

Charles S. Rivers, Jr., United States Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary grade of lieutenant.

The following named officers of the United States Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps in the permanent grade of ensign:

Cafaro, Patrick R.  
Russell, George L.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 21, 1974.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William J. Mulligan, of Wisconsin, to U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

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

#### COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Arthur S. Flemming, of Virginia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Abraham Weiss, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

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

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### SUMMER PAINTING TRIPS IN WEST VIRGINIA ATTRACT BROAD CROSS-SECTION OF ASPIRING ARTISTS

#### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, people are aware that vacations call for a change of scene and relaxation. Curbed by the energy crisis, many persons are looking close to home for an opportunity to participate in simple pleasures and unhurried pastimes. This summer, the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources will sponsor a season of painting trips to remote and scenic areas of the Mountain State. An article by the talented instructor for these outings, William Gerhold, appears in the April issue of its colorful magazine, "Wild, Wonderful West Virginia."

Mr. Gerhold is a West Virginia artist whose paintings reflect the mood of the mountains and the feelings associated with the land of America and its people. He is an artist-teacher. For the past 12 years he has taught at Marietta College, where he is chairman of the Art Department. Mr. Gerhold's paintings have been selected as the Best West Virginia Landscape in the 1971, 1972, and 1973 Forest Festivals; in the latter 2 years, he also won Best of Show Awards. Among other honors, he has received awards in two Central Ohio Watercolor Society exhibitions during 1973, and three awards in the 1973 Appalachian Arts and Crafts Festival.

Artist-Teacher-Author William Gerhold, in his article on the summer painting excursions, has caught the tang and flavor of the great outdoors. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks so that many persons—artists and outdoorsmen alike—can share the promise of the creative and comforting experiences he describes.

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

PAINTING ON LOCATION IN THE WILD, WONDERFUL WEST VIRGINIA MOUNTAINS

(By William Gerhold)

How would you like to take a trip with a group of mostly strangers, get up early in the morning, paint all day long by a beaver pond, a waterfall or on a mountain top, fix supper for 24 people, have your day's work criticized by those 24 people and then do this all over again for fourteen consecutive days?

This past summer sixty individuals representing thirteen states did just this during three separate two-week summer painting classes that were based in the new Canaan Valley State Park near Davis, West Virginia. These classes were the result of the joint efforts of the author and the Division of Parks and Recreation of the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources.

The response to these on location painting classes was such that an additional class, for a total of four, will be offered during the summer of 1974.

The idea behind these classes is to create, as inexpensively as possible, an ideal group learning situation in which an individual can intensely concentrate on creative efforts without distraction in a setting of unique natural beauty. Consequently, the classes were designed to share shopping, cooking, and dish washing chores as well as the deluxe cabins which accommodate the classes. Last summer's results included a gratifying "Spirit de corps", a sense of mutual accomplishment, new friends and, most significantly, tremendous progress in artistic skills. The economic value of this approach can be understood by the fact that each individual ate for two weeks for a mere \$15.00 (the husband of one class member suggested that the instructor write an article titled, "What Inflation?"). Before the reader assumes that the diet was spartan, dreary and otherwise undistinguished, it should be understood that when people in a group take turns having menu responsibilities, and when many of these people are housewives in addition to creative and competitive spirits, good and sometimes gourmet things happen at the dinner table. In short, not only was the food cheap but it was most tasty.

The Canaan Valley area is one of extremely rare beauty. The Canaan Valley itself is a freak of nature. Geophysically it should be 800 miles north in Canada. There are no poisonous snakes, no poison ivy, few stinging insects, abundant wildlife, much clean air and miles and miles of unoccupied wilderness. This Potomac Highland area includes such well known attractions as the Dolly Sods Wilderness Area, The Monongahela National Forest, Blackwater Falls State Park, The Canaan Valley Ski Area, Cathedral State Park (with virgin hardwood forests), Seneca Rocks, the Allegheny Front and it is within 30 miles of Spruce Knob, the highest point in West Virginia.

The painting activities of the classes may encompass some or all of these locations during a two-week period. Where one paints on any given day, is largely up to the individual. On many mornings there will be as many directions taken as there are vehicles. For example, the "June Commune", the self-invented nickname of the 1973 June class, painted above and below Blackwater Falls, on Dolly Sods, on several farms in the Canaan Valley, along both the Blackwater River and Red Creek (outstandingly clear trout streams) and various other locations. Subject matter included beaver ponds, abandoned farms, majestic rock formations, wind sculptured pine trees, tumbling moun-

tain rapids, waterfalls, canyons, eagles, hawks, geese, deer, a 19th Century mill, country stores and several citizens of this Allegheny mountain country. This pattern is typical for each of the classes.

If one prefers to paint in almost complete isolation, it is possible. The author once painted for thirteen consecutive days on an abandoned farm deep in the Canaan Valley and it was on the thirteenth day that a fellow human was encountered. He happened to be a member of the Washington, D.C. Ski Club who was re-exploring the area in which he had hunted for twenty years.

Although this Potomac Highland region is remote and sparsely settled it is easily accessible. For example, Washington, D.C. is 180 miles to the east, the Roanoke or Lynchburg area is approximately 175 miles to the south, Columbus, Ohio, is 280 miles west and Pittsburgh is 140 miles north. Two members of last summer's August class flew into Elkins, West Virginia from Chicago via commercial airlines, were met at the airport and chauffeured the last 35 miles by a fellow class member. They left Chicago at 8:50 A.M. and joined the group in the Canaan Valley State Park less than six hours later.

The typical day's schedule starts "about" 7:00 A.M. If a group breakfast has been agreed upon (frequently, the group preference has been for each individual to fix whatever he or she wants) the cooks will "arise" a bit earlier. During the breakfast hour, "fixings" are placed on a table and each person "constructs" their own lunch. The noon meal normally consists of various kinds of sandwiches and fruit. Departure for the day's painting is "about" 8:00 A.M. Usually, class members have decided the evening before with whom and where they are going. Every- cal mountain weather. The trick is to be one quickly learns how to dress for the typi- warm enough at the outset and be able to peel layers as the day warms. Desirable equipment for this kind of "on location" painting would include: 1. an easily portable painting kit which might contain, in addition to specific painting materials, a knife, insect repellent, sun tan lotion, and a piece of plastic (perhaps two, for sitting and/or covering things in case of a shower); 2. a drawing board with a rope or strap attached for carrying over one's shoulder. (Each morning the author will have freshly stretched watercolor paper covered with cardboard on both sides of the drawing board); 3. a canteen (for drinking as well as painting); and 4. a light, telescoping easel. Additionally, this painter carries in a foot locker in the rear of his Chevy Blazer (4-wheel drive vehicle), reserve paint, staple tacker, pads and blocks of paper, plastic sheets, a blanket, binoculars, a 35mm camera with high speed black and white and color film, a polaroid camera, hatchet and miscellaneous support items. It is most important to have a wide brimmed hat and good, tough shoes. A lack on either "end" can make the day miserable.

The group reconvenes about 5:30-6:00 P.M., shortly thereafter a sitdown meal is served. The dinners are usually prepared by two persons. The cooking responsibilities are shared and rotated, as are the dishwashing

chores. After supper the group will meet for the daily Critique Session. At this time the work of each class member is examined and discussed (this includes the instructor's work also). Experience to date has indicated that these Critique Sessions are immensely valuable and highly appreciated. The judgments, commentary, suggestions and collective experience of the group is directed to each individual in regard to their day's work. When one considers the fact that each group is composed of highly motivated, extremely sincere and diversely experienced individuals, the learning potential in these classes becomes evident.

Questions that frequently are asked concerning the classes are: 1. Can a beginner enroll? Yes, of course, there have been, and will be, beginners in every group; 2. Do you demonstrate? Yes, every day, all day long. We do not waste class time by doing "entertainment" demonstrations. It is the belief of the instructor that demonstrations which are conducted "out-of-context" are of dubious value. When the total group can benefit from a particular demonstration in regard to a shared, mutual problem then demonstrations take place. Otherwise, the instructor's demonstrations occur between 8:00 A.M. and 5:30 P.M., "on location", daily; 3. What are the living and sleeping quarters like? The cabins are solid, electrically heated, equipped with a complete kitchen, large living room and dining area, wood burning fire place, showers and bedrooms which open off of a common hallway. This year two people will be assigned to each bedroom (previously, there were three in most rooms). For a class of 24 persons there will be three cabins (two with 4 bedrooms and one with three); 4. Will I need to have a car? No, not necessarily. There will be enough vehicles to more than comfortably serve everyone's transportation needs during the class period; 5. Can I get college credit? Yes, 3 semester hours of credit from Marietta College is possible. Both undergraduate and graduate credit recognition were accepted on a transfer basis by various institutions last summer. The cost for the academic credit option is \$60.00; 6. Will a materials list be furnished? Yes, a recommended materials list and discussion is mailed to each class member. This letter also contains travel directions, class roster with addresses (making car pools possible) and general instructions; 7. Can I purchase materials after I get to class? Yes, basic materials will be available (paint, brushes, and assorted watercolor paper). These will be in limited supply. A student should plan to be fully equipped on arrival. There are no art supply stores in the area. 8. Is there an Apprenticeship Program available? Yes, the West Virginia Artists and Craftsmen Guild have granted a limited number of Apprentice Scholarships in conjunction with the Mountain State Arts and Crafts Fair. It is expected that other Apprentice Scholarships will be available; 9. How does one get application forms and specific information regarding the classes? By writing to: Paint West Virginia Program, 510 Caroline Avenue, Williamstown, West Virginia. 10. Dates, etc., listed. 11. What are the ages of class members? It varies. One of the very nice things about the group is that there is a wide age range in the "young-in-heart" people who meet in the mountains. Last summer the ages ranged from 17 to 75. The class rosters included retired teachers, high school, undergraduate and graduate students, a public school superintendent, art teachers, housewives, career girls, a Federal Aviation Agency Air Traffic Controller, mothers, fathers, grandmothers, grandfathers, amateur artists, professional artists, a commercial artist, a professional pilot, a florist, a nurse, a retired minister and one sewing expert, a former sewing machine store owner, who organized the most outstanding "snipe hunt" the West Virginia hills had witnessed in many a year.

If you are interested in painting, would like beautiful, unspoiled, unique mountain wilderness studio where you will work hard, make new friends and have a chance to smile—you may want to investigate the possibility of painting "on location" in the wild, wonderful West Virginia mountains this summer.

#### PROTECTION OF ARTISTS

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, art is mankind's way of participating in the very creativity of God. The artist reveals through his works his inner being, his basic self. The artist externalizes for others what his very soul has discovered and experienced.

Art is sacred. It should be protected from piracy. And the better works of musical artists will be subject to widespread piracy if Congress does not make provision for copyright protection for sound recordings issued after January 1, 1975.

Since the current law protecting sound recordings from unauthorized duplication (Public Law 92-140) expires at the end of this year, I wish today to introduce legislation that will protect artists next year.

I enclose a copy of my bill at this point in the RECORD:

A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code to remove the expiration date provided in Public Law 92-140 which authorized the creation of a limited copyright in sound recordings for the purpose of protecting against unauthorized duplication and piracy of sound recordings; to increase the criminal penalties for piracy and counterfeiting of sound recordings; and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 3 of Public Law 92-140, which amended title 17 of the United States Code, is amended by striking the words "and before January 1, 1975" from the second sentence of section 3 of such law so that such sentence will read in part as follows:

"Sec. 3. \* \* \* The provisions of title 17, United States Code, as amended by section 1 of this Act, shall apply only to sound recordings fixed, published, and copyrighted on and after the effective date of this Act, and nothing in title 17, United States Code, as amended by section 1 of this Act, shall be applied retroactively or be construed as affecting in any way any rights with respect to sound recordings fixed before the effective date of this Act."

Sec. 2. Section 104 of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by adding the following provision: "Provided, That any person who willfully and for profit shall infringe and copyright provided by subsections 1(f) of title 17 of the United States Code as amended, or who should knowingly and willfully aid or abet such infringement, shall be fined not more than \$25,000 or imprisoned for not more than three years, or both, for the first offense and shall be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned not more than seven years, or both, for any subsequent offense."

Sec. 3. The provisions of section 2318 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2318. Transportation, sale, or receipt of phonograph records bearing forged or counterfeit labels

"Whoever knowingly and with fraudulent intent, transports, causes to be transported, receives, sells, or offers for sale in interstate or foreign commerce any phonograph record, disk, wire, tape, film, or other article on which sounds are recorded, to which or upon which is stamped, pasted, or affixed any forged or counterfeited label, knowing the label to have been falsely made, forged, or counterfeited shall be fined not more than \$25,000 or imprisoned for not more than three years, or both, for the first such offense and shall be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned not more than seven years, or both, for any subsequent offense."

#### ANTHROPOLOGY IN LEGISLATION

### HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a speech which I delivered before the Anthropological Society of Washington on March 19, 1974, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### ANTHROPOLOGY IN LEGISLATION

(By Senator FRANK E. MOSS)

I am flattered to be asked to speak here this evening—flattered and somewhat surprised. One of the subjects I know the least about is anthropology.

When you ask me to speak on the subject of "Anthropology and Legislation," I am on a little more familiar ground, because I do hold myself, after fifteen years in the United States Senate, as passably knowledgeable about legislation.

My invitation to speak here tonight was extended, I am sure, mainly because I have been the chief sponsor in the United States Senate for the past several years of the so-called "archeology protection bill"—a bill to provide for the protection and recovery of scientific, prehistorical, historical and archeological data which might be affected by Federal construction programs before excavation or construction alters the terrain.

I became chief sponsor, not because of any great knowledge of archeology, but because I was then an active member of the Senate Interior Committee who was getting quite a few interior bills through the Congress. The American Society of Archeology sought me out and asked me to introduce the bill which the society had developed, and I was glad to do so. In the process, I learned a lot more about archeology than I knew in the beginning, which I consider a great plus. I have enjoyed my contacts with some of the Nation's archeologists—who are among the finest men I have ever met.

In the last three years the Senate has twice passed what has come to be known as the Moss Archeology Bill, and the House of Representatives is about to pass the House version of the bill, introduced by Congress, the finest men I have ever met.

We legislators have leaned heavily on professional archeologists for all scientific aspects of the bill, and as a result the bill which will go to the President for signature will probably approach the ultimate in legislative achievement—a measure which is satisfactory to almost everyone.

It is indeed a good bill. It amends the 1960 law under which the Secretary of the



Interior, through the National Park Service, conducts archeological salvage programs at reservoir construction sites.

Under the 1960 law, Federal agencies responsible for dam construction or for issuing licenses for dams are requested to notify the Secretary of the Interior, before starting construction or issuing the license. Upon receiving such notice, the Secretary is directed to survey the area involved to determine whether historical and archeological data exist and should be preserved. In this respect he is advised by trained archeologists. If such data exist, the Secretary is then directed to preserve those data.

The Moss bill, as passed by the Senate, would simply amend existing law to include all Federal or federally assisted or authorized construction projects, such as major airports, roads and public housing projects, or any other construction which would alter the terrain. The House bill has changed the Senate language to provide more specific terminology—substituting the words "Federal construction project" for "federally assisted project," and it has also provided clear and specific provision for action under Federal grant and loan programs. I haven't had time to study these proposed changes in detail yet, but they seem reasonable and wise.

Under the first part of the program—the Federal construction program provisions—funds for archeological salvage work would come from an allocation of not more than one percent of the appropriated funds for the project. This means that there would be no separate costs to the Federal Government for the archeological work—the money for it would come out of funds already appropriated.

Under the loan and grant program, special funds would have to be appropriated. I am sure you will agree that they would be highly justified. The salvage work in every instance would be done by professional archeologists.

I can predict with as much certainty as can be done on any legislation, that final action will be taken on the archeology protection bill in this Congress, and that the President will sign the bill. This action will come not one moment too soon.

The Nation faces what can rightfully be called an archeological resource crisis. Our land is being altered and our archeological data are being destroyed at an alarming rate. We must assure that enough of the past is preserved to enable archeologists of the future to make adequate interpretations. In this respect, the bill is a conservation measure—and I add one of the most important conservation measures before the Congress.

The professional archeologists with whom I have worked on this bill are a most dedicated group. Representatives of the Society for American Archeology and the Committee for the Recovery of Archeological remains have come often to Washington, and they have stayed for long periods of time. They have been indefatigable.

Dr. Carl H. Chapman, director of the Archeological Research Activities at the University of Missouri first came to launch the bill, and then returned a number of times. On one occasion he brought a number of his students, who fanned out all over Capitol Hill to visit Members of the House of Representatives of the Senate to tell them about the bill and ask them to co-sponsor. As a result, the Senate bill had 46 co-sponsors—almost half of the Senate—and the House bill has over a hundred co-sponsors.

Dr. Charles R. McGimsey III, director of the Arkansas Archeology Survey Coordinating Office, has come many times literally to follow the bill step by step through Congress. He has been assisted by many other devoted men—among them Dr. Robert Stephenson of South Carolina, Utah's Dr. Jesse Jennings, and others. Their visits, and the skill with which they have operated, have helped pro-

duce a success story which other professional groups might well emulate.

I am sorry I cannot come up with a comparable legislative success story on bills relating to other aspects of anthropology. Perhaps this is because anthropology as a whole is a less specific discipline than archeology. Or perhaps it is because anthropology is really interdisciplinary, with wide ranging implications.

Since I am participating here in a lecture series on "the role of anthropology in society," and since Congress is, I hope, a very important part of society, I would like, therefore, to discuss some of the areas in which I feel the views and expertise of anthropologists could be used more widely than they are now in the legislative process.

According to the report of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee (called BASS) which was convened jointly by the National Academy of Sciences and the Social Science Research Council, one of the principal objectives of anthropology is "to search for the common denominator of human existence and the forces that condition persistence of change in customs or whole cultures."

If you will accept this statement, I then can say that there are many coincidences between your objectives and some of the legislative activities of the Congress.

The correspondence between our mutual interests becomes even clearer, in my opinion, after a quick look at specific subfields of anthropology, and the objectives of their various thrusts of inquiry. BASS divides the subfields into four.

First, social and cultural anthropology, or ethnology, which endeavors to provide better understanding of changes and customs and values of social groups.

Second, linguistic anthropology, which deals with the dynamics of language and other communications and their implications on human behavior and culture.

Third, physical anthropology—that is the relative influence of heredity and the environment, on man's physical and psychological behavior, and;

Fourth, archeology, which generates the basic information and explanation about the evolution of cultures.

Using these criteria as my base, I can suggest a number of specific public policy issues whose resolution would profit from the thinking of professional anthropologists. They range over a broad spectrum, and include, for instance, the changing role of women in society, juvenile delinquency, and training programs for youth, ethical problems involved in foreign policy. Family planning, housing, anti-poverty programs, including ACTION and VISTA, the status of the American Indian, the dynamics of aging, crime, access to expert information, and of course, anthropological research by various Government departments.

Let me consider access to information first. Congress is diligently seeking to improve both our access to information and the quality of information we use in the legislative process.

For example, in 1972, we established the Office of Technology Assessment in the Congress. This office is providing us with information and analyses to help us anticipate the costs and benefits of the application of new technologies, both hard and soft.

Both Houses of Congress are also now seeking better legislative oversight of the budget. In so doing, we are seeking information generated by the Nation's educators, scientists, and technologists—in all disciplines.

We are also anxious to insure adequate levels and priorities in the support of science. We would like to know that decisions to allocate Federal expenditures for anthropological research coincide with the mutual needs of both scientists and the public.

Federal expenditures for basic and applied

anthropological research have more than doubled, in terms of current dollars, from 1965 to 1974. Actual obligations totalling \$8,121,000 in 1965 rose to estimated expenditures in 1974 of \$17,399,000.

There is a distinct trend by the Government toward the support of applied anthropology. Seven percent of total Federal obligations for anthropology research in 1965 went to the applied aspects of your field. About 30 percent of funds allocated for anthropological research in 1974 will be for applied anthropology.

