heart of the decentralization-decategorization debate.

Informed opposition to CETA raised two important questions that may haunt ardent proponents of decentralized and decategorized manpower programs: Can state and local governments be trusted to give priority to the needs of disadvantaged people? And will the feds supply as much money for a single comprehensive program as for the aggregate of many separate ones?

## ACCOUNTABILITY UNDER CETA

The first fear was fostered by the extreme manpower revenue sharing rhetoric, which sounded as though the administration was in fact preparing to abandon responsibility for manpower efforts except for the supply of funds. Any such inclinations were tempered in CETA which leaves the federal establishment an opportunity and a mandate to remain the steward of appropriated funds. In fact, federal manpower agencies never had much influence over what occurred with manpower money in the field. They could audit to determine whether anyone had "his hand in the till." They could require reports stating that all or most of the enrollees fit the disadvantaged criteria. But they could never assure that the reports were accurate or that the criteria in fact identified those most in need of services. They could insist that program operators supply the services prescribed in program guidelines but they could never assure that the services fit the clients' needs nor that they were of high quality. All of these quality controls had to be left to the local jurisdiction's good faith and commitment.

Since manpower is only one of the many responsibilities of a governor, mayor, or county supervisor, his competence as a manpower practitioner is less important than his commitment to manpower as a local policy tool. The elected official is in a position to create his own bureaucracy to plan and administer programs. The tradeoff will be between the established, professional, federally-oriented bureaucracies and a new and smaller bureaucracy less experienced and accountable to an elected official who will likely be concerned only about the political consequences of his manpower policies. Inexperience is by definition temporary. The continuing issue will be political responsiveness to the manpower clientele. This responsiveness will now depend on clients' organization and political muscle, not on the relationship of the elected official to his bureaucrats.

## THE 1975 MANPOWER BUDGET

Without minimizing the importance of good administration in the delivery of manpower services, it must be recognized that the most efficient administration does not create jobs or provide training facilities and opportunities. Funds are needed to plan and implement manpower programs and even the most ardent advocates of encouraging greater local participation in manpower programs recognize that decentralization of authority over manpower services will not increase the efficiency of these programs overnight. On the contrary, the period of transition may entail extra expenditures and little administrative savings. Clearly, the inclusion of state and local officials in the manpower system can bring about only marginal improvements in the short run. Some had hoped that the period of transition to greater roles

for state and local manpower administrators would be accompanied by the necessary financial support to allow for the orderly continuation of existing programs and that the manpower budget would be sweetened to allow for greater local experimentation. This, regrettably, was not the case.

After the sharp reductions of manpower outlays in 1973, it is quite clear that the fat years for manpower are over. The budget demonstrates that the administration favors comprehensive programs only if they can be achieved with smaller aggregate costs. Total manpower expenditures peaked at the \$5 billion level during fiscal 1973—a cut of \$300 million from the earlier announced plans (Table 1). The Office of Management and Budget anticipates that fiscal 1974 outlays for manpower programs will be cut during the current year by an additional \$153 million and that they will remain at the \$4.8 billion level during the succeeding fiscal year.

The apparent stabilization of manpower outlays is, of course, misleading because it does not take into account the inflation that has occurred in recent years. Given the 8.8 percent rise in the Consumer Price Index during 1973 and an anticipated increase of about 7 percent (if not worse) during the current year, it would have required an increase of about \$700 million in the manpower

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

budget just to keep up the 1973 real level of expenditures.

TABLE 1.—MANPOWER BUDGET SUMMARY  
(In millions of dollars)

Program	1973 actual	1974 estimate	1975 estimate
Total	4,952	4,808	4,831
Comprehensive manpower assistance training	1,388	1,398	1,902
Emergency employment assistance	1,005	631	—
Work incentive training and placement	177	197	200
Veterans programs	292	337	339
Employment service	431	428	424
Vocational rehabilitation	636	715	770
Social services training	58	41	61
Other training and placement programs	276	282	260
Employment-related child care	433	502	584
Program direction, research, and support	209	220	219
Other supportive services	48	58	51

Source: U.S. Office of Management and Budget.

The aggregate manpower budget reduction of about 18 percent in real terms between 1973 and 1975 masks the disproportionate distribution of the losses. Programs for the poor, the unemployed, and the underemployed

served by CETA are slated for the sharpest cuts. In fiscal 1973, the outlays that are covered by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act efforts amounted to \$2.4 billion. The administration proposes to cut these outlays to \$1.9 billion during fiscal 1975 (Table 2).

At the state and local level, the combination of manpower funds administered by the Department of Labor amounted to \$2.1 billion of the \$2.4 billion total. It was reduced to \$1.9 billion in 1974 and to \$1.6 billion in 1975. Institutional expenditures are expected to expand slightly in 1975 after their cut in 1974. This assumption seems reasonable since states and localities will receive a 5 percent funding bonus for planning institutional programs jointly with state vocational education agencies. On-the-job training programs, which underwent significant cutbacks in 1974, are expected to receive greater preference among state and local sponsors in 1975. Much of the increase is due to the fact that state and local governments will have to pick up funding for the JOBS program, which was a national program this year. Expenditures for work experience programs for school age youth, also retrenched in 1974, will grow by 30 percent in 1975 thanks to unexpended funds left over from previous appropriations. The legality of impounding these funds has been questioned by the lower courts.

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING FUNDS

(Dollar amounts in millions)

	1973			1974			1975				
	Actual	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Actual	Percent	Estimate	Percent	
Total	\$2,393	100.0	\$2,029	100.0	\$1,902	100.0					
State and local:											
Institutional	410	17.1	365	18.0	417	21.9					
OJT	143	6.0	91	4.5	242	12.7					
In-school work support	295	12.3	289	14.2	394	20.7					
Postschool work support	248	10.4	311	15.3	573	30.1					
Subtotal	1,096	45.8	1,056	52.0	1,626	85.5					
Public employment program	1,005	42.0	631	31.1							

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Office of Management and Budget.