Of all Federal agencies, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare devotes most support to this field—about \$5 million estimated in 1974. HEW is followed by the National Science Foundation and the Smithsonian Institution, which each will allocate about \$4 million to anthropology in 1974. The Departments of the Interior and the Army each support about \$1 million worth of research in your discipline.

We in Congress are eager to hear how scientists feel about the allocation of public funds for the support of their specific interest areas. Many channels are open. In the past we have benefited considerably from the testimony of anthropologists' investigations on Federal support and policies for social sciences.

For example, anthropologists appeared at hearings in 1966 on "Federal Support of International Science and Behavioral Research" held by the Subcommittee on Government Research within the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and they testified at hearings held in 1966 and 1967 on a proposal to establish a National Foundation for the Social Sciences.

But recent hearing records covering investigations of this nature show a blank so far of testimony from anthropologists is concerned.

No anthropologist was heard at the Senate Committees on Government Operations and on Labor and Public Welfare on the proposal to establish a social accounting system and a council of social advisors.

No anthropologist was heard in the most recent authorization, appropriations and oversight hearings for agencies which support anthropological research.

No anthropologist was heard at the hearings by the Committee on Education and Labor in August 1972 to establish an Asian studies institute, or at hearings held by the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities to authorize additional appropriations to the Smithsonian Institution for expanded museum services throughout the Nation. All of these inquiries might have profited, it seems to me, by your insight and wisdom.

The Office of Child Development in HEW will obligate about \$5 million to applied anthropology research in 1974. This research will generate information and understanding on the patterns of child development in relation to the dynamics of aging and changes in the family structure. The Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration of the HEW will devote about \$2.3 million to anthropology research. I am glad to be able to tell you that the Subcommittee on Children and Youth of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare benefited from the testimony of your distinguished colleague, Dr. Margaret Mead, at hearings held last September on the influences of governmental policies and programs on changes in the structure of American families.

But at several other 1973 hearings on HEW research programs, including employment and work study programs for the young, establishment of a research institute on aging, and programs for older Americans, no anthropologists were present.

Among Department of the Interior anthropological research program are programs in

the National Park Service, and the Office of Water Resources Research, and, of course, those studying the impact of governmental programs and policies on American Indians. Anthropologists testified at only two hearings of 33 held during 1973 which focused on varied aspects of these programs.

Representatives of your profession were present at hearings inquiring into the repeal of Federal supervision over the property and members of the Menominee Indian tribe and the restoration to the tribe of Federal services. There were no anthropologists in attendance at hearings dealing with educational and economic development services, alcohol abuse, and mining, mineral, public works and land use policies impacting upon Indians.

Another area in which we in the Congress would probably benefit from the knowledge and understanding generated by anthropology would be in inquiries into the effects of foreign assistance and technical assistance programs, including such undertakings as the Peace Corps.

Now I realize that most anthropologists do not have the time to come regularly to Capitol Hill to testify on various measures, no matter how interested they may be or how much they may feel they have something to contribute. You all have classes to teach at universities or colleges, or studies or research work in which you are deeply involved. Time shackles all of us.

Also, I am sure you sometimes wonder if it is worth while—there are often so many people seeking to testify on an issue, and you question whether in the welter of that testimony your few words will be heard or seen, or have any impact.

Let me assure you that if you ask to be heard, you will be heard, or at the very least your statement will be filed as part of the record. And let me assure you furthermore that if what you say is valid—is relevant—and is backed by expertise and knowledge, it will be given attention.

The problems this country is facing are enormous—I don't need to tell you that—and if the past can give us any leads for the present, let us hear them.

Anthropologists and anthropological thinking and advice seems to be one of our current shortages on many levels. When my office called the Library of Congress recently to ask for some research material that I needed for the preparation of this speech, we were told there was not a single anthropologist in residence in the entire congressional research service.

There had been one, but she had left to have a baby. Dr. Maday and Dr. Philleo Nash helped us out, and to them I extend my thanks.

So in conclusion, let me emphasize again that Congress is in the market for expertise and anthropologists should not be backward. Don't hide your light under a bushel. We can use you to a far greater degree than we do now in identifying and helping us understand some of the complex and almost terrifying problems for which we are seeking solutions.

#### STATEMENT OF REED HAMILTON

**HON. RALPH S. REGULA**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, on December 3, 1973, I introduced a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to authorize a feasibility study for the estab-

lishment of a national system of bicycle trails. Since that time I have received a great deal of enthusiastic support from interested groups and individuals. My hope is that the three national trails I have proposed will become part of a much larger national system to which State bicycle trails could be connected.

The Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 presents affected States with a chance to acquire many miles of recreation trail rights-of-way. Miles of track may be abandoned. They may become linear wastelands unless the States act to see that they are converted to a useful purpose.

Reed Hamilton of the American Bikeways Foundation recently testified before the Interstate Commerce Committee proposing that these abandoned rights-of-way be converted to recreational trails. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his proposal be inserted in the RECORD at this point for all to read:

#### STATEMENT OF REED HAMILTON

Gentlemen, I am pleased to make a presentation of views on behalf of The American Bikeways Foundation, and on behalf of America's 80,000,000 recreational bicyclists.

Subparagraph (c) (5) of Section 303 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 mandates that the "final system plan" for the reorganized rail system designate those rail properties proposed to be abandoned that will be suitable for public use.

The American Bikeways Foundation is interested in uneconomic rail properties because they are ideally suitable for conversion into public recreation trails and linear parks. Unfortunately, the Report on the second stage of the planning process fails to designate which, if any, of the proposed rail abandonments are considered to be suitable for public recreation use. Unless a proposed abandonment is designated as a potential recreation trail, and the designation is called to the public's attention, it is doubtful that many citizen recreation groups, or even state and local park and recreation authorities, are going to show up at these hearings. We ourselves learned of them only by chance, although we thought we had been put on the appropriate list long ago.

We are disheartened to observe the apparent lack of participation by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Rail Reorganization Planning Process. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has been charged by Congress with the implementation of the National Outdoor Recreation Plan, a major element of which is the development of a national "interstate network" of scenic and recreational trails. We regard the effective use of abandoned rail properties as an essential component in the economical development of a national recreation trail system. Therefore, we view it as a costly oversight by those who drafted the Railroad Reorganization Act because of their failure to give the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation a planning role. There should also be a legal provision enabling the Secretary of Interior to step in and acquire abandoned properties that are suitable for recreation trails when state and local authorities fail to express an interest, or to act. In fact, it is our view that the Land and Water Conservation Fund administered by the Department of Interior should be given a first option on the right of acquisition of abandoned rail property for national recreation trail system needs. Also, it would have made financial sense to have allocated to the Land and Water Conservation Fund a goodly portion of the approximately \$700,000,000 appropriated by Congress for railroad modernization. The

funds allotted for conservation when used for the purchase of abandoned rail properties by B.O.R. would then be funneled or transferred, for ultimate use for the rehabilitation and modernization of the remaining rail properties of the bankrupt railroads. The significant advantage flowing from such a round-a-bout allotment of funds would be that the people of the United States would get something extra in exchange for their tax dollars.

Abandoned railbeds make ideal routes for bicycling and hiking trails. Most of the tentatively proposed abandonments traverse rural and scenic countryside. Other segments penetrate deep into urban cores. In all, they offer a recreation boon worth several times the anticipated cost of acquisition and conversion. Rail lines have easy turns that prevent surprise encounters. Railroads also pass over or under well traveled motor roads, so if trestles and bridges are left in place, there will be a minimum of conflict between motorists and trail users. Lastly, grades on railroads are moderate and, thus, less tiring to cyclists. They are also much less dangerous when wet or icy than is a typical road surface.

The number of Americans turning to recreational bicycling and hiking is expanding at a phenomenal rate. This fact alone should sound a call for expedited action by both the Department of Transportation and the Department of the Interior. A real effort is both urgent and necessary to correct the present disgraceful situation where there are only an insignificant number of miles of safe recreation trails available for tens of millions of family hikers and touring bicyclists. The Department of Transportation has publicly acknowledged that the number of accidents involving bicycles and motor vehicles will tend to increase dramatically. Principles of morality and safety, as well as considerations of physical fitness and health, call for prompt action. We cannot fail to take advantage of the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity offered by the thousands of miles of rail abandonments ordained by the Rail Reorganization Act. The proposed abandonments should be converted into linear parks and recreation trails with "all deliberate speed."

In view of the critical fuel situation, the continued exponential growth in the use of the family automobile for recreational travel has been overdone. By converting abandoned rail properties and fitting them into the national recreation trail system, true recreation travel, both physically and emotionally satisfying, can be made more readily accessible to the American people. The family motor car can then revert back to its proper role as a transportation mode rather than substitute as an inept and high cost form of vicarious recreation.

In summary we offer two criticisms:

(1) Proposed rail abandonments that are in fact suitable for recreation trail use should be so designated.

(2) The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be given a significant role in the planning process, particularly as it relates to the use of abandoned rail properties.

We recommend that the I.C.C. prepare an amendment to the Rail Reorganization Act for early submittal to Congress. The amendment should provide for funneling some funds for railroad upgrading through the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It should also provide an active role for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the rail abandonment phases of the planning process. The outdoor recreation needs of the American people will not be adequately dealt with until they are adequately considered.

The American Bikeways Foundation will be pleased to cooperate with all concerned in the search for tidy solutions to our nation's intermeshed transportation and recreation problems.

Thank you.



## THE ATLANTA STORY

## HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there was recently brought to my attention an article recounting the work of Mrs. Morton Giniger, a member of B'nai B'rith Women of Atlanta, and a school teacher, with Jewish prisoners at the Federal Penitentiary in Atlanta.

Mrs. Giniger, who is certainly to be commended for her humanitarianism and compassion, has provided a fascinating and moving story.

I bring it to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

## THE ATLANTA STORY

(By Adrienne Abramson Mandel)

(The story of one dedicated woman's work with Jewish prisoners at the Federal Penitentiary at Atlanta.)

The congregants, clad in usual attire, come together for Sabbath services. They resemble any group of men, at a lodge meeting or parent teacher fathers' night program. Among them, though sits a lone, lovely blond woman. Her participation is not prohibited; no orthodox assemblage is this. No separation of the sexes here exists. Yet, although not visible, the spirit of a certain barrier permeates all, separating these men from their brethren beyond—beyond the steel bars and stone walls of Temple Yaacov, Inmate Congregation, United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia.

This recounts the remarkable efforts of one dedicated woman who set out to bring a touch of happiness and a connection with Jewish life to the Jewish prisoners at the Federal Penitentiary at Atlanta, Georgia.

Mrs. Morton (Connie) Giniger, a member of B'nai B'rith Women of Atlanta, and a school teacher, began her work with one visit last year. The amazing results of what she has been able to accomplish since then led her to be described as "a Jewish saint who has made this her personal contribution to society."

Quite unexpectedly, one Saturday morning at eight, Connie Giniger cast herself as supporting star in a continuing drama, unfolding from within these prison gates.

Petite and bouncy, this lithe lady's voice clearly conveys enthusiasm, concern and dedication to her unique role. She becomes animated, punctuating her story both with verbal and physical exuberance.

"A mere member, a volunteer, I didn't imagine what marvelous things could be done. I can't believe what has happened to me in just six months! I'm so excited! Her sparkling eyes, expressive hands, invoke the desired image as she exhorts, "there's so much to do; they've had practically no one! They need our help desperately!"

From a chance conversation in Washington, D.C. with the Director of B'nai B'rith Commission on Community and Veterans Services, Mrs. Morton Giniger would embark on a hitherto uncharted venture. The amazing events emerged from her positive response to a casual request.

"A young man, a former member of B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, is incarcerated in the Federal prison in Atlanta," the Director explained.

"Larry" wrote inquiring whether we could

<sup>1</sup> All names of prisoners in this article are fictionalized.

send him some prayer books. "Would you please look into the details of this for us, Connie?" he asked."

Back home in Atlanta, Connie met with Rabbi Alvin M. Sugarman of The Temple in Atlanta who serves as part time Chaplain for the Jewish prisoners at the penitentiary. With trepidation, Mrs. Giniger sat down with the Rabbi to find out the details. In the two hour conversation that followed, Rabbi Sugarman covered the services, the psychological help available, his hopes for a one to one relationship with someone on the outside, the need to be in touch with other chaplains and the men themselves and their human and religious needs.

Rabbi Sugarman then arranged for Connie as a special representative of the B'nai B'rith to obtain clearance to attend her first Sabbath service at the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary.

In spite of an ice storm that immobilized Atlanta, Connie arrived at the prison at 7:45 a.m., apprehensive, not knowing what to expect. "The sound of the clanging metal engulfed me; my fears surfaced! Could one EVER be prepared for this alarming reality of life behind bars?"

"The Rabbi said that fifteen to twenty men usually came to services. He had told Larry that I would be there, and, guess what? They had to open the folding doors! Over forty men showed up that morning and I was a little nervous," Connie reveals. "But, somehow, the uneasy feeling left me. Services were short and after Rabbi Sugarman introduced me, well, we all just talked, easily, comfortably."

Meeting Larry for the first time she found him to be a perceptive and extremely bright young man. Apparently, he was both horrified with his surroundings and yet intrigued by his gradual understanding and mastery of its challenges. Mrs. Giniger was struck by his warmth, sincerity and almost brilliant ability to express himself.

Intensely, Larry conveyed to Connie the tone of general ferment that is affecting much of the criminal justice system. Recently, prisoners have begun to assert that they have the right to practice their religion while they are in prison. He expressed the yearnings and hunger of the inmates for some link with their religious and cultural heritage.

"Look into it," Connie muses. So clarion was the cry for help that immediately Connie Giniger was swept up by it. She committed herself to a cause that she had not, a few hours earlier, even realized existed. Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Warren Burger's words about prisoners rang clear. He wrote, that "We are free to do something about HIM; HE is not."

For openers, Connie responded by offering to have her B'nai B'rith Woman's Chapter provide holiday greeting cards for the men to send to their families. She understood that small things, which we "on the outside" take for granted and see as commonplace, are luxury items to the prisoners.

After receiving the cards one of the men wrote:

"It is a most valued thing to a man in prison, as often times the one remaining tenderness felt . . . is his link to his family. The ability to express this tenderness is beyond the men and the cards fill a desperate need."

As a surprise, Mrs. Giniger had her fourth graders create original cards which they mailed to each of the 45 Jewish inmates. In uneven child's script, one said simply, "We know where you are and we care about you!"

A prisoner later told Connie privately that one of the men, hardened by years in this different setting, read these words and he wept, unashamedly.

Before leaving that initial Sabbath service the inmates were assured by Connie that she would try to develop a constructive pro-

gram that would begin to meet the Jewish needs of Jewish prisoners in their current situation. She was determined to establish a flow of outside human contact for them. The continued impetus for changes in prisoners' rights would have to come from the "outside."

Connie came away from Temple Yaacov, with mixed emotions, "so happy, so sad." She heard the message that, most of all, the inmates want people to be aware of their plight and to care. Dr. Karl Menninger, in his recent book on corrections, *The Crime of Punishment*, states that "the crimes committed by society against prisoners in the name of corrections are sometimes greater than the crimes these prisoners had committed against society."

In order to initiate additional projects Connie decided to try to visit the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary again. She asked Rabbi Sugarman to explore the possibility of her attending Sabbath services at Temple Yaacov, more regularly. Clearance to participate regularly in the morning services was granted to Mrs. Morton Giniger.

Today, as she speaks to family, friends, the community, Connie Giniger is less critical of their automatic presumptions, their fears, their prejudices than she would have been if she had not "been there" too. Many, who otherwise might be most enthusiastic about community service projects were quick to shy away from involving themselves in "criminal rehabilitation" work. These attitudes do not deter her.

"Perhaps one of the interesting things about my activity," she indicates, "is people's reaction to it. Often there is no comment of any kind. They are too shocked to say anything or too polite to be honest." Too few people are aware.

But with Connie's persistence substantial help was soon forthcoming for the Jewish prisoners here, from the community, the synagogues and their youth groups, local, district and national B'nai B'rith. From embryonic efforts of providing greeting cards, records and books grew a Jewish hour rap session, one night each week.

The men are not afraid to say what they feel and they look forward to these meetings. They provide a strong core of reality contact and interaction for the prisoners with educators, doctors, media people and lawyers. "It's a significant step," Connie stresses. Previously, the prison walls served a dual purpose—to keep the outside out."

Because the very nature and effect of incarceration is spiritual, as well as physical, the prison experience tends to be a brutalizing, dehumanizing one which feeds anti-social feelings and attitudes. What a challenge and how rewarding it is for Connie Giniger to attempt to reverse this process. Not surprisingly, she has had to shed traditional concepts, accept frustrations and acquire an impenetrable shield of optimism.

"These men are my friends," Connie continues. "They ask if their fiancées, wives and children can call me. They are very sensitive and they feel with me my joy about what I am doing."

"I spend much time getting dressed to go to the penitentiary," Connie mentions. "The men compliment me. My visits are always emotionally charged experiences and yet the prisoners know what areas are beyond our purview. Legal action regarding their parole, pardon or appeal status are NOT legitimate expressions of the type of service we can properly undertake."

In a very large measure, Connie Giniger's accomplishments are reflected by incidents such as the following which happened at a meeting with the prison warden, the chaplains and other staff.

She indicated that the room the men worship in was not too conducive to prayer. "It was cold and bare." After the group trekked to the area, they verified her observations

and she was assured that efforts to refurbish it would get underway immediately. And it was! There was a fresh paint job and new curtains and the men noticed the difference.

"Culminating months of effort the Rabbi and I were consulted about New Year High Holy Days Services for the men. Best of all, our Temple youth groups musical participation in the services was approved," Connie declared.

"Ten young people entered the Federal Penitentiary to help the Jewish inmates celebrate the New Year. The kids at the prison was probably an experience that will have trouble leaving my mind and my heart. The men were happy—doesn't that seem incredible—happy even for just those few precious hours. The kids with their music and their youthful idealism and love bridged a gap that was a miracle to see."

"It's been good, really good to be reaching out and caring and being wrapped up in the feelings and results. That's it, alright!" Connie indicates that the men are aware that B'nai B'rith and the Jewish community have taken an interest in their welfare. It is difficult for them to show it, but they know."

Eloquently, Larry, as spokesman for The Inmate Congregation, describes the feelings of the men when they received some books:

"The ordinary person, secure in his job, supported by the affection of his family and friends . . . (has) a choice of recreation . . . opportunity for social intercourse with a wide range of persons . . . his self esteem, his sense of his own identity and even his mental health depends upon his nexus of personal and social relationships which he takes for granted. The prisoner . . . is completely deprived of all these props which really had sustained him."

"The man survives only if he is able to cross the span of time, using his mind as a vehicle. The books are the catalyst for this intellectual contemplation . . . we live either in the past or the future; for us there is no present."

For Mrs. Morton Giniger there IS present now and future. The scope of her endeavors should now reach beyond the Atlanta community. B'nai B'rith's Community and Veterans Services Commission has received requests for service from Jewish prisoners at the Ralston and the Belle Glade, Florida State Prisons; from the Federal Correctional Institution at Leavenworth, as well as the one at Fort Worth, Texas.

Connie insists that the communities must respond to the needs of these inmates. Yet, she knows full well that this form of helping is not for everyone. "It is only for those who are open people, who can recognize and accept the weaknesses of others." Mrs. Giniger has prepared a program to acquaint participants with the project. A pamphlet she wrote, "All Men Are Responsible for One Another," Talmud suggests "things to do."

"The men who are incarcerated," she admonishes, "Do get out. They are released and return to our communities. It is our duty as people, citizens and Jews to help a public offender become a private citizen. This begins in the institution." She pleads for interested people to "seize the opportunity to help another person, even if it is nothing more than sending a note or a card."

In August, 1973, the President's Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, after a two year study, recommended a "drastic overhaul of the American criminal justice system." The old "slave of the state" approach to one legally consigned to prison must be abandoned for the newer approach—"that a prisoner carries with him to prison all of his personal rights, losing only those necessary to effectuate his imprisonment."