The major loss which state and local governments have been asked to absorb is in public service employment. During 1973, expenditures under the Emergency Employment Act added \$1 billion to the \$248 million spent in other public service employment programs. States and localities will have \$631 million left for 1974 from EEA, to which comprehensive manpower funds are expected to add only \$311 million, bringing the cut to 25 percent. However, despite the successful struggle to include a separate public employment program in CETA, states and localities must plan for even greater reduction in public service jobs in 1975. Based on the administration proposed budget, public employment funding in 1975 is likely to amount to \$573 million—a 40 percent decrease from 1974—assuming the \$350 million authorized will be expended and anticipated additional state and local expenditures for public employment materialize. The effectiveness of public service employment as a counter-cyclical tool may be lost because the legislation allows states and localities to intermingle the money nominally set aside for public employment in high unemployment areas with their regular manpower allotments without restrictions on the activities for which dollars from either account may be used. On the other hand, the reduction in the size of the separate public service employment allocation and the freedom to use regular CETA funds for public employment may tempt localities to forego other manpower services in order to maintain their public employment effort.

Even some of the administration's "pet" manpower efforts have suffered in the new budget. The January 1974 state of the union message alluded to plans for revamping the welfare payments system, but on the manpower front the administration budget indicates a dampening of enthusiasm for its policy of combating welfare with work. Last year the Work Incentive (WIN) program appeared a big winner in the manpower budget. However, proposed 1974 and 1975 expenditures for WIN training will increase by only 2 percent and the anticipated man-years of service to be offered are the same. WIN expenditures on direct placement of welfare recipients in jobs—mandated by the Talmadge welfare amendments of 1971—also will be held constant. The administration commitment to moving welfare recipients into permanent jobs appears to have dimmed, though, despite the regrettable loss of funding, this is not an unwelcome recognition of reality.

The administration also intends to clamp down on the expenditures of the United States Employment Service. Its budget fails to reflect this year's expected increase in the unemployment rate which would presumably add to its work load. Moreover, a reduced budget seems to hurt the Department of Labor plans for more services to employers in hopes of raising the numbers of replacements.

Outlays for vocational rehabilitation and for supportive services for WIN trainees, welfare recipients, and vocational rehabilitation trainees continue to expand slowly from year

to year. Like veteran's programs, these seem to face little opposition in the annual battle for attention. This year, without U.S. military involvement in the Vietnam War, outlays on veterans programs are expected to stabilize.

Other aspects of CETA legislation threaten problems for some states and localities. The distribution of CETA funds are based on a formula which includes the previous year's allocation (50 percent), the number of unemployed (37.5 percent), and the adult population living on an annual income of below \$7,000 (12.5 percent). Despite a hold harmless clause that would prevent cuts of more than 10 percent from the previous year, the formula continues the tendency to redistribute funds to suburban jurisdictions which began in 1973. For the central cities, the outlook is for continuing shrinking budgets.

Central cities can find little hope in other portions of the federal budget. Legislative authority for the Economic Opportunity Act will end in June 1974 and Model Cities is being phased out, threatening to curtail many manpower-related activities of the community action agencies. The CAA budget, which accounted for total outlays \$396 million in 1973 and \$243 million this year, includes only \$87 million for 1975 to phase out federal support for the antipoverty agencies. Manpower expenditures by Model Cities agencies will be reduced from \$57 million in 1973 and 1974 to \$21 million in 1975. Facing reduced manpower allocations, many cities will find it difficult—if not impossible—to

pick up part of the community action or Model Cities tab.

#### MAKING DO WITH A SMALLER BUDGET

The "decategorization" of manpower funding will not eliminate categorical needs and clients. The budget analysis recognizes these facts of life in its attempt to guess how areas will divide their CETA allotments among institutional, on-the-job training, in-school and post-school work support activities. Since states and localities will be planning this spring for fiscal 1975, the Office of Management and Budget can merely make educated guesses at the distribution of the funds.

Yet, with shrinking funds the predicted number of new enrollees and man-years of service are on the rise. The obvious question is how can this be achieved since higher costs per man-year are expected in each category of service. The "solution" is to cut down on the length of time clients stay in the programs. Presumably, the strategy is speedier placement in jobs. Indeed, the average period of enrollment in institutional training has already dropped from 4.9 months to 3.4 months between 1971 and 1973. The federal budget planners anticipate a further reduction in the next year. Estimated outlays per new enrollee will presumably decline from \$2,931 in 1973 to \$1,873 next year. Given the history of manpower programs during periods of loose labor markets, like those anticipated in the next year, such a strategy has little hope of succeeding.

The pressure on new local officials and policymakers to plan with reduced budgets places difficult obstacles on the success of the new system designed by CETA. State and local planners will be confronted with politically powerful manpower agencies whose established local manpower turfs may be difficult to alter. Even in areas with good manpower relations between professional bureaucracies and elected officials, additional funds will not be available for experimentation. Moreover, development of the technical skills and political acumen necessary to design and implement changes may not be forthcoming quickly. As long as manpower budgets fail to keep pace with the goals of the new legislation, the new manpower system will not be given a chance to show whether it can operate more effectively or efficiently than the old one.

However, forecasts based on the President's budget proposals may be unnecessarily pessimistic. The modest congressional CETA authorization and the equally skimpy administration budget recommendations were planned in relatively prosperous times as the pressing needs for manpower efforts were declining. Hopefully, the economic downturn and the rising unemployment will stimulate more generous manpower appropriations than the administration and Congress were ready to provide last year. Already, influential members of Congress from both parties have introduced large-scale public employment proposals. If they pass, more CETA funds will be available for other manpower services. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act may still be given an opportunity to realize the potential inherent in the legislation.

#### EIGHTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

#### HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, each year since coming to Congress in 1966, it has been my custom to make

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

available to each of my constituents a public opinion questionnaire.

I wish to share with my colleagues the thinking of the residents of Arkansas' Third Congressional District, as expressed in the results tabulated from the 21,783 responses received to my seventh annual questionnaire, which was distributed late in the 1st session of the 93d Congress.

#### SEVENTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. Would you favor a Federal law or Constitutional amendment reconstituting Capital Punishment for certain specified crimes? 98 percent responded: 88 percent yes, 12 percent no.

2. Should there be a shift in responsibility for funding projects from categorical grants at the federal level to local decision-making? 90 percent responded: 75 percent yes, 25 percent no.

3. Do you think President Nixon is charting a good course in expanding diplomatic and trade relations with Mainland China and the U.S.S.R? 93 percent responded: 74 percent yes, 26 percent no.

4. Do you think the President is correct in insisting through military strength if necessary, that North Vietnam live up to the Paris Peace Agreement? 92 percent responded: 64 percent yes, 36 percent no.

5. If Congress appropriates spending in excess of the budget request, should the President exercise his option of impounding the additional monies? 93 percent responded: 64 percent yes, 36 percent no.

6. Do you generally favor the President's selection of domestic priorities as we phase from a war-time to a peace-time economy? 87 percent responded: 63 percent yes, 37 percent no.

7. Do you believe this questionnaire is a legitimate and effective means of communicating your views to your elected Representative? 96 percent responded: 95 percent yes, 5 percent no.

8. The Senate Agriculture Committee has approved a farm bill to continue the set-aside production concept while establishing target prices for commodities. Should the federal government continue to insure the farmer a percent of his production cost (% of parity) when the market will not support the target price? 90 percent responded: 40 percent yes, 60 percent no.

9. Do you favor federal prohibition on the sale of cheap, short-range handguns (so-called "Saturday Night Specials"), not including longer range pistols and revolvers, rifles and shotguns? 96 percent responded, 67 percent yes, 33 percent no.

10. Do you favor legislation that would insure the continuance of the Office of Economic Opportunity? 92 percent responded: 86 percent yes; 64 percent no.

11. Do you favor legislation recently passed by the House of Representatives which increases the Minimum Wage to \$2.20 within one year from enactment, and enlarges the group of employees covered? 95 percent responded: 64 percent yes; 36 percent no.

12. Do you think that the televised Senate hearings on 'Watergate' are (choose one): 94 percent responded.

(a) In the National Interest, 43 percent.

(b) Harmful to the National Interest, 57 percent.

13. Which Congressional course of action on abortion do you favor (choose one): 92 percent responded.

(a) Do nothing at all and let Supreme Court decision permitting abortion stand, 34 percent.

(b) Enact Constitutional amendment to prohibit abortion, 24 percent.

(c) Enact amendment to let each State decide abortion question, 42 percent.

14. Do you think wage-price controls should be (choose one): 91 percent responded.

March 18, 1974

- (a) More strict, 52 percent.
- (b) Less strict, 2 percent.
- (c) Kept about as they are, 16 percent.
- (d) Eliminated, 23 percent.

Mr. Speaker, my eighth annual questionnaire is now being mailed throughout the third district. I include the text of the questions in the hope that they may be of some interest or benefit to my colleagues.

1. To help meet our long-term goal of energy self-sufficiency, would you favor creation of a federal oil and gas corporation to lead accelerated but somewhat costly (estimated \$10 billion or more long term) research and development efforts?

2. Should legislation be enacted proposing a Constitutional amendment which would negate the Supreme Court's decision striking down state and local statutes governing abortion?

3. Do you favor financing campaigns for federal office with tax dollars rather than private contributions?

4. Do you feel that network television fairly presents both sides of most issues?

5. In order to conserve energy, do you think auto emissions standards and pollution controls should be relaxed?

6. Do you favor the elimination of federal wage-price controls which still affect certain services & industries?

7. Would you favor a raise in and/or an extension of Social Security benefits coupled with an increase in the Social Security Tax?

8. Do you favor federal legislation to assist the states to develop land use programs for critical areas and uses of more than local concern?

9. Do you approve of the way the President has done his job?

10. Do you think it would be in the country's best interest for President Nixon to:

- (a) Remain in office
- (b) Resign
- (c) Be impeached

11. Which of the alternatives listed below do you favor as the most effective approach to our current energy shortfall: (check one)

- (a) a national program of gasoline rationing
- (b) removal of petroleum price controls
- (c) oil industry excess profits tax provisions to encourage reinvestment in energy resource recovery and development

(d) a roll-back in petroleum product prices

12. Regarding national health insurance, which do you prefer? (check one)

- (a) a program financed and operated by the federal government
- (b) federally-funded health insurance for welfare dependents

(c) complete reliance on the private health insurance structure

(d) government insurance against only catastrophic or prolonged illness

(e) no new legislation in this area.

#### BAR PRESIDENTIAL REELECTION SAID GROVER CLEVELAND

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday anniversary of Grover Cleveland, our Nation's 22d and 24th President.

He did not believe a President should succeed himself. Indeed, he felt there should be an amendment to the Constitution to disqualify the President from reelection. It was in support of this phi-

losophy that his terms were not consecutive, thus practicing what he preached.

Grover Cleveland adopted Buffalo, N.Y., as his home. He paid it high honor and public service by his professional and civic work, including terms as Erie County assistant attorney, sheriff, and then mayor, before going on to become Governor of New York State and then President.

In his many public appearances, Grover Cleveland displayed a public dedication and independence that is refreshing.

Anne McL. Matthews, columnist for the Buffalo Courier-Express, has woven a revealing story about Cleveland and his philosophy. Her story includes several quotations from him which make timely reading. Following is her excellent text:

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express, Mar. 17, 1974]

#### GROVER CLEVELAND

(By Anne McL. Matthews)

He was born 137 years ago tomorrow in Caldwell, N.J., but he lived a lot of his life here and made Buffalo the home of his heart. He said so in dozens of speeches.

Grover Cleveland was certainly one of our greatest Presidents, unquestionably one of the most colorful citizens of Buffalo, and historically splendid, stamping the hallmark of incorruptibility on the office of mayor, governor, and President of the United States. He was truly a man for all ages—in politics. And he is too little remembered in this city and there is too little taught about him in our schools and year after year the anniversary of his birthday is shamefully ignored by a city he supremely enriched and brought renown to. Other than a school and golf course named for him and a statue in front of Buffalo's City Hall, the fame of Grover Cleveland and the incalculable service he rendered to this nation in taking the country entirely away from the prejudices and traditions of the Civil War, has dimmed. It should not be so.

Monday is Grover Cleveland Day. It should be a civic holiday with banners flying.