Converting the words of the Advisory Committee's report into reality is one of the most compelling, highest priority items of the con-

cerned community encouraged and motivated by the model of Atlanta's Connie Giniger.

This is the conclusion to a story, but actually it is a beginning: a beginning for those who are incarcerated, for those who "reach out and touch" and for those who care.

## INFLATION

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a grave dilemma faces the Nation's economy today: unemployment, we are told, must increase in order to control inflation. It seems to me, however, that we need not sacrifice employment to insure a halt in inflation. Instead, we must establish economic policies which work to monitor unemployment, while at the same time, holding prices down. We must recognize that these new policies and programs can only be effective on a long-term basis, because the process of stabilizing our economy will necessarily be a lengthy and involved one. Nevertheless, we must act now in order to achieve a strong economic future as soon as we can.

A February 10 editorial in the Boston Globe clearly depicts the circumstances surrounding the present economic dilemma. The editorial also outlines the essential programs Congress, together with the President, must enact to control the situation we face. I would like to insert the Globe editorial in the RECORD at this time for the attention of my colleagues, and hope that it serves to point out the urgent need for economic reform:

#### THE INFLATION DRAGON

This year threatens to burden the country with two very heavy loads—an inflation that could mean an 8 percent rise in consumer prices and a recession that might drive unemployment beyond 6 percent by next January.

The situation is frightening because we do not as a country have an encouraging record of meeting our objectives. The Administration has repeatedly been disappointed after making optimistic predictions about better performances on the job and price fronts, and this disappointment has been paralleled by real privation among many consumers. "Real" wages have fallen over the past year as price increases more than stripped away gains made at the bargaining table. Food and fuel have led the pack but there has been no solace either from clothes, housing, utilities or any other sector.

The situation is cruel because the historic solutions for each of the two problems of inflation and unemployment have always been at odds. Curb inflation by dampening the economy, which means more unemployment. In periods of slack it is possible to pump up employment without too much inflation because there is plenty of idle plant and unused labor force—but right now our economy is plagued by tightness not only of petroleum but of chemicals, some steel products, aluminum, fertilizers, small cars.

Despite the dilemma, we think the Administration must propose and Congress must enact programs which will emphasize sensi-

ble economic growth even though we may for a while pay with a slower reduction in the rate of inflation. The \$304.5 billion budget proposal goes only a short way down the path.

At the same time, there are steps available for getting inflation into the cage and preventing its trampling of innocent bystanders. We think that much of the inflation in recent years has not been the result of too many ordinary consumers trying to buy all they wanted from an inadequate supply of cars or cabbages or milk, although that may be the case with something like steak.

Nor do we think wages are a primary culprit—especially in the wake of their 1973 performance against inflation.

We do think there has been significant pushing up of prices as costs of basic commodities have risen in furious competitive bidding around the world by holders of currency resources who then pass the higher price along to final consumers.

The President has made too modest a start in tackling the problems in his State of the Union message and in his budget proposals, which have already started to unfold in detail.

We think the situation demands more and that it demands steps which we don't want, the public doesn't yearn for, and the business community opposes at least partly on ideological grounds. The responses to this inflation are perhaps unpalatable but they are necessary, and Mr. Nixon might tell us that if he were not so cramped by Watergate into a position of having to put a pleasant face on every situation.

While it is clear that much of our inflation problem is the result of shortages in some key areas, very little thought has gone into developing managed solutions. The Administration—and here we are talking not about the President, but about the men who formulate his economic policies—is the captive of its convictions that the marketplace will allocate resources by making them too expensive for some of their potential users to acquire. It doesn't want price controls and has asked Congress to let them expire next April 30, except in the case of health care—thereby surrendering even the moral suasion implicit in a system run by people like Treasury Secretary George Shultz and Cost of Living Council Chairman John Dunlop, who are openly hostile to controls.

And the Administration does not want supervised allocation of materials in short supply or rationing of gasoline.

We don't want any of these things, either, but we think circumstances are forcing some or all of them on us as being, in spite of their shortcomings, better than the disorder and possible chaos that threaten if a series of long-term shortages prevails in basic industrial and agricultural commodities.

For those who are worried about the philosophical implications of controls and allocations in a market economy, we would just point out that we already have enormous allocation of resources through public policy. Directly or indirectly Congress, state and local governments use tax collections and incentives to capture human and physical resources for education, transportation, mineral development, housing, food—very fundamental areas of our society.

We don't claim that the creation of allocation procedures will be painless or that errors won't be made in trying. But we think it is a mistake for Federal leadership to show so few initiatives in studying and inviting public debate about ways to set rational standards for managing our competing claims for limited supplies, standards that might help curtail the wild bidding up of prices that has seen such basic items as crude oil and grains triple in just a few months. If the President cannot or will not take the lead in this process, Congress must.



**STEPHEN P. MUGAR RECEIVES  
GOLDEN DOOR AWARD FOR CON-  
TRIBUTIONS TO AMERICAN LIFE**

**HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in learning about the good fortunes of a man who immigrated to the United States from Armenia in 1906. This man, Stephen P. Mugar, was recently the recipient of the Golden Door Award, which honors Americans of foreign birth who have made distinguished contributions to American life and culture. The award was presented by the International Institute of Boston, a center of information, service, education, and fellowship for newcomers to America. Among the other Americans who have been honored by the Golden Door Award are Arthur Fielder, director of the Boston Pops Orchestra, I. M. Pei, the outstanding architect whose designs include the beautiful addition to the National Gallery of Art, and Samuel Goldwyn, who played such a vital role in the development of the American motion picture industry.

Mr. Mugar has obviously come a long way since his arrival in Boston in 1906. He recalls how difficult it was to be in a country where he did not know the language, where clothes and customs and everything else were different from what he had known before. He can remember vividly when, at the age of 12, he would get up at 6 in the morning to join long lines of jobseekers to help secure employment for an immigrant friend who could not speak English.

Now, Stephen Mugar is the successful owner of Star Markets, a large supermarket chain in the Boston area. But he has not forgotten, like some people do, how he got where he is, that it was the American system that enabled him to be a success. As he says in his acceptance speech for the Golden Door Award:

I know the difference between what we had and the opportunities that this country offers. Yes, some people can take a lot for granted, but we as immigrants can never do this.

To express his gratitude, Mr. Mugar chose to contribute money to seven colleges in New England. He felt that his resources should go back where they came from—"to the wonderful people of New England who patronized our stores and made all this possible." In addition to his money, he has donated buildings or libraries to Brandeis, Tufts, Suffolk, Boston, and Northeastern Universities, and Colby College, N.H. He is also a trustee of Colby, Suffolk, and Northeastern, an honorary trustee of Boston University, and a fellow of Brandeis.

Stephen Mugar represents the kind of American we have not thought about in a while. He is an immigrant who came to America, the land of opportunity, to seek a better way of life. He feels that this quest for a better life, which is what brought most of our ancestors here, is one of America's greatest strengths. It is

this strength on which our Nation was founded.

Today, when our Government, our priorities, our morals, our habits, when virtually all of our institutions are being questioned, Stephen Mugar believes that "challenge will make us stronger, for we will have to think and act with renewed vigor. We must never surrender our idealism or our faith in America's future." This attitude of faith and loyalty toward his country can be an inspiration for us all, a reminder of what America stands for, of what America is all about.

**THE FUEL ALLOCATION FIASCO**

**HON. HAROLD RUNNELS**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, I hereby insert in the Record the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on February 20, 1974. It is worthy of consideration by each and every one of my colleagues.

**THE FUEL ALLOCATION FIASCO**

Imagine a food allocation system that limited the Jones family to 80% of its caloric intake of February 1972, with a prohibition against the members sharing their individual allotments.

Pop had been on a pizza binge two years ago, so now he's entitled to 80% of 4,000 calories a day. Mom was on a crash diet so she gets only 80% of 800 calories. Junior has grown six inches but still gets only 80% of 1972's 1,800 calories. Baby was born last April. Tsk, tsk. She gets nothing. And Grandma died in August; her 1,600 calories are returned to the federal government.

Put it that way and it sounds absurd. But this is precisely the way the Federal Energy Office is allocating fuel to the nation's communities, with the same result. Many areas have all the gasoline they need. Others have been starved to panic point. And there is no way to equalize the distress because the price mechanism of the marketplace is inoperative. With profits held uniform by decree across the country, and distribution maintained by fiat, there's no way to even out the suffering.

In the emergency allocation it announced yesterday, FEO essentially ignored these problems. Instead of trying to juggle supplies from one area to another, it simply ordered refiners to draw down inventories by 2 million barrels by the end of the month, distributing that amount in 20 states where the lines have been the longest.

In areas that are suffering the worst, the public naturally believes their community or state is being purposely shortchanged by the oil companies. But gasoline is being allocated against a two-year-old base period. A lot has happened to the market's demand patterns in those two years. As in the Jones' family's food consumption, there are dozens of variables. When most of the variables are in a positive direction, the town or state does all right. When most of them are negative, there is a tightening that is followed by panic.

The easiest variable to spot is population growth. The National Observer notes that Gaithersburg, Md., had a 50% population increase in the last two years but is getting only 80% of what it got before the growth; the true impact is a 47% forced fuel saving.

Abnormal weather in the base period or cases where an oil company has withdrawn from a marketing area or made some other

distribution change since the base period also complicate the calculations.

There are the effects of the conservation measures themselves. Five million autos in Southern California save a lot of gasoline by driving at 55 m.p.h. instead of at 70 or 75. In the New York area, including New Jersey and Connecticut, only a tiny percentage of the gas consumed two years ago was consumed at speeds above 55, so there is little realized saving on this count relative to most of the nation. The same is true to a degree in all the large central cities.

Another variable makes conditions worse in New York City than in most other cities. Two years ago, it was neither a major transit nor terminal point for long-distance motor tourism, the type of driving that has been most sharply curtailed by the crisis. Thus, the amount of gas it now retains by not having to sell to transients is small, overwhelmed by the increased demands local residents put on the allocated supply by not driving out of the region as they did in 1972.

The Federal Energy Office supposedly has its computers working to figure all this out, so it could order supplies around regardless of base periods. But no computer can keep up with this mass of rolling variables, for each decree of energy czar William Simon introduces new variables. New computers will always have to be employed to address the distortions and panics created by the old ones. And while a computer might be able to find out where there is "extra" fuel and where there are panics, it can't easily manage either the politics or logistics of getting gasoline from here to there.

Mr. Simon may have suspected that allocating gasoline is an impossible, thankless task, where one wrong decision out of 20 will throw the system into chaos. But his office continues to pursue the illusion that it can set things right with another round of decrees, when all these do is bring the nation closer to rationing.

For what? To keep the price from going up, which is another impossible task. The price mechanism is the only instrument the government can employ that can handle a billion variables an hour, that will enable New York to buy a little gas from California, for Miami to buy it from Jacksonville, for Chicago to get it from Springfield, and to reverse the process when the direction of the variables change. Decontrol of petroleum prices is the only solution and it will be the ultimate one, after Washington has tried and produced fiascos with every other scheme its imagination leads it to.

**NORTHEAST CATHOLIC HIGH  
SCHOOL WINS NATIONAL AWARD**

**HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Northeast Catholic High School in Philadelphia recently won first place in a national high school debate held at Georgetown University. The 23-member team was among 2,000 students from 300 high schools from all over the United States, Canada, Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Western Europe.

The debate took the form of a mock United Nations session with the participating schools representing the interests of the various member nations. Northeast Catholic's team represented Burundi in Central Africa; Uganda in East Afri-

ca; and Maldive Islands in the Indian Ocean; and the United States.

Faculty members and graduate students from Georgetown University's foreign service school were the judges who decided which students did the best job of portraying their government's policies. The criteria used by the judges included how well pupils spoke, the caucusing ability of the group, and their knowledge of parliamentary procedure.

Northeast Catholic High School bested Miramonte High School from Orinda, Calif. for first place. The first prize was presented to the team by Mr. W. Tapley Bennett, deputy ambassador for the United States to the United Nations.

Northeast Catholic's team was composed of 11 seniors, 11 juniors and 1 sophomore. The school has participated in the Georgetown debates for 4 years, finishing third 2 years ago and second last year.

I congratulate each and every member of the debate team for the great national honor they have brought to their school, to the city of Philadelphia and the Third Congressional District.

#### THE NEED FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

**HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the administration has introduced its Comprehensive Health Insurance Act. Although that plan is defective in many ways, its introduction has the effect of focusing public debate on the question of what kind of national health insurance we should have, rather than whether we should have it or not.

I hope the introduction of this bill means that the administration is serious about working for passage of national health insurance. If they do plan to work seriously for legislation, I believe that a bill that meets the needs of the American people can be passed.

I am a sponsor of the Health Security Act, which I believe offers a comprehensive solution to the problem of health care costs. I find it to be superior to the administration plan in a number of respects. Above all, it establishes top quality medical care as the equal right of all Americans, without distinction.

The administration plan has a number of faults. It would siphon off a huge amount of health care dollars to the profit of private insurance companies. It would retain heavy deductibles, copayments, and premiums that would fall hardest on those of moderate income. And it would establish no incentives for improving the efficiency of health care delivery.

Finally, I hope that as the debate over national health insurance continues, the administration will be more candid concerning the relative costs of various pro-

posals. To say that their plan will cost very little is totally misleading. The health security plan would be supported by the equitable means of payroll and general taxes. The administration plan would be paid for largely by premiums to private insurance companies and by out-of-pocket expenses by the consumer.

#### SMOKEY THE BEAR OF CAPITAN, N. MEX.

**HON. HAROLD RUNNELS**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 28 years ago firefighters combating a forest fire in the Capitan Mountains of New Mexico found a motherless cub with badly burned paws hiding in a tree. A picture of this little bear was carried in newspapers from coast to coast. The frightened cub quickly captured the hearts of millions of Americans.

Thus began the story of "Smokey the Bear" who was to become world famous as the fire prevention symbol of the U.S. Forest Service.

Smokey has lived in the National Zoo since the day he was flown to Washington from New Mexico to become the famous firefighting bear. During the years, he has been the subject of many stories, movies, songs and has been the favorite of millions of children as they are warned of the dangers of forest fires.

Smokey, at 28 years of age, is elderly in the terms of a bear's life. The citizens of Capitan, N. Mex., which is located some 10 miles from the area where Smokey was found, have a sincere desire in seeing that this bear, is returned to his birthplace at the time of his call to that great honey tree in the sky.

To quote Harlan Everett, a writer for the Ruidoso News:

Though Smokey belongs to everyone in the United States, the people of Capitan love him just a little more.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation that would express the sense of the Congress that Smokey be returned to New Mexico where a permanent memorial will be established at the Smokey the Bear Museum and Park.

Capitan Mayor J. T. Johnson, representing the citizens of this small community located in the center of the Lincoln National Forest, has expressed the desire of the community to finance this memorial. The community is not requesting any funds from Congress; it only requests that Smokey be returned to New Mexico for proper burial.

Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in the House for the people of Capitan, N. Mex., I would ask my colleagues in the Congress to consider this request favorably by directing that Smokey be returned to the mountains of New Mexico where his famous career of educating the public on the dangers of forest fires began.

#### DECLARATION OF WAR ON INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND FREE ENTERPRISE

**HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the Special Energy Act submitted by the administration to the Congress.

This proposal, announced in a seemingly innocuous press release put out by the Federal Energy Office recently, is nothing less than a declaration of war on individual rights and free enterprise. It is yet another attempt to shackle free enterprise, and remove the individual's right to choose.

The bill, as described by the Federal Energy Office, would provide for end-use rationing if necessary, and various mandatory conservation actions by the President. This bill would allow the President to limit energy consumption by imposing selective controls on public and private energy use; it would give him additional authority to ration gasoline; and it would authorize him to give State and local governments tax funds to carry out such a program.

In other words, this bill would give the executive branch complete domination over the course of our energy problems. The President could decide how and when to ration gasoline; how much electricity and natural gas the individual may use; and cleverly make accomplices of State and local governments by providing them with tax funds to run the programs dictated from Washington.

I maintain the President does not need such additional authority, as he already has it in the form of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act, the Defense Production Act of 1950, and the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970. If the Congress fails to kill this latest request, the course of individual rights and free enterprise in this Nation will be irrevocably changed for the worse. I submit the text of the FEO announcement for my colleague's consideration:

[Federal Energy Office, Public Affairs]

#### SPECIAL ENERGY ACT SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS

The Administration has submitted to the Congress a new energy bill, called the Special Energy Act, which would provide for two specific authorities: end-use rationing, if it becomes necessary; and various mandatory conservation actions. Both standby authorities were also contained in the Energy Emergency Act, which was vetoed by the President February 26. Submission of the bill does not signify any change in the administration's determination to avoid rationing.

Under the authorities granted in the bill, the President would be empowered to limit energy consumption through such actions as selective controls on public and private energy use.

In addition, the President would be authorized to ration petroleum products—including gasoline—among classes of end-users, who would be allowed to appeal any rationing determination.

Since state and local governments would



share the responsibility to develop and enforce appropriate energy measures, the President would be authorized to make grants to them, to provide assistance in managing energy problems.

FACT SHEET—SPECIAL ENERGY ACT  
BACKGROUND

On November 7, 1973, the President indicated that additional authority was needed for such measures as rationing and mandatory energy conservation programs to meet the energy emergency.

The Emergency Energy Act which was passed by the Congress on February 26 would have provided the necessary authority, but the bill was encumbered by a number of extraneous and undesirable provisions resulting in a necessity for the President to veto the bill.

During the President's veto message he announced that he would seek those authorities necessary to deal expeditiously with energy problems.

The President is now asking the Congress to enact a bill the "Special Energy Act."

THE PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED

Statutory authority available to the Executive Branch is not adequate to permit implementation of rationing should it be necessary.

Statutory authority is not sufficient to institute conservation actions.

Statutory authority is needed to provide grants to states and local governments to meet the energy challenge.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

Amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act to provide the authority for the establishment of a program for the rationing and ordering of priorities among classes of end-users if the President finds that all other methods to limit energy demand are inadequate.

Permit dissatisfied consumers to petition for review and reclassification or modification of any determination made under this Act.

Authorize the President to take appropriate actions designed to result in a reduction of energy consumption to a level consistent with available energy resources. Such actions may include:

- Transportation controls (including reduction of speed limits);
- Limitations on energy consumption.

Authorize the President to make grants to the states to carry out any programs which they shall establish in managing the energy problem.

FAMILY FIGHTS CANCER FOR THE  
THIRD TIME

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, a brave 13-year-old boy from my State of Florida is undergoing a lonely and grim battle this week in an Ohio hospital.

The boy, Stephen Southerland, faces amputation of his left leg to treat the cancer which has spread through it.

Stephen is the third son of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Southerland to suffer from cancer. One son died.

I talked with Mr. Southerland on the telephone last night and he said Stephen is facing up to his battle in good spirits.

I am sure the prayers of all of us go with this young lad and his family.

Edna Buchanan, a reporter from the Miami Herald, wrote about Stephen and his plight in the following story which appeared in the Miami Herald:

FAMILY FIGHTS CANCER FOR THE THIRD TIME  
(By Edna Buchanan)

A Dade County policeman and his wife await news of their son at a Cincinnati hospital today in an agonizing repetition that doctors call a grim first.

The news can't be good. Doctors are deciding whether to amputate Stephen Southerland's left leg or to treat the cancer that has crept through it.

Stephen, 13, is the oldest of the three sons of Metro Deputy Raymond Southerland and his wife, Sarah—and the third to develop cancer.

The same kinds of tumors have occurred, very rarely, in several members of the same family in the past, cancer specialists say.

But the malignancies of the Southerland children are rare and apparently unrelated.

"This is the first time that this particular group of cancer has occurred in the same family in the United States," said Dr. Alvin Mauer, medical director of St. Jude's Hospital in Memphis, Tenn. which specializes in childhood cancers. The hospital treated the Southerland's other surviving son and conferred with Stephen's surgeon Friday night.