Grover was a fulltime President of the United States—two times—and an all time adopted son of Buffalo who not only motivated and made things happen here as citizen, Erie County Assistant Attorney, sheriff, and then mayor but went on to carry Buffalo's flag into the office of governor and twice into the White House, for the first time 89 years ago and the second time 81 years ago. He was the 22nd and the 24th President of the United States.

He never forgot his wealth of friends and his obligations to Buffalo. He came back again and again as governor and President to use this city as a forum for international and national speeches of importance. To know the man is to listen to him and the listening I did was through a book, "The Writings and Speeches of Grover Cleveland" by George F. Parker, printed in 1892 with Cleveland's imprint 16 years before his death and the speeches provided by himself.

#### MESSAGE TO SENATE

In a message chastizing the Senate for demands upon him which he deemed imprudent he summed up his credo . . . "no demands of that body are sufficient to discourage or deter me from following in the way which I am convinced leads to better government for the people."

He didn't give long speeches. He seized upon the idea of point of first importance or of practical value and presented it with skill and emphasis. He liked to give advice to his own Democratic party but in none of his speeches did he stress a motive which was partisan and nothing more. He said this in his speech before the City Convention of

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Buffalo Oct. 25, 1881 when he accepted the nomination for mayor.

"There is, or there should be, no reason why the affairs of our city should not be managed with the same care and the same economy as private interests. And when we consider that public officials are the trustees of the people and hold their places and exercise their powers for the benefit of the people, there should be no higher inducement to a faithful and honest discharge of public duty."

In his letter accepting the nomination for governor, Oct. 7, 1882—"Public officers are the servants and agents of the people to execute laws which the people have made, and within the limits of a constitution which they have established. Hence the interference of officials of any degree, and whether state or federal, for the purpose of controlling the popular wish, should not be tolerated."

#### REGARDING MUNICIPALITIES

He said further—"I am unalterably opposed to the interference by the Legislature with the government of municipalities. I believe in the intelligence of the people when left to an honest freedom in their choice, and that when the citizens of any section of the state have determined upon the details of a local government, they should be left in the undisturbed enjoyment of the same. The doctrine of home rule, as I understand it, lies at the foundation of republican institutions, and cannot be too strongly insisted upon."

One of his greatest campaign speeches was made in Albany, July 10, 1884—"The American people are about to exercise, in its highest sense, their power of right and sovereignty. They are to call in review before them their public servants and the representatives of political parties, and demand of them an account of their stewardship.

"Parties may be so long in power, and may become so arrogant and careless of the interests of the people, as to grow heedless of their responsibility to their masters. But the time comes, as certainly as death, when the people weigh them in the balance.

"We believe that the people are not receiving at the hands of the party which, for nearly 24 years, has directed the affairs of the nation, the full benefits to which they are entitled—of a pure, just, and economical rule—and we believe that the ascendancy of genuine Democratic principles will insure a better government, and greater happiness and prosperity to all the people.

"To reach the sober thought of the nation and to dislodge an enemy entrenched behind spoils and patronage, involve a struggle, which, if we underestimate, we invite defeat. Let us do battle for a better government, confidently, courageously, always honorably, and with a firm reliance upon the intelligence and patriotism of the American people."

Would that all those involved in the Watergate mess could have learned from his letter accepting nomination as President mailed from Albany, Aug. 18, 1884—as follows—

#### VIEW ON PUBLIC SERVICE

"The people pay the wages of the public employees, and they are entitled to the fair and honest work which the money thus paid should command. It is the duty of those entrusted with the management of their affairs to see that such public service is forthcoming. The selection and retention of subordinates in government employment should depend on their ascertained fitness and the value of their work, and they should be neither expected nor allowed to do questionable party service.

"The interests of the people will be better protected; the estimate of public labor and duty will be immensely improved; public employment will be open to all who can demonstrate their fitness to enter it; the unseemly who scramble for place under government, with the consequent opportunity which embitters official life, will cease, and the public

departments will not be filled with those who conceive it to be their first duty to aid the party to which they owe their places, instead of rendering patient and honest return to the people.

"I believe that the public temper is such that the voters of the land are prepared to support the party which gives the promise of administering the government in the honest, simple, and plain manner which is consistent with its character and purposes. They have learned that mystery and concealment in the management of their affairs cover tricks and betrayal."

Cleveland came back to Buffalo to give speeches whenever he could—for instance—at Buffalo's 50th anniversary of incorporation as a city in St. James Hall, W. Eagle and Washington Sts.; at the celebration of the semi-centennial of the German Young Men's Assn. in 1891, in the Music Hall at Main and Edward Sts. (later the Teek Theater), which replaced a former hall destroyed by fire in 1885 along with St. Louis Church; and at the laying of the cornerstone of the Fitch Institute at Swan and Michigan, in 1882.

#### RISE WAS METEORIC

This was the first day care center to be established in the nation and was established by Philanthropist Benjamin Fitch as a home for children of working mothers at the behest of an organization headed by Maria Love, another Buffalonian who also gave generous sums to great causes in this city.

Cleveland's rise from an obscure lawyer to the highest office in the land was admittedly meteoric and he always in his many Buffalo speeches humbly acknowledged that it was to a great many prominent Buffalonians that he owed his successes. An example is his speech in Buffalo Oct. 2, 1884 when he acknowledged his nomination for President.

"I can hardly tell you how grateful I am for the confidence and esteem of my friends and fellow citizens. I have resided among you and in the city where all my success in private life has been achieved for nearly 30 years. But two short years ago you stood steadily by my side in every effort of mine as the chief executive of our city, to advance its interests and welfare.

"I can never forget the generous endorsement you gave my candidacy for governor.

"Because I love my state and her people, I cannot refrain from reminding you that she should be in the van of every movement which promises a safer and better administration of the general government, so closely related to her prosperity and greatness. And let me leave you with the thought that your safety lies in impressing upon the endeavor of those entrusted with the guardianship of your rights and interests, a pure, patriotic, and exacting popular sentiment.

#### CHARACTER OF GOVERNMENT

"The character of the government can hardly rise higher than the source from which it springs, and the integrity and faithfulness of public servants are not apt to be greater than the public demand."

Right here it might be pertinent to cite some Cleveland "sensational facts." A little known thing is the fact that he was the domino that set up a record in 51 days—less than two months—Buffalo had four mayors in a row. When Cleveland was elected governor he resigned as mayor (Nov. 20, 1882). The city council met and promptly named Marcus Drake as interim mayor. He resigned Dec. 22. The council then appointed Harmon S. Cutting mayor on Dec. 29. On Jan. 9, 1883, ten days later, John Manning in a special election was named mayor.

Cleveland started in his mayoralty and continued through his governorship and presidency to be known as "Mister Veto". He never hesitated to declare his honest opposition to legislation he felt unnecessary or contrary to the public welfare.

He was the first Democrat in a long time to be elected mayor and President. He is the only President who succeeded his successor.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

One of the most significant of Cleveland's great beliefs—and campaigns—was his opposition to a President succeeding himself or perpetuating himself in office (long before the Roosevelt determination to rule no matter what crisis might be obtained by disability). And this was despite his eventual serving two terms. In his letter accepting the presidential nomination in 1884 he said this which is prescient:

## ON PRESIDENTIAL REELECTION

"When an election to office shall be the selection by the voters of one of their number to assume for a time a public trust, instead of his dedication to the profession of politics; when the holders of the ballot, quickened by sense of duty, shall avenge truth betrayed and pledges broken, and when the suffrage shall be altogether free and uncorrupted, the full realization of a government by the people will be at hand.

"And of the means to this end not one would, in my judgment, be more effective than an amendment to the Constitution disqualifying the President from re-election. When we consider the patronage of this great office, the allurements of power, the temptations to retain public place once gained and, more than all, the availability a party finds in an incumbent whom a horde of office holders, with a zeal borne of benefits received and fostered by the hope of favors yet to come, stand ready to aid with money and trained political service, we recognize in the eligibility of the President for re-election a most serious danger to that calm, deliberate and intelligent political action which must characterize a government by the people."

The following is "the record of Grover Cleveland." An explanatory note about the reference to the "Murchison Letter" in his first administration is that this was a cleverly contrived Republican trick to make it seem that Cleveland was unduly friendly towards the English and hence disloyal to American-Irish and other Anglophones. In other words, political dirty tricks vintage 1888. The record:

## CLEVELAND'S RECORD

Grover Cleveland—(1837-1908) Twenty-second and Twenty-fourth President.

Born, March 18, 1837

Place of birth, Caldwell, N.J.

Ancestry, English-Scotch, Irish

Father, Richard Falley Cleveland (1804-1853)

Mother, Ann Neal Cleveland (1804-1882)

Wife, Frances Folsom (1864-1947)

Children, Five: two boys, three girls

Education, public schools

Religion, Presbyterian

Occupation, lawyer

Military Service, none

Political Party, Democrat

Offices Held: Erie County assistant attorney; sheriff of Erie County; Mayor of Buffalo; governor of New York State

Age at Inaugurations: 47 and 55

Terms served: Two (1885-1889) (1893-1897).

Vice Presidents: Thomas A. Hendricks (1885, died in office) and Adlai E. Stevenson (1893-1897).

Died: June 24, 1908, Princeton, N.J., age 71.

Cause of Death: Natural causes.

## HIS FIRST ADMINISTRATION

Highlights of historical events during Cleveland's first administration (1885-1889).

Political—1886—Presidential Succession Act; Treasury surplus grows; American Federation of Labor organized with Samuel Gompers as first President; Statue of Liberty dedicated at Bedloe's Island, New York.

1887—Interstate Commerce Commission formed; Hatch Act.

1888—"Murchison Letter".

1886—Capture of Apache Chief Geronimo ends South-West Indian hostilities.

Scientific—1895—Commercial adding machine—William Burroughs, U.S.

1888—Kodak camera—Eastman Kodak, U.S.

Territory—No states admitted.

## HIS SECOND

Highlights of Historical Events during Second Administration (1893-1897).

Political—1893—Nationwide bank panic; repeal of Sherman Silver Purchase Act; World Columbian Exposition held in Chicago.

1894—Coxey's Army; Federal troops called out to control Pullman strike.

1896—Hawaii becomes a Republic; McKinley elected president.

Military—1895—Cuban revolt.

Scientific—1894—Wireless telegraph—Guglielmo Marconi, Italy.

1896—Electric Stove—Wm. S. Hadway, U.S.

Territory—state admitted: Utah, 1896.

The statue of Grover Cleveland on the north end outside the Buffalo City Hall is a masterpiece of the famous sculptor, Bryant Baker. It was unveiled in 1932 and was the first statue to be dedicated to him in the entire United States. Baker had previously sculptured models of Taft, Hoover, Coolidge, Theodore Roosevelt and Wilson. The statue is a true likeness of the President. In order to insure Cleveland's exact proportions Baker borrowed an overcoat from Mrs. Cleveland and for his facial expression he used the death mask of the President which is kept at Princeton University. The statue portrays Cleveland delivering an address so characteristic of his political career.

An amusing item of interest in connection with the situation of the statue is the significance of the exact site. It was argued that the statue of Millard Fillmore to the south should have faced the site of the Hotel Statler which was the location of Fillmore's mansion and that Cleveland should have been placed so that he might forever stare at the site of Louis Goetz' Pearl Street saloon which he frequented many times with scores of Buffalo cronies.

A bust of Grover Cleveland is presently in The Buffalo Club in Delaware Ave.

## MARS—LIKE A MAGNET TO SOVIETS

## HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. Speaker, within the funds available, our national space program is attempting to utilize the technology of space more and more directly for the benefit of this Nation and the world. To provide the store of knowledge necessary to do this requires funding scientific research and development in space. A significant part of this scientific effort is the future exploration of Mars with unmanned landing vehicles in the NASA-Viking program. It is important to note that the Soviet Union continues to press on with their vigorous exploration of the solar system. Undoubtedly they are motivated by a similar concern to our own—that of developing the scientific basis upon which to build programs of strong and direct worth to their people. Mr. Kenneth W. Gatland in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor reviews the Soviet plans for scientific exploration of Mars. The article follows:

## MARS—LIKE A MAGNET TO SOVIETS

(By Kenneth W. Gatland)

LONDON.—With an armada of four automatic interplanetary stations heading toward Mars, the determination of the Soviet Union to press ahead with the unmanned exploration of that great planet is beyond question.