"It could be lightning striking not once, but three times," Dr. Mauer said. "It's terribly important to find if there is some common thread, some common denominator. It could help us to better understand cancer and its causes."

Stephen, an athletic youth who's a Dolphins fan, saw one younger brother die of leukemia and the other survive cancer surgery and cobalt treatments. Just before Stephen became ill, the orthodontist put braces on his teeth.

"Dad," Stephen asked last week. "Will they bury me in braces?"

"I broke down," his father says. "I told him we're not going to worry about that now. We're just worrying about that leg."

"This one kills me," Southerland said Saturday, his voice trembling.

"If ever one boy deserved not to have cancer, it's him. He's a little boy who goes to Sunday school. Nobody has to tell him to go. I don't understand it. It's so unreal."

"The chances of three children in the same family all developing different, completely unrelated types of cancer are very remote," one pediatrician, Leo Grossman of Miami Beach, said Saturday.

"The odds are astronomical," said Miami's Dr. Harry Kaufman, who specializes in childhood diseases. "An amazing streak of unbelievably bad luck."

When Stephen was 8, his brother, Jeffrey, 4, died of lymphatic leukemia after an 18-month battle.

The day before Jeffrey died, a malignant schwannoma, one of the rarest forms of cancer, was diagnosed in the nerve lining of his brother Michael's spine.

Michael was 3.

"The doctor didn't want to tell us," Southerland recalls. "He felt it couldn't happen that way."

Three days after Jeffrey's funeral the couple, who lived in Indiana then, took Michael to the Children's Research Center in Cincinnati on their doctor's advice.

The tumor was removed. In a second operation, Dr. Lester Martin removed muscle and three bony structures from the top of the youngster's spine.

"Then they gave him a lot of cobalt," Southerland, 35, said.

Michael was given a 30 per cent chance to survive.

He finished the treatments at age 5. He's 9 now and there's been no recurrence. His left

arm, once paralyzed has improved with physical therapy. The loss of mobility that the doctors feared was overcome.

"He runs and plays like any other child," his father says.

Southerland, a former Marine who was graduated from college at 28, quit his job as a Vigo County, Ind., Sheriff's Department detective lieutenant two years ago to move the family to Miami and work for the Public Safety Department.

Assigned to the community services division, he works with youngsters as a school liaison officer.

"We went for two years and things looked bright, real good for everybody," he says. Working together, the couple, reduced \$28,000 in outstanding medical bills to \$400.

The family, now living in the Kendall area, was nearly back on its feet.

"Then this hit us like a ton of lead," Southerland says.

A few weeks ago Stephen complained of pain in his left leg. His parents thought he pulled a muscle playing football.

The pain grew worse. A doctor x-rayed the leg. The news was bad.

"When they told me he had cancer, it just seemed unreal," Southerland says.

"All of them were perfect children. But Steve's something special. He helped us get through all the other crisis times. Anything you would ask, he'd say, 'Dad, I'll take care of that.'"

"He took care of Mike during Jeff's illness. He was always stable, with a lot of common sense. He wants to be a lawyer."

The day after they got the news, Southerland drove his wife and son to Cincinnati.

"It seems like a nightmare being back here," he said Saturday from the hospital. "It brings back all the bad memories that were with us the first time."

Doctors removed a section of bone Saturday to determine the type of cancer Stephen has. If it is Ewing's tumor, as they suspect, he will be returned to Florida for radiation and chemotherapy treatments by University of Miami specialists. If it is osteogenic (another form of cancer) the leg will be amputated there and therapy will follow.

The best that doctors can predict is a 30 per cent chance of complete recovery. Results of the test won't be known for several days.

"It's enough to give us hope," Southerland said. "If we have hope we have everything going for us. My wife has gone through so much. I don't believe many women could ever do it."

"She and I have sat down and talked and studied. One thing we can't do is run away from it. Where are you going to run to?"

"We live day by day now. We give our boys all the love we can give them that day. Whenever we have problems we group together. We have close ties."

"They haven't thought of waiting."

"He's one in a million," his mother said. "We're lucky to have him."

STRACKBEIN LETTER

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, recently I inserted in the Record—March 6—a copy of a letter from O. R. Strackbein to James Reston, vice president of the New York Times, who writes a column for the same newspaper.

I have now received an echo from a reader of the RECORD. It comes from a clergyman in Montana. He writes that the points Mr. Strackbein made in his letter to Mr. Reston "are both revealing and sobering. I feel they need to be shouted from the housetops all over the nation."

Mr. Strackbein has written to another New York Times columnist—Mr. Anthony Lewis—who devotes much of his output to President Nixon. I believe that the comments Mr. Strackbein makes in this letter are as cogent, though different, as those contained in his letter to Mr. Reston. I, therefore, insert them as a part of my remarks. The letter follows:

NOVEMBER 28, 1973.

MR. ANTHONY LEWIS,  
The New York Times,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. LEWIS: Your column of November 26, 1973, entitled "Living with Illusion" says that "Mr. Nixon feels no real regret at the official lawlessness."

Much of what you say is interpretative and subjective, and, of course, lends itself to no objective measure.

Nevertheless, since commentators are much given to speculation, part of it adding to reader interest in seeking to understand the meaning of events, I will accept your thesis for my own comment.

You mention Mr. Nixon's failure to express regret over Mr. Agnew, who was "exposed as a petty grafter"; Mr. Nixon's bombing of a neutral country under an elaborate cover-up; his "promulgation of a secret plan for Federal agents to use burglary, wire-tapping and other illegal methods;" etc., etc., as evidence. Then you say that "Mr. Nixon feels no real regret at the official lawlessness of the last five years?"

In saying these things your reader must gather that you have a special insight into Mr. Nixon's soul. Do you suppose that generals feel no "real" regrets when they deplore the death of the men who are sent to battle on their orders? You would probably say that some do and some do not; but I wonder how you would go about separating the sheep from the goats. Would you be able to judge the generals by their outer appearances? By their utterances on the subject, or by their silence? Or by the tone of their voice? How?

Then you express the fear that Mr. Nixon may get away with it all, although you are more optimistic than the pessimist whom you quote who thinks that Mr. Nixon will succeed in his efforts by treating his legal problems as public relations problems. The pessimist thinks that Congress will not care about the rule of law. You yourself think rather higher of Congress. Are these expressions not mere matter of personal opinion?

I do not call into question the observations you offer. They may be well-founded; and the practices about which you complain may be deplored, regretted and condemned.

My principal question is why everyone seems suddenly to be so surprised over our political corruption. Lincoln Steffens and Ida Tarbell were appalled by it over fifty years ago. In the first place, corruption is not only prevalent in our politics but has been present since the founding of our republic. It then becomes a matter of degree; but to some extent also a matter of kind.

There are those, for example, who say that the current corruption is worse than the corruption that springs from greed such as Teapot Dome, involving bribery, for example, because it goes to the very foundation of our democratic system of government. I agree that the Watergate part of it does indicate

that what was done was not done for personal pecuniary gain. Those who engaged in it did so in some instances because they simply took orders. It was not theirs to reason why. This country is thickly populated by people who take orders, and for this we may be thankful. Some regarded themselves as patriotic and as engaging in a good cause, according to their own accounts.

The overriding question is how the President, even if he did not know the details of what was happening, could preside over it all and allow a climate to be created in which the direct participants felt comfortable. The former Attorney General, Mr. Mitchell, after learning about the activities did not wish to tell the President because he feared Mr. Nixon's reaction and the possible loss of the presidential campaign. His belief in the President overrode his misgivings about the means of warding off the election of the other candidate.

My interest is in the ensemble, i.e., in the "climate" that permitted the departure from earlier practices—not only in point of degree; for degree does make a difference; but also in kind.

There are those who blame Mr. Nixon's choice of aides. The former President, Lyndon Johnson, reportedly observed that these relatively young men would get Mr. Nixon into trouble because they lacked political experience—an observation that is not noted for its moral content. It could be interpreted as indicating that experienced politicians would have been too smart to let themselves get caught, or would have known other means of achieving the same end.

To me the whole phenomenon is the natural fruit of the changing philosophy, psychology and moral values of our times.

We had until the more recent times believed in absolutes in the field of morals. Right was right and wrong was wrong. The upbringing of children was "stricter" than later. Home teaching dwelt more in the moral virtues than in recent years. Even our school copybooks were designed to imbue youngsters with moral values that might act as guides in future confrontations involving moral questions.

Thanks to modern psychology this method of inculcation has been laughed out of the schools, or condemned as sources of neuroses.

The absolute values, moreover, were upset by the ideas of relativism. Anthropologists demonstrated that morality is affected by circumstances and conditions. What was immoral in one society could be regarded as wholly acceptable behavior in other societies. Relativity was also given a mysterious boost through Einstein's theory. Physical indeterminacy helped soften our underfoot. We were not moving in a medium that was actually what it seemed to be. Certainty was something of an illusion. Other great physicists, Heisenberg notably, helped cut the ground out from under the certainty we all seek. Valhalla held forth with his philosophy of "As If"—as an explanation of behavior. The Behaviorists did their part.

The great liberator, however, so far as morality was concerned, came from pragmatism, so lucidly expounded by Professor William James of Harvard and from Sigmund Freud who for good or evil or both turned our conventional sex teachings upside down.

Add to this breakdown of the old solid footing, the great technological revolution of the past generation, such as radio, television, aircraft, nuclear energy, biological discoveries, going hand-in-hand with the exaltation of children and the denigration of parenthood and authority; altogether a liberation of and license, for our impulses, appetites and ambitions, a freeing from discipline and restraint while substituting little or

nothing for the discarded guidelines: Thus has man been converted into the cleverest animal that inhabits the earth.

As for Mr. Nixon, he hired standard young Americans, really well above the average cut, products of our finest colleges and universities, and exemplars. I am sure, in most instances, in their private lives—imbued with the modern outlook, wherein God is dead or dying but in any case obsolescent, wherein truth is determined by what works or pays (See William James on Pragmatism), and wherein individualism runs to the extreme of everyone's seeking self-expression (e.g., doing one's thing) without regard to impingement on fellow members of the human family; yes, Mr. Nixon failed to taking unto himself the bright products of our unhinged civilization, that having been cut loose from the moorings of the past, from folk wisdom, tradition and authority, has not yet found a new footing.

Pragmatism, relativity in morality, the modern psychology (permissiveness), banishment of extra-mundane authority (decay of religion), team together to affirm the proposition that the end justifies the means, and ultimately, that might makes right.

Without an external referee man becomes self-sufficient and self-fulfilling. His wisdom and his folly then determine our destiny. Who then will judge but the tribe? And who among them but the most clever or the most powerful?

To the extent that a residue of our former moral considerations and references still persists, the climate is most conducive to hypocrisy. This is to say we will continue for a season or two to render homage to the past while de facto doing what comes naturally and whatever it may be that we can get away with under the cloak of conformity. We find it easier to identify what we wish to do with what "has to be done". We become a law unto ourselves; and a new order of survival of the fittest in terms of cleverness is set before us as our new abode.

Now, Mr. Lewis, if you wish to condemn Mr. Nixon for having succumbed to the world of pragmatism, moral relativism, and the liberation of original sin (the animal heritage in us) I think you will accomplish very little unless you attend to these other underlying causes of the climatic change that has at least for the time being both confused us and corrupted us. Innately I believe man prefers right over wrong, but if he has lost his compass it may take him a while to find a new way, such as a generation or two.

In the premises I question the useful function of vehemence, intemperance and hatred. If it works out that Congress will not impeach the President and that he also will not resign, then by the pragmatic measure, your quest is false. It will not have worked; i.e., you are not sufficiently powerful or influential.

Or would you rather have recourse to some absolutes? If so, where would you begin, with the cause or the effect? Quite a bit of unwinding will be necessary since moral absolutism is quite far gone. If man is master of his own destiny and the sole referee you must trust in man.

If you wish to go with this new order you should take your medicine; and fight from within, which is probably what you are doing; but don't forget, you cannot call on an outside referee; you must simply be more clever and more powerful than those you would put down. You pass then into the Nietzschean world. I doubt that you would find that very much to your liking.

Is it possible that Mr. Nixon, having a foot in both worlds finds himself in a dichotomous discomfiture from which extrication is not very easy; and that also the American people are in a distressing dilemma, in which those remaining in the support of the Presi-



dent have resort to pragmatism as the source of their justification, while those who condemn him have recourse to the very principle of discipline, moral and philosophical, which they have forsaken as old-fashioned and therefore inoperative?

The irony of it is then the uncovering of human frailty: The Nixon supporters are driven to defend what they do not wish to defend while his detractors would be phenomenally complacent over the wrongdoing if it had been committed by their own favorite. Political history through its long years spills over with such human inconsistency. That is why history should not be written by contemporaries.

Sincerely,

O. R. STRACKBEIN.

## LOWER INCOME TAX WITHHOLDING RATES

**HON. BARBARA JORDAN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Ms. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced, along with 29 cosponsors, legislation which would reduce the current personal income tax withholding rates by 8 percent. Last Tuesday the administration, in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee by Secretary of the Treasury George Shultz, endorsed this concept and urged its enactment. I am pleased to have the support of the administration behind a bill which would stimulate the economy and increase take-home pay for millions of working Americans.

When the Congress enacted new withholding schedules in 1971 most workers found their paychecks reduced due to overwithholding. This legislation would lower the withholding rates by 8 percent—and thereby provide additional take-home pay to workers amounting to \$10 billion annually. The effect, economically, would be that of a temporary tax cut, while the budgetary effect would be nil. If the bill were to be enacted in the near future, 1974 taxes would appear to be lower, reflecting the lower withholding rates. Since taxpayers would have more income in 1974, they would presumably spend more. The economy would then expand to meet this demand; the gross national product would rise and more jobs would be created.

The list of cosponsors and article from the New York Times of March 20, 1974, follows:

**COSPONSORS OF LEGISLATION REDUCING INCOME TAX WITHHOLDING RATES (H.R. 12788, H.R. 12992, H.R. 13141, H.R. 13438)**

Ms. Barbara Jordan, Texas  
Ms. Bella Abzug, New York  
Mr. Herman Badillo, New York  
Mr. Jonathan Bingham, New York  
Ms. Corinne Boggs, Louisiana  
Mr. George Brown, California  
Ms. Yvonne Burke, California  
Ms. Shirley Chisholm, New York  
Mr. John Conyers, Michigan  
Mr. Ronald Dellums, California  
Mr. Bob Eckhardt, Texas  
Mr. Don Edwards, California

Mr. Joshua Ellberg, Pennsylvania  
Mr. James Hastings, New York  
Mr. Ken Hechler, West Virginia  
Ms. Elizabeth Holtzman, New York  
Mr. Robert Huber, Michigan  
Mr. Manuel Lujan, New Mexico  
Mr. Parren Mitchell, Maryland  
Mr. John Moakley, Massachusetts  
Mr. John Moss, California  
Mr. Robert Nix, Pennsylvania  
Mr. Wayne Owens, Utah  
Mr. Richardson Preyer, North Carolina  
Mr. Melvin Price, Illinois  
Mr. Donald Riegle, Michigan  
Mr. Paul Sarbanes, Maryland  
Mr. John Seiberling, Ohio  
Mr. Louis Stokes, Ohio  
Mr. Antonio Won Pat, Guam

[From the New York Times, Mar. 20, 1974]

### SHULTZ URGES LOWER WITHHOLDING RATES IN BID TO STOP TAX-CUT DRIVE BY CONGRESS

WASHINGTON.—Hoping to head off a congressional tax-cut drive, the Nixon administration urged instead that lawmakers tinker with tax-withholding tables to produce more take-home pay for millions of workers.

Treasury Secretary George Shultz told Congress that the economy isn't so weak as to need the antirecession tax cut that many lawmakers want to pass. But recognizing the election-year appeal of some move to ease the inflationary pinch on consumers, he proposed a change in the law that would reduce overwithholding of federal income taxes from many wage earners' paychecks.

Backing up his chief economic adviser, President Nixon said last night in his televised appearance before the National Association of Broadcasters in Houston that the economy will pull out of its present "difficult period" during the latter half of the year. At that time, he predicted, "unemployment will go down, the price level will abate, and by then the American people will be convinced they aren't in a recession."

On inflation, Mr. Nixon reiterated that "we will continue to have a difficult time" with consumer-price increases into the third quarter of the year. After that, he said, the rise in consumer prices "will begin to abate." He acknowledged, however, that a potential shortage of beef this fall could keep pressure on meat prices.

Mr. Shultz indicated his proposal, made in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, would reduce overwithholding by about \$6 billion a year. Though Treasury officials earlier had disclosed they were studying such a plan, the Secretary's testimony was the first formal proposal of the idea by the administration.

The administration's chief economic spokesman told the committee that the White House opposes an outright tax cut because it would overstimulate the economy, worsen inflation and erode federal revenue growth needed to cover rising spending. But he said a revision of withholding tables, which wouldn't reduce government tax receipts but would affect the timing of their collection, wouldn't have those "disadvantages" of an actual tax cut.

The main beneficiaries of the proposed change in tax-withholding schedules would be family heads without working spouses. These sole breadwinners currently are subject to substantial overwithholding, Mr. Shultz noted, due to a 1971 change in the law that based withholding tables on a dual wage-earner assumption that's appropriate to households where both husband and wife are employed. The 1971 law allowed sole breadwinners to claim an extra exemption to offset this assumption, but "many millions of people" eligible for the offset haven't used it, Mr. Shultz said.

He urged lawmakers to revise withholding schedules for sole breadwinners to "remove his unintended overwithholding." A Shultz aide said Treasury tax specialists would meet with congressional tax-writers to draft a specific formula for the reduced withholding.

The reduction in withholding, Mr. Shultz testified, "would have an immediate one-time impact on spendable incomes and would produce moderate acceleration of demand" to stimulate the currently soft economy.

While some Republican and Southern Democratic panel members seemed favorably inclined toward the Shultz proposal, liberal Democrats pressed their case for an actual tax cut to stimulate the economy. The hearing, which was called to consider various Democratic proposals for tax credits, increased personal exemptions or other devices to lower individual's tax bills, heard pleas by Sens. Walter Mondale (D., Minn.) and Edward Kennedy (D., Mass.) for the antirecession tax cut they've sponsored.

But the Treasury chief argued that the current economic slowdown isn't "severe enough or widespread enough to call for additional fiscal stimulus," such as a tax cut. The slump is "concentrated in a handful of industries," such as auto manufacturing and travel, which have been hurt by fuel shortages, Mr. Shultz said.

The economic problems in energy-related areas aren't having a "falling-domino effect on other parts of the economy," Mr. Shultz contended. Thus, he argued, a general stimulative measure such as a tax cut would only worsen inflation by overheating the economy.

The second half of 1974 "will be a crossroads for the future of inflation in America," he said. If the economy rebounds too fast, he warned, "we could get a step-up in the inflation rate from which it will be hard ever to retreat." A high inflation rate could be built into the economy "in a way that would take a severe economic bust to dislodge," Mr. Shultz said.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69

**HON. LLOYD MEEDS**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following amendment intended to be offered by me to H.R. 69:

AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY MR. MEEDS TO H.R. 69

(3) Amend H. R. 69 on page 87 by striking out all the language beginning on line 13 and extending down through line 20 and substituting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (2) of this subsection, to the extent that a State aid equalization formula in providing State funds to a local educational agency takes into account the total assessed property valuation available to the local educational agency such State aid formula may also take into account as local property taxation assessment such amount as would be required at the local property tax rate for such local educational agency to produce an amount equal to the amount provided to the local educational agency by this title or to the extent that a State aid formula takes into account by other comparable means the abil-

ity of a local educational agency to raise revenue for public elementary and secondary education such State aid formula may take into account funds received by a local educational agency under this title to the same extent. The Commissioner shall implement the provisions of this paragraph by appropriate regulation.

RETIREMENT OF WILLIAM J. HASSAN, COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY, ARLINGTON, VA.

### HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, proud, and honored to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen and public servant, Mr. William J. Hassan, the recently retired commonwealth attorney of Arlington County, Va. For 22 years this man, whom I highly respect as a man of proven rectitude, trustworthiness, and competence, served his community and State in such fashion and manner, between the period of 1952 to 1974, as to be elected to six consecutive 4-year terms. I think it can be safely said that had not the gods designed otherwise, in that poor health overtook him, Bill Hassan could have been Arlington County's commonwealth attorney for as long as he chose to serve.

Born and raised in the environs of Boston, Mr. Hassan went to college at Wabash in Crawfordsville, Ind. There, in the heart of Hoosierland, that place from whence come the smartest people in the world, as George Ade so often and aptly put it, Bill determined to be a lawyer, and we are all the better off for that decision. He completed law school after a World War II tour as an officer in the Coast Guard, serving afloat and ashore. He entered private law practice across the river in Arlington in 1949. The rest is history. He ran for commonwealth attorney in 1951 and there began a career unparalleled in Virginia political history. He will be honored by a reception on the 23d of March, a salute he richly deserves.

William J. Hassan and others like him stand out and apart in the legal profession. The full measure of this man cannot be fully told without the listing of the many times his fellowmen have placed him in a leadership position. He has served as:

President of the Association of Commonwealth's Attorneys of Virginia.  
President, Arlington Democratic Club.  
President, Arlington Democratic Council; member of the Arlington Democratic Executive Committee.  
President, Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

Grand knight and district deputy of Knights of Columbus.

Department senior vice-commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Washington, D.C.

Member, American Legion; member, board of directors of Arlington Cancer

Society; member, executive board of the National Capital Area Council, Boy Scouts of America.

Member, Arlington County Recreation Council, and past chairman of same.

President, Arlington County Bar Association.

Member, Virginia State Bar Association; member, American Bar Association.

Member, National District Attorneys' Association.

Member, Virginia Advisory Legislative Committee on Eminent Domain, 1959-61.

Delegate to the 1956 Chicago Convention.

Democratic Presidential Elector for the 10th District of Virginia, 1960.

Member, Mental Health Association of Virginia.

Member, Arlington County Drug Abuse Task Force.

Member, Northern Virginia Law Enforcement Commission.

Director, United Savings and Loan Association.

Member, board of governors, criminal law section, Virginia State Bar.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say in conclusion that William J. Hassan has stood tall, straight and true, and he will be sorely missed.

### 11500 BANANAS ON PIKES PEAK

### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11500, the bill to break the back of surface coal mining prohibits any mining or reclamation within 100 feet of a lake, river, stream or creek.

Roadbuilders routinely change the course of streams whenever they need to. Up to now surface mine operators routinely divert small streams, et cetera, to recover the coal beneath and restore them in the reclamation process without damage.

This foolish provision of H.R. 11500 would constrict the surface mining industry by banning mining in a 200-foot band downhill from every spring that seeps, let alone all the countless rivers and lakes in this country. Surface mining would become a practical impossibility. That is apparently what the authors of the bill want. They would impose it dictatorially despite the fact that this Nation needs all the coal it can get from mines above and below the surface both. And, with proper reclamation practices it can be gotten without undue detriment to the environment.

H.R. 11500's total environmentalist bias is dangerously one-sided. The things it dictates are as crazy as trying to raise bananas on Pikes Peak. Let us dump H.R. 11500 and get a bill the country can live with.

### MOUNT WASHINGTON DEVELOPMENT CO. AND CALVIN PERKINS COOPERATE FOR CONSERVATION

### HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House an outstanding article on the work of the Soil Conservation Service, so ably led by Administrator Kent Grant, who served many years in New Hampshire.

A new ski development was started a little over 2 years ago on Rosebrook Mountain, which is in New Hampshire's White Mountains. The Mount Washington Development Co., the builders of the new ski area, showed their concern for the area by seeking technical advice on the environmental impact of the project from the SCS.

The SCS was able to give effective advice on the planning of the ski development in regard to soil conservation. They provided soil survey data imperative to the proper construction of ski trails, ski lifts, underground snowmaking equipment, maintenance buildings, lodges, condominiums, access roads, parking lots, and other facilities. Due to the SCS's help and direction, major construction has been completed with minimal impact on the environment.

Calvin Perkins of Lancaster, N.H., district conservationist for the SCS, deserves a great deal of credit for this conservation work at the grass roots level. Too often we tend to think of conservation in terms of far-reaching Federal projects. This is an example of conservation at the local level.

Other recreational people all over America should take note of Calvin Perkins' efforts. The recreational needs of America must be met. As in this case we see that properly planned construction will provide for these needs and not result in any harmful environmental effects.

The article follows:

NO SCARS ON THE LANDSCAPE

(By Calvin J. Perkins)

Two winters ago I was driving east on U.S. Route 302 near Carroll, New Hampshire, and saw trees on the steep slopes of Rosebrook Mountain being cut and large piles of brush being burned. Work had started on the area's new ski development.

My thoughts quickly turned to beautiful snow-covered Mount Washington to my left and the ice-laden Ammonoosuc River that flows peacefully along the base of Rosebrook Mountain to my right. Was this to be a hazardous development that would interrupt the picturesque views of the White Mountains and contaminate the clean water of this mountain stream?

No. It wasn't. Early into those winter months a representative of the Mount Washington Development Company contacted leaders of the North County Resource Conservation and Development Project. He was looking for technical assistance in planning and applying conservation practices in the ski development area to reduce erosion and sediment and protect the natural environment.



That contact resulted in a meeting of SCS people with planners, engineers, contractors, and others associated with the new ski complex. And it was the beginning of a successful effort to incorporate conservation concepts into the ski development.

The Soil Conservation Service, through the Coos County and Grafton County Conservation Districts, provided soil survey data on 2,500 acres. Soil data are basic to planning, and these data were used in planning the ski development, including 100 acres of cleared ski trails and sites of lift lines, underground snowmaking equipment, maintenance buildings, a lodge, condominiums, access roads, parking lots, and other related facilities.

The soil information included interpretative maps depicting various land use limitations.

Construction was halted late in winter because of the heavy snow accumulation. Fortunately, snowmelt the next spring did not cause excessive erosion. As soon as the land was dry enough for construction activity, the work was renewed.

SCS suggested improved methods of erosion control during construction. These were quickly adopted. They included two large sediment basins at the base of the mountain to settle out loose sediment and prevent it from entering the Ammonoosuc River. All of the small streams and surface water channels within the construction area were directed into two major drainageways that flowed into and through these sediment basins.

Culverts up to 6 feet in diameter were used to conduct water safely under access roads and across critical points on the ski slopes. Each culvert had stone headwalls at each end to prevent erosion and to provide a rustic appearance in keeping with the setting.

Temporary diversions were roughed in across the ski slopes after stumps and boulders were removed and were kept free of debris at all times. These were spaced about 50 feet apart on slopes greater than 35 percent and not more than 200 feet apart on slopes of less than 35 percent.

These diversions broke long slopes into short ones, reduced the potential for erosion, and took the excess water off the area in an orderly manner.

During the final grading, which began at the top of the slopes, workers seeded, fertilized, and mulched as they moved downslope, never leaving more than 500 feet without proper cover or exposed to erosion.

Permanent diversions were installed where necessary on a grade of 1 percent or less. Each of these diversions was constructed to outlet into wooded space between trails and lift lines where a natural surface water channel carried the water safely downhill without erosion and into the sediment basins.

As access roads were constructed, surface-water ditches were also constructed; all cut and fill slopes were seeded and mulched immediately after construction.

With all of this construction activity, one could almost visualize a scarred landscape. But there is none. Engineers designed the ski trails so that they are not visible from the highway from either direction of approach until the viewer is directly opposite the ski development.

The Mount Washington Development Company has demonstrated that when conservation practices are included in development plans, the adverse effects on the area and its environment are minimal.

The White Mountains have retained their magnificent splendor, and the Ammonoosuc River continues along its path unaware of man's activity nearby.

## WALL STREET JOURNAL REPORTS ON NOTRE DAME

### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of a most informative article published in the Wall Street Journal of March 11, 1974 concerning the University of Notre Dame, which is located in the congressional district I have the honor to represent.

The article follows:

CRACKING THE BOOKS—FOOTBALL-SCHOOL IMAGE DOESN'T REFLECT FACTS AT NOTRE DAME TODAY

(By David M. Elsner, Staff Reporter of the Wall Street Journal)

NOTRE DAME, IND.—Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, once visited the chancellor of England's Oxford University. He found him relaxing in his office, quietly reading Plato in Greek. How, Father Hesburgh asked, did the chancellor find time for leisure and still keep the university running?

"Tradition," the chancellor said.

"Sometimes," replied Father Hesburgh, "I think tradition is my biggest problem."

Indeed, it has been. Notre Dame's dual heritages of football and Catholicism (a faculty member once correlated 50 years of football scores with communion attendance) are regarded with suspicion in academic circles. Both are viewed as "anti-intellectual" and have led outsiders to conclude that the development of an open university, free to question and debate, was unlikely.

But Notre Dame, a 1,000-acre wooded retreat of neo-Gothic buildings surrounded by Indiana cornfields, is changing. In the late 1960s it became the nation's first Catholic institution of higher learning to transfer control from its founding order of priests to a board composed primarily of laymen. A little more than a year ago, the university abandoned its monastic stance and admitted women.

#### A GRAIN OF SALT

And now many scholars are saying that Notre Dame (pronounced "Noter Daym" according to a university ruling once made to aid sportscasters) not only has become a fine Catholic university, but also appears on the verge of becoming a fine university, period. Special centers for biological research, medieval studies and civil rights are leaders in their fields. The general undergraduate program is regarded as one of the nation's best, and a recent opinion survey by the American Council of Education placed the quality of Notre Dame's graduate departments among the top 30 private universities in the country.

It might be even better than that. "Those polls should be taken with a grain of salt," says Lewis Mayhew, a professor of education at Stanford University who has closely studied the course of higher education in the U.S. "A school that's going downhill will hang onto an undeserved high rating for years afterward, and a school on the way up, like Notre Dame, might never get the recognition it deserves."

Evidence exists, however, that the school's reputation is spreading to the non-Catholic world. Author Norman Mailer, who is Jewish, says that if his son (now 10) were ready for college, he might try to talk him into going to Notre Dame. "It's a great college," he says.

"What you get from the students is a lively Catholicism plus a lively agnosticism. I can use the word 'soul' there and they don't snicker."

Adds Harvard sociologist David Riesman: "The main difference between their student and ours is that ours is more self-confident. The Notre Dame student underestimates himself; certainly the intellectual difference isn't that great. I can't think of any reason, except snobbery and prejudice, why a non-Catholic shouldn't go there."

#### CONFISCATED TICKETS

It used to be easy to recite a litany of reasons. Students formerly led a cloistered life and complained of the school's West Point-like disciplinary code. Dormitory lights were turned off at 11 p.m.; permission was needed to travel to nearby South Bend; Mass was compulsory, and bed checks were frequent. Students were encouraged to pray for guidance before going out on dates with girls from neighboring St. Mary's College, who are known locally as the "belles of St. Mary's."

Today's regulations are more lenient, although four students who held a noisy dormitory party last semester did have their football tickets confiscated. Rules forbid "overdrinking" and sex in dormitories but are often ignored, students say. Nor can anyone remember the last time he prayed before a date.

A major problem, though, was the faculty, which before World War II was dominated by priests of the Order of the Holy Cross. (A French Holy Cross priest, Edward Sorin, founded the school in 1842.) Father Leo R. Ward, who taught philosophy for 40 years, says that unqualified priests often were sent to teach in departments that didn't want them. Many also saw their pastoral duties as more important than their academic ones, he says. Indeed, the theology department at one time was so dogmatic that some Catholic students claimed they weren't Catholic to avoid the requirement. The environment also dictated that any conflict between academics and religious doctrine was settled in favor of the latter, according to some faculty members.

#### "PUBLISH OR PARISH"

Today, however, priests make up less than 10% of the 745-member faculty. They are subject to the same tenure and publishing requirements as lay faculty. ("We used to say it was publish or parish," says one department chairman.) The theology department is populated now by more liberal priests who frequently discuss church reform and existentialism, and occasionally express doubts about the Immaculate Conception, students say.

Still Father Hesburgh says Notre Dame will retain its Catholic commitment and its "vital core" of Catholic teachers, who still outnumber members of other religions on the faculty by more than two-to-one. "A Catholic university emphasizes moral leadership, commitment to justice, integrity and honor," he says. "If ever we needed education that was sensitive to higher values, it's today. Everyone in Watergate was a product of the universities, some of the best, yet they showed a monumental lack of perception of values."

Yet Catholicism seems decidedly secondary when it comes to hiring. "I told them I was an agnostic," says a philosophy professor whom Notre Dame tried to lure from a prestigious Midwestern university. "They said it didn't matter." He adds: "I also discovered that I knew more Aquinas than anyone in their department."

Attracting "name" scholars for senior posts has proved difficult. This year, however, benefiting financially from a moratorium on a costly building program, Notre Dame began a long-term campaign to endow three or four

faculty chairs a year at a cost of about \$800,000 apiece. "We'll be looking for the best people in the country, people from places like Harvard, Yale and Stanford," says Father Hesburgh. "We can afford them now."

Until now, Notre Dame had sought to build its faculty mainly by hiring bright young Ph. D.s directly out of college. "In philosophy, for instance, we obtained dossiers on every new Ph. D. in the country," says Father James T. Burtchall, the university's chancellor. "We had four openings and got the top four people." The program has worked so well that other schools, including some in the Ivy League, have begun to raid Notre Dame for talent. In the last several years, its faculty members have gone on to full professorships or endowed chairs at the universities of Chicago, Cornell, North Carolina, Virginia, Munich in Germany and Fribourg in Switzerland.

Of course, many of the changes at Notre Dame haven't set well with some alumni who feel that the school is abandoning its religious absolutes. A recent birth control conference on campus drew particular ire. "Isn't it time that the university had enough confidence in itself . . . to indeed take stands on Catholic issues . . . and weather the attacks that it is suppressing academic freedom," wrote one graduate of the class of '67: "Other universities have the courage to be secular. Why doesn't Notre Dame have the courage to be Catholic?"

#### STEADFAST ALUMNI

Father Hesburgh's answer: "I don't want this place to be a ghetto or a backwash. We should discuss all issues. This doesn't mean we agree with them, but we can't hide." In a way, however, he agrees that Notre Dame isn't as Catholic as it used to be. "One makes less and less differentiation between Catholic and Christian now," he says.

Despite the criticism, alumni loyalties have remained steadfast. Contributions from alumni year in and out rank among the top 10 in the nation, despite the school's relatively small size (6,000 undergraduates and 1,750 graduate students). Last year's alumni contributions of \$3.5 million will go toward raising other schools for senior faculty.

Notre Dame's powerful football teams have played a large part in keeping alumni loyal while the university has undergone unsettling changes. It also has made a monetary contribution. During fiscal 1973, Notre Dame cleared about \$280,000 on intercollegiate athletics which went into the school's general fund. This year, with a lucrative post-season Sugar Bowl appearance, profits undoubtedly will be higher.

Notre Dame's football players aren't dumb jocks either, the university says. It maintains that more than 95% of its players in the past 10 years have graduated in the regular four-year period. Collegiate athletic officials estimate the graduation rate for players at other major football universities at about 40%. "And we don't have a physical-education major either," boasts Ed "Moose" Krause, Notre Dame's athletic director.

Notre Dame football is as popular as ever. It is the only college or university whose games are carried weekly over a national radio network (Mutual). "It's hard to explain the phenomenon," says Prof. Richard Sullivan, who has written a history of the university. "For a long period, however, Catholics were out of the mainstream of American culture and Notre Dame gave them something to cheer about. We also had an image of a poor boy's school and became popular in a David and Goliath way. The tradition just grew."

#### HAVING A GOAL

Catholics, of course, no longer are out of the mainstream. Nor is Notre Dame a poor boy's school; tuition is a hefty \$2,616 a year.

Yet even today Notre Dame appears to attract a student who is more oriented toward business and the professions than the norm.

Kevin Britt, for example, is a neatly dressed, 18-year-old freshman from Kettering, Ohio, who addresses his elders as "sir" or "ma'am." His father went to Notre Dame, too. His views aren't untypical.

"I'm flattered to be in this group," he says. "Most people here seem to have a goal and know what they want to do. Friends I have at other schools seem to be squandering their time."

Kevin says he doesn't mind the university's rules. "I feel they really care about me and that it's for my own good," he explains.

He adds that he intends to go into business after graduation. "People tell me I'm a lot like my Dad (an advertising executive)," he says. "That's the highest compliment anyone can pay me. Notre Dame made him a success. I want it to do the same for me."

#### BUSY LIBRARY

Senior Joe Abell, managing editor of the student newspaper, *The Observer*, notes that students are slow to arouse to the same student politics that dominate other campuses. "This is a real grade-point factory," he says. "On any given night you'll find three-quarters of the student body in the library."

Notre Dame had little of the turmoil that upset other universities during the Vietnam war. A student sit-in against recruiters from Dow Chemical and the Central Intelligence Agency in 1969 prompted Father Hesburgh to proclaim that in the future demonstrators would be given "15 minutes of meditation to cease and desist"; those who wouldn't were to be suspended or arrested. The edict was widely criticized at Notre Dame and elsewhere ("If we had taken that stand, the place probably would have burned down," said a California college administrator at the time), but students never challenged it. Notre Dame remains one of only several private universities with four active ROTC branches on campus.

Yet that atmosphere has bred some solid scholarship, especially in the sciences, where Notre Dame is ranked high.

The chemistry department first gained prominence in the early 1920s when Rev. Julius A. Nieuwland, a Holy Cross priest, discovered the basic formula for synthetic rubber. The patents were sold to Du Pont, and Notre Dame collected royalties of \$2 million by the time they expired before World War II.

The bacteriology laboratory pioneered the technique for raising germ-free mice and guinea pigs for experimental research, and a descendant of a Notre Dame-bred mouse went on the first moon trip. The university is also a major international center for radiation chemistry and parasitology. In addition, scientists at its Vector Laboratory are leading the fight to eliminate the *Aedes aegypti*, a mosquito that is the prime carrier of yellow fever, still a major killer in Africa.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS AND LOGIC

Notable contributions are being made in the humanities and law as well. A civil rights center, backed by the Ford Foundation, opened recently and is expected to become one of the nation's principal libraries for the use of legislators and historians studying civil rights issues. Among other things, the center houses Father Hesburgh's papers from his 15-year tenure on the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (He was fired by President Nixon after publicly criticizing the administration's stance on civil rights.)

In 1959, the university began publishing the *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, which symbolic logicians now consider to be one of their two most important publi-

cations. "At the beginning I had to send out letters to colleagues to solicit articles," recalls Boleslaw Sobocinski, professor emeritus of philosophy and editor of the journal. "Now I have 150 articles waiting for publication, and we come out only four times a year."

And the university's Mediaeval Institute, unique in the country, has nearly completed its 15-year task of microfilming the Ambrosiana, a 17-Century Milanese library that is one of the world's major repositories of medieval manuscripts and documents. "At first they wouldn't allow us to touch a thing," says Prof. Astrik L. Gabriel, director of the institute and a noted medieval authority. "We had to get Cardinal Montini (now Pope Paul VI) to intercede for us."

"Somehow," he adds, "I don't think Yale would have gotten the same cooperation."

#### ANIMAL SURVIVAL CENTERS

### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the number of animal species which are endangered and facing extinction is continuing to grow. In some cases swift action must be taken by authorities to retain those living representatives that can continue and extend the species. Animals, birds, and marine mammals are suffering disastrous depletion of their numbers and must be protected from man if they are to recover. Many of these species are represented in zoos across the Nation. But the reproductive requirements of some are exacting. They will not reproduce while confined in cages or otherwise removed from their natural environment.

One of the salutary activities of some major zoos is encouragement of programs to increase the number of endangered and captive animals. In the past, zoos were a major drain on the number of endangered species remaining in the wild. A program of reproduction would be of benefit to both animal and man. The animal benefits because one more source of its reduction is eliminated, and man benefits because he comes to better understand the animal's needs and behavior.