March 18, 1974

Had the United States space budget not been cut two Viking spacecraft equipped with biological laboratories would have joined them. But now it will be August, 1975, the next opportunity to launch for Mars, before America's major Mars experiment can get off the ground.

Undoubtedly we are witnessing a major Soviet effort not only to survey the planet from orbit, but also to land television cameras and scientific instruments.

The first two craft, Mars 4 and Mars 5, were launched from the Soviet cosmodrome at Tyuratam in central Asia on July 21 and July 25, respectively. They should reach the planet in mid-February, 1974.

## FOUR TRACKING SHIPS

Mars 6 and Mars 7 left the cosmodrome on Aug. 5 and Aug. 9. They are expected to arrive a few weeks after their predecessors. Their departure from earth-orbit was under the control of ground stations in the Soviet Union and four tracking ships strung out across the oceans with Molniya communications satellites completing the link.

The clue that the Soviets may have launched a major exploratory device for soft-landing on Mars was given by the official Tass announcement on the launching of Mars 6.

This gave the main objective as the exploration of the planet and the surrounding space, and in-flight studies of the interplanetary medium. It also stated that "Mars 6 differs somewhat in its design" from the craft launched in July.

## ROBOT EQUIPMENT

The communiqué continued: "It is envisaged that Mars 6 will carry out part of the scientific exploration with the use of equipment of Mars 4."

It seems that one craft, probably Mars 4, is meant to serve as a relay station in Mars orbit for a major surface experiment that could involve television and the manipulation of robot equipment. The orbiter could also be used to boost TV signals from the lander to the Soviet deep-space tracking station at Yevpatoriya in the Crimea.

Mars 6 and 7 are stated to be similar in design. Both carry French instruments provided under the Franco-Soviet agreement for peaceful cooperation in space. This main experiment, also carried on Mars 3 in 1971, examines the sun's radio emission in the one-meter band simultaneously with ground stations in France and the Soviet Union. Other spaceborne instruments study the characteristics of solar plasma and cosmic rays.

The Russians are known to have two major projects for Mars exploration. One is an automatic microbiological laboratory. It will scoop up samples of Martian soil and analyze them automatically for traces of living organisms such as bacteria, yeasts, and fungal cultures. Air samples will be drawn into the capsule for analysis through a filter designed to trap microorganisms.

When I visited Moscow earlier this year I was told that scientists hope to land instruments in a region near the south polar cap where the thin carbon dioxide air might carry moisture. Initially, they plan to analyze the soil with a gamma-ray spectrometer of the type used on the Moon and Venus.

Russian scientists are paying particular attention to a broad region of the so-called Red Planet between 15 degrees and 50 degrees south and 20 degrees and 45 degrees west using photographs obtained from Mars orbit by America's highly successful Mariner 9 spacecraft.

## REMOTE CHEMICAL ANALYSIS

Lev Mukhin, chief of the Laboratory of Exobiology of the Soviet Institute of Space Research, has already shown that microorganisms and simple plants in a Mars simulator can live in a thin, mainly carbon dioxide atmosphere with minute amounts of water vapor. Mariner 9 confirmed that the polar region of Mars contains both frozen carbon dioxide (dry ice) and water ice. How-

ever, the Soviet scientists know only too well how difficult the problems are. They may be content first to obtain panoramic television pictures of surface conditions at the landing site and to make a remote chemical analysis of the soil.

The other major project on which the Russians are working is a wheeled Mars rover.

**CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR PRAISES AKRON'S NEW PERFORMING ARTS CENTER**

**HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

**Mr. SEIBERLING.** Mr. Speaker, I am again delighted to offer for the RECORD another article praising the new Edwin J. Thomas Performing Arts Center at the University of Akron in my home city of Akron, Ohio. In an article in the Christian Science Monitor for March 15, William Marlin, editor in chief of the Architectural Forum, writes that the Thomas Hall—

In pointed contrast to the bejeweled banality of so many "culture centers" of the 1950's and 1960's, is a structurally inventive and, expressing this, spatially dynamic experience.

Mr. Marlin goes on to say that—

It is not stretching it to say that this eminently flexible building, with its Stradivarius of a room, has achieved at least one of the most memorable public spaces to appear since the 1960's resurgence of cultural concern at the grass-roots level.

Mr. Speaker, so striking is this magnificent building that one can only regret the lack of an opportunity, because of the format of our RECORD, to reproduce in the RECORD a graphic replica of the building. I can certainly recommend to all of our colleagues who may be in the vicinity of Akron, that they make a point of visiting this notable achievement, which Ada Louise Huxtable, the architectural critic of the New York Times, stated:

Makes all other similar centers built in recent years look provincial.

In all fairness, I should point out that while the building was built with \$11 million of local money, it was designed by architects from Houston, Tex., in association with architects from Cleveland.

Having achieved such a notable work of engineering skill and architectural finesse, the University of Akron and the surrounding community must now meet the challenge of insuring that this building is used in a manner befitting such a grand structure. The signs are that the community is meeting the challenge. However, it is also a challenge for the Nation as a whole. Most civilized countries have long since recognized that art and culture do not "pay their way." The classic theater, symphony orchestras, ballet, opera, art museums, historical museums, and other similar activities involving the preservation and dissemination of our magnificent cultural heritage require both private and public subsidies to keep them alive. Kept alive they must be, since they represent the most noble expressions of civilization.

There is no more reason why the arts

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

should not be subsidized than there is that education should not be subsidized. In fact, the arts are part of our educational process, and unlike the formal phases of our education, serve people of all ages and backgrounds.

The Christian Science Monitor article follows:

**ARTS CENTER IN AKRON, OHIO, LEAPS FREE OF THE ORDINARY**

(By William Marlin)

AKRON, OHIO.—In the tiremaking city of Akron, cultural concerns tread lightly among such big concerns as B. F. Goodrich, Goodyear, and Firestone.

Gradually, however, culture has developed a traction in these parts, and the result, opened six months ago, is the Edwin J. Thomas Performing Arts Hall, built with \$11 million of local money, and designed by architects Caudill Rowlett Scott of Houston, in association with Dalton, Van Dijk, Johnson & Partners of Cleveland.

Thomas Hall, in pointed contrast to the bejeweled banality of so many "culture centers" of the 1950's and 1960's, is a structurally inventive and, expressing this, spatially dynamic experience.

Instead of inert encrustations of imported chisel, like New York's Lincoln Center or Washington's Kennedy Center, the Akron job orchestrates structural and spatial essentials, and *only* essentials, eschewing applied effects.

**ON-CAMPUS SITE**

Located on the University of Akron campus, near downtown, the configuration of Thomas Hall reflects a variety of programmatic needs—space for seminars, business meetings, and conferences, space for campus programs, space where the city could proudly house visiting performers, space to host conventions.

In other words, the architects were faced with one specific—that is, providing a non-specific room in which a lot of very different things could be done.

The result is *some* room.

Or, to be more exact, some *three* rooms—rolled in one.

In concert with theater-design consultant George Izenour and acoustician Vern Knudsen, the architects have created a flexible instrument which, by way of changeable ceiling configuration, can be finely turned to an audience of 3,000, or 2,400, or an even more intimate 900 people.

The ceiling is an arresting, iridescent undulation of metallic, trapezoidal panels, adding up to a deceptively ethereal 44 tons. All of which is suspended from cables. These in turn thread out into the 90-foot-high lobby where, looping around a constellation of pulleys, they support 27 chrome-plated steel cylinders, adding up to an inadvertently artistic 47-ton "sculpture" of counterweights.

This element, plainly functional and yet compellingly beautiful, is a metaphor for all of Thomas Hall. Take a closer look, again, at that great room.

It's grandeur as a space directly expresses the need for flexibility and, at the same time, the tenets of acoustical science. Indeed, there are sweeps of continental seating, and non-stop expanses of vermillion upholstery. But more. The ceiling looks the way it does because its adjustable sections are purposely poised for action.

The hall is not your usual friendly neighborhood shoe box but is, instead, expressive of the building's unrelenting symmetry which generates a fan-shaped plan.

The seating is banked at a 30-degree angle, and because of both the plan and the seating angle, no one is more than 132 feet from the stage. The uppermost, third tier of seats, is held forward from the rear wall, not for effect of spatial movement, but because acousticians from Dankmar Adler to Vern Knudsen want *sound* to move, and not get caught topside.

We are reminded of the still-used triumph of Adler's Chicago Auditorium (1889), done with his partner Louis Henri Sullivan, which has a similar tier in the rear. Like the auditorium, Thomas Hall is a synthesis of science and art. And to think it took the better part of a century to excel that noble precedent.

The outside of the building is, as you might expect by now, a no-nonsense expression of what goes on inside. Its concrete structure is an outcropping of geometric shapes, all of which perform some very practical purpose.

A deft sequence of landscaped terraces step gradually up from a plaza and fountain, admitting patrons on several levels. Two stair towers read as triangular prisms. A block of backstage facilities, parallelogram-shape in plan, looms up as a stark mess, relieved on the outside by the low-lying planted terraces under which are tucked dressing rooms, spaces for the design and construction of sets, and assorted offices.

An immense envelop of concrete curves around the north and west sides of the building, like a great caress, keeping out the noise and vibration of nearby railroad tracks.

**NONTREATMENT OF GLASS**

The dominant vertical planes of these vertical masses give way, on the horizontal plane, to recessed concrete spandrels, denoting the edges of floors. And seeming to hover above this geometric array is a roof composed of concrete folded plates which, angling up from the back-stage mass, span across and clamp onto the northwesterly, curving wall.

This crystalline composition is further enhanced by the treatment or, more accurately, nontreatment of glass. There are great sheets of it between the prisms, curves, and folds. The planes are delicately joined by strong stainless-steel clamps, thus doing away with the typical mullion elements which would have done visual combat with the concrete structural masses.

Where glass meets mass, the panes are simply slid into an almost indiscernible slot. The juncture between glass and mass is that of the facet of a gem.

Once inside the building's outside (distinctions are aptly difficult to make here), the 90-foot-high lobby, with those counterweights hanging up above you, is marked by an incredible dimension of movement as bridges, balconies, and stairs give way to one another with a symphonic spatial flow.

It is a place where promenading is, itself, a performing art.

**MOVABLE, FUNCTIONAL**

Thomas Hall is more than architecture as object.

It is, literally, a movable array of functional and structural elements which, carefully counterpointing each other, create a symbol for culture and for Akron.

It is not stretching it to say that this eminently flexible building, with its Stradivarius of a room, has achieved at least one of the most memorable public spaces to appear since the 1960's resurgence of cultural concern at the grass-roots level.

But as important—indeed, more important—it is a building in which people can easily comprehend that culture, and its symbols, consist in more than just getting the best acts. As Emily Dickinson once observed, "The show is not the show, but they who go."

**CASE FOR FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 11**

**HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of this century, vast ex-

panses of public-owned lands in the Western United States were purchased by private speculators. It had already become apparent, by this time, that petroleum was critically important to the future of the American economy.

During this same period, the Navy began to convert from coal to oil as its primary fuel source. To insure access to petroleum in emergencies, defense planners suggested that the Government not allow certain oil-bearing lands to be claimed by private entrepreneurs. In light of these factors, four naval petroleum reserves and three naval oil shale reserves were established between 1912 and 1923. It has been estimated that Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 at Elk Hills in California, Reserve No. 2 at Buena Vista Hills on lands adjacent to the southern boundaries of Elk Hills, Reserve No. 3 at Teapot Dome in Wyoming, and Reserve No. 4 in Alaska contain a total of approximately 39 billion barrels of recoverable oil reserves. In addition, Naval Oil Shale Reserves No. 1 and No. 2 in Colorado, and Reserve No. 3 in Wyoming are estimated to contain as much as 25.8 billion barrels of recoverable oil shale.

As we are all aware, these naval petroleum reserves have been the focal point of extensive controversy ever since, as private corporations have schemed and struggled to gain control of them.

For instance, the Teapot Dome scandal during the Harding administration centered on private attempts to exploit these lands.