While this is a program worthy of support, Congress has not yet met the need. Zoos and aquariums across the country face nearly the same problems, the financial inability to improve and expand their facilities. There is a bill in the House and Senate which addresses itself to this problem. There is one difference between the two which I would like to bring to your attention. The House bill, H.R. 12047, authorizes and creates support for facilities established to breed, care, and perpetuate endangered species. These "survival centers" can be the breakthrough in the battle to reverse the steadily increasing numbers of species becoming extinct.

I support the Senate bill introduced by Senator MARK O. HATFIELD, Republican of Oregon, but I wish to point out that the House bill I introduced last De-



ember 19 contains the provision for these survival centers.

Zoos and aquariums across the Nation need to be upgraded. I have often made remarks to this body on that subject. Congress now has the enlarged opportunity to do more than just improve conditions for those animals already in captivity. There was comment made by Senator HATFIELD and myself regarding the subject of Federal responsibility for zoos and aquariums and I include at this point in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Washington Post printed in the March 15 edition:

**FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ZOOS AND AQUARIUMS**

Recently, a column critical of our efforts to aid zoological parks and aquariums appeared in The Washington Post and was syndicated through its wire service. The column, authored by Bernard Fensterwald, essentially took the point of view that zoos were inherently inhumane places to house animals, that we would be better off if zoos were closed down, and that Senate Bill 2774, represented an expensive federal transfusion in aid of an archaic institution. While we appreciate Mr. Fensterwald's input, we must strongly disagree with his conclusions.

To many persons in our increasingly urbanized society, the zoo serves as the only source of contact they may have with the animal kingdom. For the person who will study and relate to the animals, there is much to be learned. No picture, no written description can so well express what these other inhabitants of our globe are really like.

Though zoos have traditionally been and should remain largely a local concern, we would contend that the federal government has both a necessary and legitimate role in making zoos more humane and in increasing their utility as an educational instrument. In our view, and in the view of many persons acquainted with the serious financial problems zoos and aquariums have encountered, S. 2774 provides the mechanism by which these dual concerns might be successfully addressed.

Unlike a number of federal matching grant programs, in which local money acts as a catalyst for federal dollars, the intent behind this legislation is that federal dollars act as a stimulus to hold an imaginative zoo development on the local level.

Many persons who have looked at the state of American zoos are coming to grips with the fact that zoos in general are antiquated and decrepit. These obsolete physical plants tend to create three principal problems: First, exhibiting animals in such a traditional and confined manner sharply diminishes the enormous educational potential which zoos hold for our people. As our friends at the Portland Zoological Society have correctly noted, you cannot run a zoo like a menagerie and expect it to achieve its maximal educational impact. In the traditional zoo setting, it is quite easy to miss at least half the picture. When an animal is caged, you can only guess at what he might really be like. If no activity is provided, if no effort is necessary, if the animal can easily survive doing nothing, then that is precisely what he will learn to do: nothing.

The modern zoo must be not only a museum, but a living museum, a place not just to exhibit animals, but an integral part of our educational and cultural heritage, and a reminder to our commitment to the sanctity of life.

Second, an unfortunate, but seemingly inherent, consequence of archaic facilities at zoos is the inadequate treatment of animals.

The Humane Society of the United States is on public record as stating that these facilities may amount to nothing more than "concentration camps of cages." In most instances, these conditions exist not because people approve of them, but are instead attributable to an increasing tension between stagnant budgets and rising costs.

Third, taking animals out of their natural habitat and placing them in the kind of zoo facilities that now exist in many places has had a demonstrably bad effect on animal breeding. We think Paul Maxwell, a zoologist at the San Francisco Zoo said it best:

"You can't take an animal from a rain forest and stick him on a cement slab, and expect him to reproduce."

As a consequence of our breeding problems, we have had to continue to milk vanishing wildlife resources to obtain zoo exhibits. Our goal instead should be to replace the concrete slab with exhibits that resemble the animal's natural habitat, to change zoos that weren't built for breeding into places where breeding is both possible and abundant.

We would submit that Mr. Fensterwald's objectives and ours are quite similar and so must conclude that his criticisms of S. 2774, though well-intentioned, represent a misunderstanding of the propositions for which it stands.

**NATIONAL DAY OF HUMILIATION, FASTING, AND PRAYER**

**HON. RALPH S. REGULA**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution modeled after one adopted in 1863 and written by Abraham Lincoln. The resolution proposes that April 30 of this year be set aside as a national day of humiliation, fasting, and prayer.

In 1863, the Nation had been torn apart by civil war. The country was struggling to find a national purpose. Today, though we are not at war, there is similar despair.

We who hold positions of leadership and to whom the people we represent look for leadership must confront erosion of faith and trust in our Government. We must take time to contemplate and reevaluate our purpose and I feel that the people whom we represent need to do the same—"For here the people rule" and from the people we derive our authority. Without this confidence and trust we cannot lead and without our God's guidance, our leadership surely will miss the lofty goals we have set.

A similar resolution has passed the Senate. Two similar resolutions have been introduced in the House.

The text of my bill is as follows:

Joint resolution to proclaim April 30, 1974, as a National Day for Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer

Whereas it is the duty of nations, as well as of men, to owe their dependence upon the overruling power of God, to confess their sins and transgressions, in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon, and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in

the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations are blessed whose God is the Lord; and

Whereas we know that we have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of Heaven; we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity; we have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown; but we have forgotten God; and

Whereas we have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own; and

Whereas, intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us; and

Whereas we have made such an idol out of our pursuit of "national security" that we have forgotten that only God can be the ultimate guardian of our true livelihood and safety; and

Whereas we have failed to respond, personally and collectively, with sacrifice and uncompromised commitment to the unmet needs of our fellow man, both at home and abroad; as a people, we have become so absorbed with the selfish pursuits of pleasure and profit that we have blinded ourselves to God's standard of justice and righteousness for this society; and

Whereas it therefore behooves us to humble ourselves before Almighty God, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby proclaims that April 30, 1974, be a National Day of Humiliation, Fasting, and Prayer; and calls upon the people of our Nation to humble ourselves as we see fit, before our Creator to acknowledge our final dependence upon Him and to repent of our national sins.

**ANGLES IN THE NEWS**

**HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of regularly reading the Editor's Report sent to me by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers. Mrs. Arends and I always find these reports most interesting and to the point.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the Editor's Report for March 17, 1974, entitled, "Angles in the News." Mr. Hearst very pointedly calls attention to a very important statement attributed to our colleague in the Senate, Senator SAM ERVIN, Jr., to the effect that the Watergate investigation did not indicate to him that President Nixon had committed an impeachable offense. This normally would be front page news across the country but went virtually unreported.

Mr. Hearst has drawn some interesting conclusions from this incident. His report follows:

## ANGLES IN THE NEWS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—There were two unconnected, non-headlined stories this week which struck me as commentable (if that's a word) here today. One involves that now well-known Washington character Sen. Sam Ervin, while the other concerns the faceless masters of Marxism in the Kremlin who are supposed to be cooperating with us in the spirit of detente.

Both stories are noteworthy for what they reveal, but the first one has the added attraction of being something of a mystery story. It started, for me, when I was looking through a copy of the New York Daily News of last Tuesday. There, on page 6, was a picture of Big Sam and another man. The caption below it said:

"Sen. Sam Ervin Jr. and Sen. Howard M. Metzenbaum leave Severance Hall, Cleveland, on Sunday after speech by Ervin. Ervin said the Watergate investigation did not indicate to him that President Nixon had committed an impeachable offense."

To me that was pretty startling news. Big Sam, after all, is the Bible-quoting sage from North Carolina who presided over the Senate Watergate hearings and delighted anti-Nixonites with his pointed sermonettes on the evils of sin and power in high places. And here he was declaring in summation that impeachment was unwarranted.

Real front page stuff, right?

A real break for the President in his desperate battle against political enemies determined to topple him, right?

Certainly as important as the headline stories when Rep. Wilbur Mills predicted that Mr. Nixon would be forced to resign over undisclosed tax trouble, right?

Wrong, almost a thousand per cent wrong. No New York newspaper carried the Ervin bombshell on the front page. A careful search of editions for several days, in fact, disclosed no stories at all in any other New York paper—unless they had been buried some place in want-ad size and thus defied detection.

To a life-long newspaperman, the absence of attention to the Ervin declaration was all but incredible. A check with United Press International and the Associated Press showed both had covered the extemporaneous speech. Here, for the record, is the UPI night lead on the story, sent on Monday, March 11:

"CLEVELAND.—No evidence was produced in the Senate Watergate hearings to support impeachment of President Nixon, Watergate Committee Chairman Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C., said Sunday.

"I think this is one section of the Constitution on which Dick Nixon and I agree," he said."

So the mystery of the all-lost-story remains. You can't charge that there was any kind of deliberate plot to kill it. It could have been lost in the shuffle, as many extemporaneous Sunday night speeches are. Remember that the picture in the Daily News didn't appear until Tuesday.

On the other hand it certainly is no secret that many members of the press and electronic media, including editors, have it in for Dick Nixon. He is quite right in charging that their hostility has produced a widespread overplaying of anything unfavorable to him, and vice versa.

You will have to draw your own conclusions as to what happened to the Ervin story and why it was so generally ignored.

I have done so—and on the evidence before me must cast my vote for impeachment of the news media.

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE:  
INCOME TAX INEQUITIES

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my constituents on inequities in the income tax laws which discriminate against working, producing Americans. I include the text of that television broadcast in the Record, as follows:

## INCOME TAX INEQUITIES

If you're an average American worker, you'll work two hours and 38 minutes out of an eight-hour working day to pay your Federal, state and local taxes. That's one minute a day longer than it took last year to pay the same taxes. The fact is that it will take all the money you make from January 1st through May 1st to pay your taxes for 1974.

It's not a pleasant thought. But then again, taxes are not a very pleasant subject.

No American under the age of 61 has lived in a time when there was no income tax in the United States. Most younger Americans are surprised to learn that there was a time when the United States government operated efficiently without imposing a personal income tax on its citizens. But it did.

For 137 years, our country managed to function, pay the bills and carry out the business of government without resorting to income taxation of American working people. From the American Revolution to the Civil War, except in time of war, our citizens were free of all Federal taxes except the tariff on imports. From the Civil War to the enactment of the Federal Income Tax Act in 1913, government revenue was raised by taxes on liquor and tobacco, from import tariffs and the sale of public lands. During this long period of American history, the country prospered because our people were not drained of financial incentives through excessive taxes. The emphasis was on less government and more individual responsibility. And American enterprise prospered mainly because of the great individual freedom the people enjoyed.

I think that a part of the reason for this long history without income taxes was that the people remembered that the nation was born out of a revolution against excessive taxation. We have come a long way since 1776, when the rallying cry of American patriots was "No taxation without representation." Taxation today falls most heavily on the middle-income working and producing American. Upper-income groups avoid paying their share of the tax bills through tax loopholes, tax shelters and other preferential treatment provided for them.

It's a national disgrace that most Washington politicians pay more attention to the tax-free foundations, which pay nothing to support government, than they do to the average taxpaying citizen who carries the financial burden of the nation. This uneven tax distribution is nothing more than a form of discrimination against American working people.

From the little 30-word statement amending the Constitution, the Internal Revenue Code has developed into an enormous collection of regulations that reach into the private lives of us all. It is the most far-reaching group of documents ever placed as a stumbling block to individual initiative and liberty. It has led our government into the most inflationary element in the economic system—deficit spending.

With the taxpayers footing the bill, the

Federal government has taken this country on the wildest spending spree in world history. If you applied the same principles used by government economists to the management of your own finances, you'd quickly be forced into bankruptcy and headed for the poor house.

The simple fact is that our government's out-go exceeds its income, according to the President's new budget, by a whopping \$9.4 billion—up 103 percent over the previous budget. Our national debt has swollen to nearly half a trillion dollars. This deficit spending is the cornerstone of our skyrocketing inflation rate. This debt will have to continue to rise, as long as the Treasury spends more than it takes in in taxes.

The interest alone on the national debt is appalling. The \$495.2 billion debt will cost the American worker and taxpayer \$30.5 billion in interest payments during the next fiscal year. That's about triple what it was just ten years ago. The interest paid for the last two years is actually more than the entire national budget for 1941.

A sizable number of the tax dollars that you and I pay into the U.S. Treasury will go directly to line the pockets of foreigners. According to the most recent figures available, foreign banks, governments and wealthy individuals are paid interest on \$55 billion of our national debt.

It is unjust that the American worker, farmer, small businessman and other middle-income people carry the greatest financial burden of this country. People with middle income pay upwards to 80 percent of the personal income taxes. They also pay the great bulk of use, sales, excise, property and other taxes. While corporation income taxes supplies only 27.5 percent of the combined total, the average citizen keeps getting his every April 15th.

There's a growing resentment of inequities in the tax laws by middle income taxpayers. And a glance at headlines from around the country indicates that people are fed up with taxes, taxes, taxes. They've had it with the complexities of the tax laws which allow the rich and the super rich to pay little or no money to support the system that enabled them to make their money—and even worse, those who live abroad and make profit from Americans who labor.

There are any number of cases where million dollar corporations pay little or no income taxes on the money they make. There's the celebrated case, a billionaire in this country whose tax, when computed by the method the middle-income taxpayer uses, would be \$75 million a year. Yet he pays only a few thousand dollars, because of loopholes and tax shelters.

The American taxpayer has every right to be up in arms over the inequities in the tax system. When the Internal Revenue Service began collecting personal income taxes in 1913 it imposed a minimum rate of one percent on incomes over \$3,000 and a maximum of seven percent upon incomes in excess of \$500,000. If you look at the tax schedule today, you'll see that a citizen who makes only \$1,000 must pay 14 percent and the scale goes up to 70 percent on earnings in excess of \$200,000.

So far in this session of Congress, I have introduced 28 bills aimed at providing tax benefits for the average workingman, elderly and retired people and small businessmen. Many of my bills have received a great deal of Congressional support.

Early in this session of Congress, I introduced a bill that would allow retired individuals having a gross income of \$10,000 or less not to have to file income tax returns. These people who have worked all their lives should be entitled to enjoy a moderate income free of taxation in their retirement



years. In the same general area of tax assistance to the elderly, one bill I have introduced would allow any individual who has reached the age of 65 and continues to work to elect to treat services performed by him as noncovered (and exempt from tax) for Social Security purposes. After all, these people have already paid their share of Social Security during the time before they reached age 65.

Another of my tax-relief bills that has gained much recognition and support from a wide spectrum of Congress would allow a tax deduction for certain expenses incurred in the adoption of a child. Fifty-five legislators have joined me in this bill so far. Existing tax laws allow for a tax deduction for certain expenses resulting from the birth of a child, and similar consideration should be shown to those people who seek to provide a home for children through legal adoption. Another bill to aid the workingman is to allow an itemized deduction for automobile insurance premiums.

More and more legislation is being introduced to provide tax relief for working people, the elderly, veterans, teachers, and others who have been forced to carry the tax burden of the country. But to correct the inequities of the tax benefits to middle income people, I have reintroduced bills that would remove the tax-exempt status from foundations engaged in propaganda and politics, and force them to show each source of income, including the money they receive from governmental sources.

The Federal government can continue to operate without enslaving the American people to a personal income tax—it worked for 137 years without it. Elimination of unconstitutional Federal programs alone would make up the difference. Government can do nothing for people they cannot do better for themselves and that includes spending their money.

Every time government takes a dollar from its people in taxes, it denies the citizen the freedom to use as he sees fit the earnings of his labor.

**IN MEMORIAM: TO THE HONORABLE CHARLES BENSON, OF POMPTON LAKES, N.J., OUTSTANDING FOOTBALL COACH, ESTEEMED EDUCATOR, AND GREAT AMERICAN**

**HON. ROBERT A. ROE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the people of my Eighth Congressional District and the State of New Jersey deeply mourn the passing of one of our finest citizens, exemplary neighbor and good friend, the Honorable Charles Benson, who passed away at the age of 67 in Knud Hansen Memorial Hospital, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, where he was vacationing after a brief illness. I know you will want to join me in extending our most sincere condolences and profound sympathy to his wife, the former Elizabeth Edeburn; his daughter, Mrs. Joyce Cogan of South Orange; and his grandchildren.

Charles Benson is a native of Dayton, Ohio, and graduate of the University of Illinois, class of 1928. During the past 42 years he has been a resident of the Borough of Pompton Lakes, N.J., and has achieved the highest standards of ex-

cellence as a nationally prominent football coach. In June 1973, he retired as director of athletics and physical education of Clifton High School in my district, and has been the superintendent of parks and recreation of the Borough of Pompton Lakes since the inception of this borough program.

There are many, many commendations that could be cited on behalf of Charles Benson's lifetime of achievements in service to his fellow man and he will always be remembered for the warmth of his friendship and the quality of his leadership in guiding and building the character of our youth in recreation, and particularly as the "Dean of Coaches" in the sports world of football. With your permission I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from his obituary that appeared in one of New Jersey's most prestigious newspapers, the Paterson News, which eloquently translates some of his victories in his career pursuits that will always endear him to all of us as an inspiring leader of our young people and a great American. The News excerpt is as follows:

**CHARLES BENSON, RETIRED FOOTBALL COACH**  
During his 31 years of tutoring Pompton Lakes High School football teams, Benson compiled a record of 159 victories, 71 defeats and 13 ties. One of the deadlocks was in his final game as a Cardinal coach against arch rival Butler.

"He left a remarkable record," said Paul Kelley, currently the Pompton Lakes High School athletic director. "He was a standout coach and man."

Benson came to Pompton Lakes in 1932 when Thiel College, Pa., where he had been coaching, dropped football. He was a coach without a squad that year as he prepared a hand-picked group, drilled them in single wing fundamentals and introduced the military-styled huddle break.

When the newly-constructed Pompton Lakes High School opened in 1933, Benson was at the helm of the football squad he had nicknamed the "Cardinals."

#### SCORED WINNING STREAK

After beating only Netcong during its first four games of the inaugural season, Pompton Lakes then hit its stride. The Benson-coached squad won 34 of its next 35 games, during which it compiled a 24-game winning streak.

The streak was registered against some of the best scholastic teams in the East as Benson booked numerous intersectional contests. He also introduced night football to the area, and the crowds were so large that Pompton Lakes had to vacate its little Lakeside Oval for the 12,000 seater at Hinchliffe Stadium in Paterson.

A man who played end as a junior the year that teammate Harold (Red) Grange became the "Galloping Ghost" at the University of Illinois, Benson directed the Pompton teams which won state football championships in 1934, '35, '36, '37, '40, '42, '43, '45, '54, and '60.

#### PIONEER OF "T" FORMATION

Benson was an advocate of the single wing, but long before Stanford University brought the "T" formation to prominence with Frankie Albert, he used the "T".

It was under Benson that Pompton Lakes played the first intersectional football game in New Jersey in 1937, when it defeated Clearwater, Fla., 13-6, at Hinchliffe Stadium. Benson also hosted the first intersectional scholastic basketball game in 1938, when his Lakers defeated Marblehead, Mass.

During his 31-year tenure as a football, baseball and basketball coach, as well as the school's athletic director, Benson led Pompton Lakes to victory over 1,000 times.

His football disciples are almost as legendary as their former coach. Foremost is Fred Keil, the highly successful De-Paul Diocesan High School mentor.

Following the 1963 football season, at the end of which he was named The Paterson News Area's first "Coach of The Year," Benson was named athletic director at Clifton High School.

When he first arrived at Clifton, the school fielded six boys' athletic teams. Today it numbers 22, including 14 boys' sports and sports for eight girls' teams.