A more recent example involves the President's statement of September 10, 1973. Against the advice of then acting Attorney General Kliendienst, the President recommended that Standard Oil of California—SoCal—be permitted to extract up to 160,000 barrels a day from the Elk Hills Reserve, ostensibly to help relieve the energy crisis. As my colleague, Mr. Moss has pointed out, while the President's decision would allow SoCal to realize profits of \$200 million in the first year of production, development of this reserve would leave our energy plight virtually unaltered; the amount of oil which could be recovered from Elk Hills represents only nine-tenths of one percent of our total domestic consumption.

The need for Government petroleum reserves is certainly necessary, but I see no reason why private corporations should profit from activity on these lands. SoCal seems especially unsuited to be permitted stewardship over Elk Hills; in fact, earlier this year SoCal was successfully sued by the Justice Department, at the request of the Navy, for illegally draining certain oil pools within the reserve. Because of SoCal's actions, the public has been illegally deprived of millions of barrels of oil.

It seems to me that a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation would be a more dependable and conscientious overseer of these reserves. The legislation to create the Corporation provides, "the Secretary of Defense, acting for the Secretary of the Navy, shall transfer possession of certain properties inside the naval petroleum and oil shale reserves, which are subject to such Secretary's jurisdiction and control, to the Corporation."

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Through the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, we could be assured, after more than 60 years of scandals and administrative confusion, that our Federal petroleum reserves would be responsibly controlled.

### A PSYCHIATRIST TELLS WHY HE IS A GUN-CARRYING DOCTOR

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two excellent articles appearing in the Manchester Union Leader of Manchester, N.H., on Monday, March 11, 1974.

The first, by the distinguished publisher of that newspaper, Mr. William Loeb, is entitled "A Psychiatrist Tells Why He's a Gun-Carrying Doctor," and the second is an editorial signed by Mr. William Loeb explaining his feelings regarding firearms ownership.

The articles follow:

**A PSYCHIATRIST TELLS WHY HE'S A GUN-CARRYING DOCTOR**

(By James A. Brussel, M.D.)

As I waited to renew my handgun permit at the New York City license bureau recently, I noticed that the police officer who paged applicants to step forward seemed to address about one in six as "Doctor."

Though I've carried a revolver for some time, I hadn't realized till then that many of my megalopolitan colleagues do, too. Before my name was called, I corralled several and asked why.

Through tales of office holdups and broad-daylight street muggings ran one theme: the need for protection against drug addicts.

I've never fired my .32-caliber Iver Johnson at anyone. But it's never far from reach while I attend patients in my mid-Manhattan office or on outside calls.

And, believe me, if I ever needed to shoot—I will. I remember all too well that three of my psychiatrist-colleagues have been savagely beaten (one fatally) by frenzied addicts for whom they'd refused to write narcotic prescriptions.

I could easily have met the same fate not long ago when the doorman for my building announced over the intercom that a Mr. Miller wanted to see me. I asked the stranger to explain why he'd come, and he said a young man whom I'd once had in therapy had recommended me. I told Mr. Miller to come to my office.

He was about 21, tall, well-built, and claimed to be an outpatient at a local methadone clinic that was closed for the day.

"All I need is one lousy pill, Doc," he insisted. But when I proposed calling the clinic to verify his story, he angrily offered me the choice of writing the prescription or taking a beating.

"I've got a choice for you, too," I said as I drew my revolver and pointed it at his head. "Either walk out of here quietly, or . . ." He stared at the weapon for a moment, then turned and left.

The gun has helped me out of tight spots on occasional emergency night calls. Usually, I'm summoned to an apartment by a former patient whose friend is unconscious from a drug overdose.

Getting a cab to some high-crime neighborhoods isn't hard, but getting back can be.

March 18, 1974

Often, I have to walk several blocks to a subway. When I do, I carry the gun in my hand—not in my pocket.

Once, about midnight, an almost-stoned bruiser snarled, "I wanna talk to you, Mister." I leveled the gun, and he backed off hurriedly, hands raised.

Nor is the need for self-protection always connected with my practice. Last week, my wife and I returned home from the opera by subway because cabs were unavailable. As we climbed the steps of the exit adjacent to our apartment building, I saw three youths slouched against the wall. "Get behind me," I told my wife.

One youngster moved in front of us. "Hold it, Whitey," he sneered, "we got something to say to you."

"So do I," I answered, and aimed the revolver at his middle. All three fled down the street.

Before that night, my wife had constantly begged me not to carry the gun. She hasn't since.

### REASONS WHY YOU NEED A GUN

In an article at the top of our back page today, a doctor tells why he carries a gun—not to shoot anybody, but to keep himself from being shot or assaulted by someone else. In his short and to-the-point article, he tells how, on three occasions, his having a gun protected him from serious bodily harm and possible death.

That's a point that the anti-gun people always miss. They say that if all handguns were confiscated, there would be fewer accidents in the home. That may be true. However, accidents in the home can be prevented through more training in the safe handling of guns.

They say, also, that fewer quarrels would end in murder, but that's speculation. People can kill people with anything that's handy, from knives to clubs.

But entirely aside from the constitutional right of citizens to have guns, the point that the anti-gun people always miss is that the presence of guns in the hands of good people deters criminals from attacks, just as the doctor describes at the top of our back page today.

Most gun-owners have never had to use a gun against anyone, but occasionally they have had to show they had a gun in order to make some wrongdoer back off and think better of his attack.

However, if wrongdoers know that, by law, their victims automatically have no possibility of having a weapon on them, then, of course, either by superior physical strength, greater numbers or by having guns of their own, they can easily work their will on their victims without risking retaliation.

Along this line, probably the most moving and effective testimony given against the confiscatory gun laws proposed for Massachusetts at a recent hearing at the Massachusetts State House was that given by a housewife who still exhibited bruises and injuries from a very severe beating she received from robbers who had entered her and her husband's house. The robbers tied up her husband and beat her unmercifully until she lapsed into unconsciousness. When she came to, she realized that she had one of the family guns within reach. She grabbed it and shot and killed one of the robbers. The other fled.

As she said most movingly at the hearing, "If it wasn't for that gun, probably I would be lying now alongside my husband in a grave in a New England cemetery."

We most sincerely commend to your attention this article at the top of our back page today because this New York psychiatrist tells so simply and so completely why the sensible people of the United States should be armed.

WILLIAM LOEB, Publisher.