Benson was a member of the National Retired Teachers Association; the New Jersey Education Association; the New Jersey State Directors of Athletics Association; the University of Illinois Alumni Association; the American Football Coaches Association and the retired Teachers Association.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of Charles Benson is a great loss to all of us for he, indeed, has truly contributed to the educational and cultural enrichment of our community, State, and Nation. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in a moment of silent prayer to his memory and extend our heartfelt sympathy to his wife and family. I trust that they will soon find abiding comfort in the faith that God has given them and in the knowledge that our beloved Charles Benson is now under His eternal care. May he rest in peace.

#### BILL TO CORRECT MISTAKE IN PUBLIC LAW 93-66

**HON. JEROME R. WALDIE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the intent of Public Law 93-66 was to help rather than hinder the needy. But a technical error has brought hardship to many Californians. At a time when the cost of living is soaring at a faster-than-ever pace, welfare recipients are receiving less than in the past. And they can ill afford any reduction in benefits received.

So I introduce today a bill that will correct this mistake and resolve this injustice. I enclose a copy of the bill and request that it be printed in the RECORD:

H.R. 13682

A bill to make it clear that the bonus value of food stamps is to be included in the "hold harmless" amount guaranteed to recipients of supplemental security income benefits under the Social Security Amendments of 1972, so as to assure that recipients in cash-out States do not suffer reductions in the benefits they actually receive

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 212(a)(3)(B)(i) of Public Law 93-66 is amended by striking out "and" after "June 1973," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "together with the bonus value of food stamps in such State for January 1972,

as defined in section 401(b)(3) of Public Law 92-603, for which such individual was eligible, or would have been eligible had he applied, in December 1973 if, for such month, such individual resides in a State which provides State supplementary payments (I) of the type described in section 1616(a) of the Social Security Act, and (II) the level of which has been found by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to have been specifically increased so as to include the bonus value of food stamps, and".

Sec. 2. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1974.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to prescribe regulations for the adjustment of an individual's monthly supplemental security income payment in accordance with any increase to which such individual may be entitled under the amendment made by the first section of this Act: *Provided*, That such adjustment in monthly payment, together with the remittance of any prior unpaid increments to which such individual may be entitled under such amendment, shall be made no later than the first day of the first month beginning more than sixty days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### WOMEN IN SERVICE ACADEMIES

**HON. BELLA S. ABZUG**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to object to the manner in which S. 2771, providing pay bonuses for the armed forces, was passed by the House. I have three objections.

First, the bill was brought up under suspension of the rules without the customary 3-day lay-over and without proper notification. Second, consideration by the House Armed Services Committee was cursory and treatment of the bill's opponents, shabby. The Senate had approved an amendment permitting women to enter the military training academies, which the House Committee voted to delete by a count of 18 to 16. A gentleman who came in late was then allowed to vote, which made the tally 18 to 17. Ms. SCHROEDER then came in and asked to record her vote. She was refused permission. Another Member states that in his 14 years of service on the Armed Services Committee, this was the first time he had ever heard a Member denied the right to be recorded on a vote.

It seems obvious that as one Member said, "This is a man/woman battle put on the Suspension Calendar." It is indicative of the mind-set that blocks full equality for women. The House is now deprived of the opportunity to vote on this amendment. This is my third reason for opposing the bill.

Surely the time has come when discrimination against women must be eliminated in military academies as in every other area. However traditional it may be, such discrimination is obviously wrong. Women who wish to make careers in the armed forces should be as free as men to do so. Women already

serve as commissioned officers in the WACs, WAVES, and WAFs, and should have the benefit of officers' training.

The very thought appears to shock some old-line military men, who cite the need of changing physical facilities—which I assume means installing "ladies' rooms"—and even changing the curriculum—I am not at all sure what that means.

A basic fear seems to be that women will be required to go into combat. In this attitude there is paternalism as well as gallantry. The new generation of women demanding complete equality do not exempt themselves from combat. Most of them say that no one, male or female, should ever again have to engage in war. Many would like to see the military academies abolished as obsolete and undemocratic relics. But so long as war and preparation for war exists, they feel the responsibility should be evenly divided. They do not merely want men to help with unpleasant household chores; they want to share with men the unpleasant realities of national defense. They should be allowed—as women in many other countries are allowed—to train for participation in every phase, as commanders as well as privates. In any case this bill deals with bonuses to encourage those who can fill critical and shortage skill requirements in the new voluntary army. To hold back the participation of women who can add numbers needed is contrary to the purposes of this bill.

I hope the chairman of the Armed Services Committee will adhere to his promise to hold hearings on this topic soon, and to bring out and support the passage of the bill.

#### SPIRIT OF '76 ESSAY CONTEST

**HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of July, 1776, the Declaration of Independence was signed. The 200th anniversary of this historic day is a time for reflection on the past and for contemplation of the future.

The bicentennial is an event which has great importance to Americans, but it also has tremendous implications for all of the people of the world. It is not too soon to start planning to properly celebrate this event. The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission welcomes suggestions to enrich our celebration of the historic Declaration of Independence.

It is in this spirit that I have chosen to sponsor a "Spirit of '76" essay contest which will be open to all of the high school students in the 10th Illinois Congressional District.

I have requested participants to write an essay describing the role the United States should play in the world through the year 2000. Essays may focus on one

or several aspects of this country and may describe the leadership that this country should provide politically, socially, and morally to Americans and to the rest of the world.

Two winning essays will be selected from each high school, and these essays will then be judged by a panel of prominent citizens who will select the final two winning essays and the authors will be specially honored. Copies of the final two winning essays will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and will be delivered to the National Committee on Critical Choices appointed by the President and chaired by Governor Nelson Rockefeller. The two winning authors will be provided with an expense-paid trip to Washington, D.C.

To encourage participation in this contest, I have prepared contest rules, letters, and posters announcing the contest. I hope that the contest will stimulate the high school youth of the 10th District to review their heritage, to develop pride in their country, and to develop high aspirations for the future of the United States of America.

I invite any of my colleagues who believe that this program has merit to use any of these materials for similar essay contests in other congressional districts.

#### THE MAN AND THE MYTH: ALLENDE AND CHILEAN DEMOCRACY

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this past week the House Internal Security Committee, of which I am the ranking minority member, held hearings dealing with the "Theory and Practice of Communism." In particular the committee examined the recent history of Chile and the efforts of the former President Salvador Allende Gossens to impose his Marxist views upon the country over the objections of the majority of the people and the rulings of the Chilean Supreme Court. An apparently well-coordinated effort has been underway among many people to martyrize Allende since his ouster from power. As was pointed out in the hearings, much of the recent discussion of Chile under Allende has become increasingly divergent from the reality of his rule. In particular, the massive smuggling of armaments and revolutionaries into Chile from Communist nations has been conspicuously ignored by the critics of the new military government.

A careful examination of Chile under Allende belies much of the current mythology about the activities of revolutionary parties and organizations. Among the witnesses before the committee, an American documentary journalist, Mr. Tom Sullivan, testified about his own experiences in Chile and the rule of Allende. His testimony, as well as that of



other witnesses should be carefully examined when published by the committee. At this time I would like to include with my remarks several columns written earlier this year by Sullivan which deal with events leading up to the military coup.

The material follows:

ALLENDE: A PROMISING START  
(By Tom Sullivan)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—Based on his background in public service and his training as a physician, Dr. Salvador Allende Gossens should have been the best president ever to hold office in Chile or any other Latin American country.

Indeed, as minister of health in the late 1930s and early 1940s he introduced health care programs that brought the nation a light year ahead of its neighbors, and later as senator he sponsored excellent legislation in health, education and the protection of ocean resources.

Yet when he became president in 1970, the national infant mortality rate was 86 per 1,000 births, and by the day he died in 1973, the level was up to 130 per 1,000, boosted because health care was moribund and malnutrition commonplace.

His earlier legislation protecting the resources of Chile's 3,000-mile shoreline went by the board when he became president as he allowed Russian trawlers to fish indiscriminately, endangering some species.

VIOLENCE-RIDDEN PRELUDE

In the 55-day leading up to the coup, strikes, demonstrations and violence brought industry and commerce to a standstill. An estimated 90,000 persons remained at work out of a population of 10 million.

The Medical College of Chile that Allende helped to establish in his senatorial years, like the rest of the nation's colleges and universities, was the battleground and closed, for much of 1973. On lower school levels, parents often kept children home for fear of violence, so that the academic year was a total loss.

Allende took office in 1970 with only 36.5 per cent of the vote and even that figure was cast in doubt by the suspicion of large-scale electoral frauds. Virtually every day he spent in the presidency was embattled.

Having waged unsuccessful campaigns for the presidency in 1952, 1958 and 1964, Allende and his coterie had plenty of time to think about what they could do if power ever fell to them, and despite some high-sounding promises when he was eventually sworn in, there is evidence some abuses of office started almost immediately.

Loopholes were sought in the nation's 17,000 statutes and Allende operated by what he termed "decrees of insistence" to bypass the constitution and the machinery of parliament and the courts.

OTHER BRANCHES BRISTLE

In keeping with Chile's long tradition of government stability under law, those agencies tried for almost three years to halt Allende's abuse of office but with no success. On May 26, 1973, the Supreme Court advised him formally his government was operating outside the law and on Aug. 22, 1973, the Chamber of Deputies, equivalent to our Congress, passed a resolution declaring the government unconstitutional.

This meant that a legal ouster, an impeachment, was imminent, but as later evidence was to prove Allende was running a grim race against time to seize absolute power in a bloody massacre of all who stood in his way, Plan Z was the means and Sept. 19 was the day.

The evidence appears clear that Allende

had his plan for a coup in mind from the start and he systematically drew upon the public treasury to finance it.

Until he took office, all Chilean presidents lived in their own homes, governing from La Casa Moneda and doing official and large-scale entertainment there. Allende used public money to buy a luxurious villa on Tomas Moro Street as an official residence. Later, more funds were diverted to buy a sumptuous country estate in the foothills of the Andes, supposedly so that the president could have privacy on weekends.

COMMAND HEADQUARTERS

Each place became an arsenal, filled with clandestinely imported armament from the Soviet bloc, and the country estate, Canaveral, was expanded with dormitories to sleep 150, kitchens to feed 200, classrooms and an obstacle course for guerrilla training. A projection room with a 20-foot screen was added and a vast collection of pornographic movies reposed there.

Guns, ammunition, materials to make bombs, bazookas and other antitank weapons came in under diplomatic cover. Fidel Castro sent instructors and the private army of Allende came into being.

During my stay in Chile I spent considerable time at Tomas Moro and Canaveral, verifying the nature of their uses. The Chilean army was always equipped with U.S. arms, yet I was able to inspect thousands of weapons from the Communist bloc and photographs and documents taken from Allende's safes after his death verified the horror of Plan Z.

PLAN Z BUILDS METHODICALLY TO DEFEAT  
(By Tom Sullivan)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—Allende took office as president of Chile on November 3, 1970. At the end of his first year the first signs of his paramilitary activities became evident, though no one suspected their full meaning.

On December 17, 1971, while luggage was being rearranged in the hold of a Lan Chile 727 at Tocumen Airport in Panama, a box destined for Santiago was found to contain a machine gun with ammunition, including tracer cartridges. It was handed over to local police and retained by them.

Three days later at Madrid Airport in Spain, a bomb scare on an Iberian jetliner prompted police to search other jets parked nearby. On Lan Chile Flight 171, soon to take off for Santiago, police found a box containing 15 new Spanish-made Llama pistols that had been purchased by Lan Chile officials with company money.

They never reached their destination, either.

CUBA A SUPPLIER

Evidence suggested that other such shipments had reached Chile without being processed through customs channels. Responsible authorities reported the illicit traffic in weapons to the president. The report never saw the light of day until Allende's safe was cut open after his death.

Another shipment, this time from Cuba, flown in aboard the Empresa Cubana de Aviacion of Cuban Airlines, more than a ton packed in 13 crates, bypassed customs and was delivered to Apartment 213, Tower 18, Remodelacion San Borja, occupied by Allende confidant Eduardo "Coco" Paredes, former chief of the Chilean Bureau of Investigations.

Machine pistols with ammunition, flame throwers, submachine guns, some Russian-made pistols, an assortment of Colt and Smith and Wesson revolvers and automatics, thousands of rounds of ammunition and ancillary equipment were found when unaligned lawmen discovered the cache.

Allende's office denied the report, but the full list of contents was made public.

Other members of the GAP (Allende's Personal Guards), who were housed and trained at Tomas Moro, were implicated from time to time in raids on military arsenals and, as was subsequently discovered when Tomas Moro, Canaveral and Allende's private wing of La Casa Moneda were cleaned out after the coup, thousands of weapons from pistols to antitank guns, and hundreds of thousands of rounds of ammunition had been brought in to Chile clandestinely and his guerrilla army was trained to use them.

TERRORISTS ADMITTED

Between 13,000 and 15,000 terrorists from all over the world, Tupamaros who were on the run from rigorous military action in Uruguay; outlaws from Brazil, Peru, Ecuador and Argentina—even Algerian and North Korean paramilitary experts—were admitted to Chile by Allende, some properly documented, thousands not.

One of the coordinators was Allende's son-in-law, Luis Fernandez Ona, chief of Fidel Castro's secret police in Havana, who was sent with specific instructions from the Cuban dictator.

It was all part of Plan Z, a meticulously drawn up operation that would employ the trainees from the guerrilla schools and the imported terrorists to seize power in Santiago and other major cities.

I personally handled hundreds of the Communist Bloc weapons, saw original photographs of the guerrilla operations taken from Tomas Moro and the Moneda, and—have copies of the documents reportedly taken from the safes of Allende and his colleagues after Sept. 11.

"PLAN" DISCONTINUED

The plan was so complex and so well notched together with a wealth of other material that was accumulated in chronological order over a period of years that the possibility of its fabrication by representatives of the government now in power is not credible.

Some Chileans expressed concern to me that Plan Z might be a fabrication post facto to justify the coup, citing the refusal of the military government to publish the list of 200 names on the so-called massacre list.

That list included military, political, union and professional leaders and, in many cases, their wives and children. Most of them would have been gathered under a single roof on Sept. 19 at a banquet where the massacre was to take place.

HAZARD CITED

"We cannot publish those names," a representative of the military government told me, "for it would be advertising to any demoralized follower of Allende who was on the death list, and might result in some deaths."

In a "Dear Salvador" letter handwritten by Castro in Havana on July 29, the Cuban dictator said "Under the pretext, of discussing with you questions concerning the meeting of non-aligned countries, Carlos and Pineiro have gone to see you. The real purpose is to discuss with you your willingness to cooperate in the face of the difficulties and dangers which hinder and threaten the process."

The visitors were Carlos Rafael Rodriguez and Manuel "Redbeard" Pineiro, the new chief of the Cuban secret police. It has been fairly well established they were in Santiago to put the finishing touches on the coup, and that, among other instances of intervention, would account for the severing of diplomatic relations with Cuba by the junta within hours of the shootout on Sept. 11.

All the while Allende attacked his politi-

cal opponents in the press and on television, accusing them of preparing for civil war.

#### SEPTEMBER 11: RENDEZVOUS WITH RETRIBUTION

(By Tom Sullivan)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—When Salvador Allende was elected to the presidency in 1970, it was with 36.5 per cent of the vote. In the municipal elections of April, 1971, his Unidad Popular received 49.23 per cent of the vote, and the parliamentary elections of March, 1973, 43.98 per cent.

At no time did he ever attain a majority, and a committee of faculty members from the Catholic University's Institute of Political Sciences, under the chairmanship of its dean, Jaime De Valle, reported in March last year, after a comprehensive study, that in each election large-scale frauds were perpetrated to create the Unidad Popular margins.

They searched ballot records and discovered thousands of votes were cast from cemeteries because deceased persons' names had not been taken from electoral rolls. There was widespread double registration of Allende supporters as literate and illiterate voters, and many supporters voted in more than one district, they charged.

In a radio broadcast on July 17, 1973, Del Valle said the evidence in possession of the committee established more than 200,000 fraudulent votes had been cast in the March elections.

#### PARLIAMENT'S CENSURE

Following those revelations, the Chamber of Deputies, the Chilean parliament, launched its own investigation and amassed sufficient evidence to warrant passage of a resolution on Aug. 22, 1973, declaring that the Allende government had placed itself completely outside the law.

This action followed in essence the condemnation issued by the Chilean Supreme Court on May 26 that the Allende government had placed itself not only outside the law, but outside the constitution.

With the stage set for Allende's ouster by parliamentary means, he and his colleagues pressed ahead with plans for a seizure of total power through violence, according to spokesmen for the military government, who offered as evidence an array of documents reportedly taken from Allende's safes after Sept. 11.

Typical was a general order distributed to members of the Chilean Communist party on June 30, specifying that every militant was to get a firearm to take home, ingredients for making firebombs and a list of necessities to stockpile to assure "survival of militants."

The "Dear Salvador" letter from Fidel Castro on July 29 stated: "Your determination to defend the process strongly and with the greatest honor possible, even if it means risking your own life, will draw to your side all the forces able to fight and all the worthwhile men and women in Chile. Your courage, your serenity, and your daring in this historic moment of your country and, above all, your strong resolve and heroic leadership, hold the key to the situation."

#### PLOT UNCOVERED

Allende's documents, shown me by the military government, put Sept. 19 as the day for the start of the seizure of power. But through its own intelligence-gathering system the highly professional but hitherto politically aloof military uncovered the plot.

On Sept. 11 they informed Allende at the Moneda that a military jet was standing by to take him, his family and any of his supporters who wished to go, to any destination that would receive them.

Believing himself secure in the old palace, with a heavy arsenal of weapons and many supporters trained in their use, Allende did not respond.

The military then broadcast a warning at 11 a.m. that all should leave the Moneda or face attack by noon. Some left, many did not. Before the deadline, firing broke out from the inside.

At 11:55 a jet swooped in and laced the beautiful old building with rockets. By then a pitched battle was in progress and fire had broken out in the wooden interior.

As the only newsman permitted to photograph inside the ruins, I was able to record the exact moment that Allende's ill-fated experiment in revolution came to an end. I found the burned-out time clock with its scorched card racks. The hands were stopped at 11:57.

#### RELEASE IS REFUSED

Later in the day Allende phoned the defense ministry, according to my military liaison men. They said he was intoxicated, but announced that he wished to leave the Moneda. He was told that was not possible since there was heavy gunfire from in and out of the palace.

In her interview with the international press the next day, his widow said Allende called her after that conversation and told her he would not allow himself to be taken but would use the automatic weapon given him by Fidel Castro to take his own life.

I saw the office where his death occurred. Later Mrs. Allende changed her story, saying he was killed by the military, but he is said to have been dead some time before the troops were able to enter the Moneda.

Gen. Augusto Pinochet, commander in chief of the army, was named president of the junta de gobierno, as he, Adm. Jose Toribio Merino, Air Force Gen. Gustavo Leigh and Director General of The Carabineros, Gen. Cesar Mendoza, assumed power.

Interestingly, of the Allende power axis, only the leader died. His fellow architects for the Marxist government, Louis Corvalan, Pedro Vuskovic and Daniel "Barney" Vergara, are all alive, most in custody, though Vuskovic is in sanctuary in a foreign embassy. Another, Carlos Altamirano, found his way to Cuba where he has issued bellicose statements.

The military insists that fewer than one-tenth of the number of deaths reported after the coup actually occurred and they involved persons in possession of weapons and responsible for direct violence against the new government.

Certainly the reality of Chile today belies most published reports, and if any tears are being shed for Allende, I was unable to see them.

#### GOV. MILTON SHAPP'S RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH ON THE TRUCKERS

#### HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Pennsylvania's Governor, Milton Shapp, delivered his response to President Nixon's February 9 speech regarding the truckers. At this time I would like to insert in the Record a text of the Governor's remarks delivered over the CBS radio network:

TEXT OF STATEMENT DELIVERED BY GOV. MILTON J. SHAPP, ON CBS RADIO NETWORK

Last Saturday, in a radio address to the Nation, President Nixon spoke about the independent truckers' strike.

I know something about that situation because, for five days and nights last week I was in Washington doing what I could to shape an agreement to end the strike and its serious economic consequences. And for eight weeks before that I had been meeting with truckers from all sectors of the Nation in my office and at truck stops discussing their problems.

It was apparent to me that the truckers' strike would not merely make the public aware of the truckers' grievances, although their grievances were legitimate.

What concerned me greatly was the fact that a truck strike could indeed tie up the country economically by blocking the shipment of essential goods, produce and industrial commodities.

The end result would have affected the food on our tables, the jobs in our factories and the safety on our highways.

And equally important, I saw the truckers' grievances as typical of the problems faced by all Americans—steelworkers, autoworkers, small businessmen, clerks, farmers and housewives—all caught in the squeeze of the energy shortage, rising prices, mounting unemployment, economic uncertainty and, above all, becoming angrier with each passing day because of a national government unresponsive to their needs.

On Thursday, of last week, after 'round-the-clock meetings for four days, I announced the terms of an agreement reached between federal officials and representatives of the independent truckers. On Friday, I visited a number of truckstops in Pennsylvania, urging independent truckers to accept the agreement and go back to work. I spoke to other trucker groups via telephone urging their acceptance of the agreement as the best that could be obtained at this time to help alleviate their problems.

Today, most truckers are back on the road. Essential consumer and industrial goods are moving again.

Factories are rehiring workers laid off during the strike.

Incidents of violence have virtually disappeared.

But this is no time to be complacent.

As I have stated—the terms agreed to last week were the best we could get under the circumstances.

But their continued acceptance by the independent truckers will depend upon two factors:

First, solid determination by the federal government to honor its commitments, and Second, the willingness of the federal government and Congress to pursue other legitimate needs of the independent truckers quickly, within the next few weeks.

Follow through in both of these areas will take continued vigilance by the truckers' representatives, by myself and by other state and local officials because I have found, much to my regret, that you just can't depend upon the Nixon administration to deliver for the people without constant vigilance and unrelenting pressure.

I do not say this lightly.

Consider an example from the President's speech itself.

In his address last Saturday, President Nixon said that his administration would take every possible step so that the truckers' fuel supplies "will be equal to 100 percent of their needs."

Five days later, many truckers and the head of the national truck stop operators called my office to tell me that neither the



oil companies nor the federal government were complying with the agreement.

Immediately, I requested of appropriate officials in Washington that they deliver on this promise made by the President himself.

Finally, just last Thursday, February 14th—one full week after the agreement was reached, Mr. William Simon, the federal Energy Czar, at my insistence, sent out telegrams to the oil companies advising them of the truckers' agreement and requested that the oil companies take steps to deliver sufficient fuel to supply their dealers.

The terms of the present agreement are not our only concern.

Washington must do much more to cure the evils of the present system before the President's claim of "redressing the truckers' legitimate concerns" can be considered valid.

1. Congress can—and must—enact uniform national length and weight standards for trucks on our interstate highways.

2. A single license plate and permit can—and should—be made valid on trucks in all states, just as one tag and permit are valid for passenger cars. The added cost, confusion and harassment of the present system is a cause of numerous unnecessary problems and higher costs for the truckers.

3. The U.S. Department of Transportation, should by executive order, rule that, except in cases already covered by tariff regulations, loading and unloading costs must be borne by the shipper or receiver, and not by the truckers.

These—and other additional steps—must be taken and quickly.

In short, last week's agreement has bought time. But the time we now have must be utilized to provide a better opportunity for the independent trucker to overcome his losses and make a living.

Now, I would like to comment on two statements made by the President in his radio address last week because they point up very clearly the basic problems that our people face in trying to get action from the federal government.

The president said that last week's agreement demonstrates that "the federal government will act promptly" when any segment of the economy has serious problems.

Let me state emphatically that not once prior to the strike or during my stay in Washington was it apparent to me that either the President or his top aides were fully aware of the true dimensions of the truckers' strike.

Nor was it apparent that they were willing to take bold action needed to bring the strike to an end.

As the days went on, second level Nixon administration officials began to see that this was a really serious problem, and, fortunately, they eventually prevailed at the White House and an agreement was reached. Further, as I indicated before, even after the agreement was reached, the Nixon administration dragged its feet on implementing one of the key provisions—that of providing an adequate supply of diesel fuel.

Also, in his speech, the President referred to the truckers as a "handful of desperadoes."

Let me say at this point that no state in the Nation acted more promptly to prevent violence than Pennsylvania. As early as Friday, February 1st, I signed a Declaration of Emergency, placed the State Police on full alert and called out the National Guard. Repeatedly, I said that we would not tolerate violence or disorder from any source.

Frankly, I don't think it serves the public interest for the President to describe the strikers as "desperadoes."

Desperate they were—but if the President had taken the time to talk to them, he would have found that they were only desperate to earn a decent living for themselves and their families.

For months, they sought relief from Washington to help meet rising fuel costs and many other economic problems which beset them. They got only empty promises and doubletalk from administration officials. Finally, they stopped driving and actually as witnessed by the fire bombing of the Pittsburgh headquarters of the steelhaulers, the truckers themselves were victims of some of the violence.

Their desperation was really no different from the desperation felt by the many other Americans from all walks of life caught in today's squeeze created by the inability of the Nixon administration to deal with various economic crises that are causing the rampant inflation now sweeping the nation.

The way to handle these problems is not to withdraw further into the isolation of the White House. Nor is it in the public interest to persist in policies which consistently seem to favor the big oil interests over the consumer.

The only way to handle these problems is for the President and his aides to get out and listen to the people, to find out what is on their minds and to take positive action to alleviate their problems.

After all, isn't that what government's all about—doing things for people?

And how can the federal government do things for people unless it listens to the voice of the people in the factories, on the farms and in the streets of our big cities?

My father often advised me, "Milt, you have two ears and one mouth. Use them in the same proportion and you'll go a lot further in life."

Listening is what is missing today in Washington as is action based upon listening to people.

Yes, we've fallen back a long way from the open, people oriented government which was sparked in the early sixties by John F. Kennedy to the closed, isolated and suspicious environment of Richard Nixon's White House.

I was there in the administration of John Kennedy.

I saw its openness with my own eyes. As a consultant to the Secretary of Commerce, I had access to top aides of the President, Cabinet officials and was even able to talk to the President, as were others in similar capacities during the Kennedy administration.

But last week as Governor of the third largest state in the Nation, who went to Washington to help solve a national crisis, I saw the exact opposite—isolation, inaccessibility and an unwillingness on the part of the President to even seek pertinent information.

I implore the President to change this atmosphere, this spirit and to adopt goals for his administration now that will avert future domestic crises.

Yes, what is needed in our national life today is an open door, a receptive mind, a concern for people and a willingness to take bold action on behalf of the people at the highest levels of our national government.

I hope that the lesson of the truckers' strike will be seen and understood at the White House so that it will never again be necessary for the Governor of one state to go to Washington in an attempt to solve a problem which cries out for national leadership.

And I hope that action will be taken in Washington soon enough to avert another truckers' strike in the near future. We barely

averted martial law in this nation last week. Let's hope that by Presidential negligence we do not place our nation too close to the fire again.

## INDEPENDENT SERVICE STATIONS CALL FOR HELP

**HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, a recent meeting of the Serve Yourself and Multiple Pump Association, Inc., in Los Angeles, indicated that the independent gasoline station owners do not feel that they are being treated fairly. A resolution adopted unanimously by the association on March 12, 1974, is printed below:

### RESOLUTION

(Adopted unanimously by the Members and the attending Board of Directors of the Serve Yourself & Multiple Pump Assn. at an extraordinary meeting on March 12, 1974 in Los Angeles, Calif.)

Whereas the independent branded and unbranded service stations are the only true examples of our cherished free enterprise system, and hereafter we shall refer to them as True Independents.

Whereas these stations are the only real competitive force in gasoline marketing; and;

Whereas their very existence is predicated on fair and equal sharing of available product at fair, equitable wholesale prices; and;

Whereas, presently, governmental bungling and the Major Oil Companies' unbelievable political and material influence in a corruption ridden administration; and;

Whereas the true Independent Refiners can supply less than 10% of our needs and the majors traditionally supplied 90% or more of the product we need to keep competition alive; and;

Whereas, the independents are now forced to pay 6¢ to 18¢ per gallon higher wholesale prices than the major Oil Companies' dealers and Company Operated Stations; and;

Whereas, if this continues, despite the spirit and fortitude of the True Independent, they will be crushed and put out of business; and;

Whereas, the Major Oil Companies, with their illegal and secret contributions to political candidates, would like nothing better than to put the True Independent out of business, thus removing the last and only obstacles in their accomplishment of complete cartelization of the Oil Industry.

Now, therefore; be it resolved, that the governmental agencies that are still fighting for the survival of this endangered species of True Independents . . . such agencies as the Anti-Trust Dept. of the Justice Dept.; the Federal Trade Commission; and the courageous, but frustrated FEO under William Simon, be accorded the unqualified support of the members of both houses of Congress, without any respect to their political affiliation, in order that they may be enabled to insure that the True Independents can purchase their fair allocations of product at fair and equitable prices.

JAMES L. BEEBE,  
President.  
PAUL T. ERDOS,  
Executive Secretary.

ADDRESS BY GEN. ROBERT E. L. EATON, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, General Eaton has rendered outstanding service as National Commander of the American Legion, and I commend his timely remarks to my colleagues and the American people:

ADDRESS BY GEN. ROBERT E. L. EATON BEFORE THE ROA NATIONAL COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 22, 1974

Members of the Reserve Officers Association, Distinguished Guests, I am delighted to be with you this morning.

The American Legion which I am privileged to represent shares with the ROA a number of common views and concerns. One is the continuing need for a strong national defense. Another is that our Reserve Forces should figure prominently in our defense structure. It is to these points that I shall address myself today.

The American Legion holds that there is substantial room for improvement in the general area of defense manpower utilization.

Specifically, we feel that the Department of Defense is not adequately exploiting its Reserve potential.

We feel that increased reliance on Reserve Forces offer the greatest promise for maximum security within the limits of our resources.

We feel that certain parochial attitudes on the part of the active establishment are restricting the development of that promise.

We intend to press vigorously our contention that the interests of national defense are best served by elevating, rather than depressing, the status of our Reserve components.

Today it is more than customarily difficult to convince the American public of the need for continued maintenance of a strong deterrent posture.

One reason is the fact that we have recently ended our involvement in a war. It seems to be an American tradition—a regrettable one—that a war's end inevitably brings a clamor for dismantling the force structure so laboriously and so expensively constructed. As a nation we seem incapable of absorbing the often-repeated lessons of previous experience.

Once again there is a demand for "reordering priorities." To some Americans that phrase suggests that we could finance increases in social programs by paring the defense budget beyond the limit of sanity. Certainly we should do everything within our power to improve the quality of life for all who are part of this nation. But when considering priorities, we should remember that defense is itself a social service, the most important one because it guarantees our freedom and our very existence.

Advocates of reduced defense expenditures point to a degree of thaw in our relationships with the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists as evidence of a diminishing need for military strength.

That is a wishful approach. It accepts the promise of lasting peace as if it were already fact. It is not. The attitudes of the Soviets and the Chinese appear to augur some hope for the future. But, speaking for The American Legion, we remain unconvinced that these adversaries have totally abandoned their plans for military superiority and conquest.

Another reason why there is some resistance to maintaining a strong deterrent force is the ever-rising cost of defense. The

fiscal 1975 budget now before the Congress contemplates defense outlays some \$6 billion greater than those of the current fiscal year. That makes the defense budget a prime target for sniper fire.

However, the increase is illusory. Anyone who has bought a steak or a gallon of gasoline recently is aware of the eroding effect of inflation on defense purchasing power as well as personal purchasing power. There are additional factors compounding the problem of defense costs. There is the essential demand for greater performance in each new generation of weapon systems; this means greater complexity, hence higher costs. There are also the dramatic funding increases associated with the zero-draft, all-volunteer defense force.

Viewed in proper perspective, the proposed defense budget is anything but munificent. It amounts to a smaller percentage of the gross national product than in any year since 1950. It represents 29 percent of the total federal budget, where six years ago it was 44 percent. The American Legion supports the Administration's defense budget, with this qualification: It provides only the minimum level required for American preparedness, dollar increases notwithstanding.

Clearly, rising costs dictate a greater-than-ever quest for efficiencies in utilizing our defense resources. The alternative is further reduction in force, which is not tolerable in today's unsettled international climate.

In the search for new efficiencies, defense manpower appears a particularly promising area for focus of attention. In fiscal 1975, the average per capita pay of military personnel will reach \$11,000, approximately double the figure for 1968. Despite large-scale reductions in personnel strength, manpower costs in 1975 will be up almost 50 percent above the 1968 level.

Manpower is now the largest major component of the defense budget. It takes a larger bite of the total budget than the combined sum of operations, procurement, construction, research and development. In both the current fiscal year and the coming year, manpower outlays amount to 55 percent of the defense budget.

How can we improve efficiency in manpower utilization? By really implementing the total force concept, the complete integration of U.S. Reserve Forces into the combat-ready force in being. I stress the word *really*. Although the total force concept has been a matter of Department of Defense policy since 1970, its implementation has been something less than vigorous.

Inherent to the total force concept are these tenets:

First, the difference in combat effectiveness between Regular and Reserve Forces is insignificant, as has been demonstrated by studies, tests and actual combat experience;

Second, Reserve units can be organized, manned, equipped, trained and operated at costs dramatically lower than the costs for similar Regular Force units. For example, a combat infantry battalion can be maintained in the Reserve Forces for about 20 percent of the cost of maintaining an active army infantry battalion.

The essence of the total force policy is that necessary reductions in active defense strength can be offset by greater reliance on Reserve capabilities. Toward that end some Reserve Forces—particularly the National Guard—have been assigned high-priority missions once considered the sole province of active forces.

I submit that there is an opportunity for greater cost effectiveness in manpower utilization through further steps in this direction. The Department of Defense should give full consideration to a substantial shift in emphasis, roles, missions and resources from the Regular Forces to the Reserve Forces.

There is, of course, a requirement for a hard core of Regular Forces. This hard core

must include, among other things, an adequate rotational base for the maintenance of overseas units. The balance of the total defense requirement could be met by strong, well-equipped, combat-ready Reserve components.

Such a shift involves nothing more than full acceptance of the total force policy already established. It could prove immensely advantageous to the nation.

If the mandate is maintenance of a given level of force, it could be accomplished at far lower cost.

If the determining factor is cost ceiling, we can obtain a higher level of force within the monetary limitation.

Will the total force policy work in practice? There is ample evidence that it will. Witness, for example, the rapid response and effective deployment of the Israeli Reserves in the most recent Middle East conflagration. Our own Reserves have on several occasions provided similar testimony. The National Guard has already demonstrated its ability to meet the challenge of total force by attaining the highest level of combat-readiness in its history.

However, if the total force policy is to work it must be fully implemented. Full implementation means this:

The force has to be manned;

The force has to be equipped; and

The force has to be trained.

Full implementation of the total force policy will require a commitment greater than we have yet witnessed on the part of the active establishment. If we are to get that commitment, we must first effect a radical change in Department of Defense thinking concerning the role of the Reserves. Despite lip service to the concept of total force and the advantages it offers, there are still many in important positions who regard the Reserves as a "mobilization" force, something to be called up in the late innings of a war rather than a component of the force-in-being.

That word "mobilization" is one I would like to remove from the dictionary, at least insofar as it pertains to Reserve Forces.

It is true that the Reserves were conceived as a mobilization force in the Defense Act of 1916, before our entry into World War I. The legislators of that day envisioned the mobilization force as one that could be activated at the start of an emergency but equipped and trained over long months—or even years—thereafter. It was a military second string for use in a long-term war.

But that was six decades ago. The leisurely-mobilized Reserve Force of 1916 would be useless in today's—and tomorrow's—environment. We will never again experience an emergency in which long-term mobilization is possible. Thus, today's Reserve Force cannot be a mobilization force. It must be a ready force, complementary but not inferior to the active force. Where there are deficiencies in readiness level or equipment, the Department of Defense should bend every effort to bring the deficient units to an appropriate level of capability.

Because of the parochial views I mentioned, the Department of Defense is not moving toward full implementation of the total force policy. In fact, and perhaps for the same reason, it is moving in the opposite direction. There was a recent decision to deactivate a number of air national units. There are indications of further cuts in the Reserve components. Such reductions are completely inconsistent with the objective of getting the most defense for the dollar outlaid.

It is difficult to understand the rationale of defense management with regard to Reserve Force reductions, actual and contemplated.

The keystone tenet of the total force policy is this: When considerations of the national economy dictate reductions in active strength, the impact must be counterbal-



anced by improvement in Reserve capability. Yet look at what is happening.

Over the past 3 years, the Soviet Union has increased its active forces from 3 million to 3.8 million men. The USSR has not reduced the size of its reserve establishment.

The United States, on the other hand, has been in a steady decline with respect to active personnel strength. In 1968, the peak year of the Vietnam conflict, there were 3.5 million military personnel on active duty. In the coming fiscal year, that figure will drop to 2.2 million.

Thus, at a time when our active forces are at the lowest level in more than 20 years, there are moves afoot to cut the Reserve Forces as well. This is a rejection of the basic principle of the total force concept.

It is also a foolish way to achieve economy. We of The American Legion deplore any reductions in defense strength at a time of uncertain international atmosphere. But if there absolutely must be reductions it is upside-down philosophy to cut the Reserve Forces rather than the active establishment.

Look at it this way. If it became absolutely imperative to cut your family budget, how would you go about it? Would you turn out all the lights in your home to save a few dollars a month? Or would you give up your country club membership to realize a much more significant reduction with less real hardship?

Defense management is turning off the lights, so to speak. Because the Reserve unit is far less costly to operate, its elimination saves relatively few dollars. To put it another way, we lose more defense capability by cutting the Reserves than we do by reducing the Regular Forces.

There is one other aspect of Defense management's attitude toward the Reserves.

Recently I wrote the Secretary of Defense protesting Reserve reductions. I received a reply from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs. There was nothing in the reply which in any way changed the views I have enunciated today. There was, however, one paragraph which merits public airing: I quote:

"It is essential that units, Active and Reserve, that provide little effectiveness because they are performing marginal mission or because they are manned and equipped in a manner that is an inefficient use of defense dollars be eliminated."

This is another attitude to which I take exception. It constitutes a lack of understanding of the Reserve role. It ignores the fact that a Reserve unit—however outmoded—is a valuable defense asset. Elimination of a Reserve unit is a waste of the time, funding, recruiting and training that brought it into being.

Is it not more logical to convert the outmoded unit to new capability? If it is performing a marginal mission, give it a new one. If it is under-equipped, equip it properly. It takes but a stroke of the pen to dissolve an active duty unit or to reactivate it. But a Reserve unit, once broken up, takes years to rebuild.

Until now, I have presented the case for proper utilization of the Reserve Forces in strictly pragmatic terms. I have outlined the cost effectiveness and other gains that can accrue from real implementation of the total force policy.

There is another side to the subject—the philosophical side.

From the earliest days of the Republic, Americans have embraced the fundamental doctrine that the cornerstone of defense is the citizen army. The first article of the Constitution empowered Congress to "call forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection and repel invasions."

Since its formation, The American Legion has espoused that doctrine. At the Legion's second national convention in 1920, the Military Affairs Committee stated a policy for in-

surging the readiness of our citizen soldiery. I quote:

"We recognize the Constitutional principle that a well-trained and disciplined citizen soldiery is essential to the peace and safety of both state and nation. In conformity with the spirit of our organization, we pledge our efforts in aid of the constituted authorities of the United States, and of each of the several states, in the formation, recruiting and maintenance of the National Guard of the United States at that standard of strength and dependability required by the adopted military policy of our government and the welfare of our national and state institutions."

"We believe that national safety with freedom from militarism is best assured by a national citizen army based on the democratic and American principles of the equality of obligation and opportunity for all. The National Guard and organized Reserves, which should and must be the chief reliance of The United States in time of war, should be officered in peace and in war as far as practical by men from their own ranks."

That statement was advanced in the wake of World War One. The thinking of that day envisioned the slow mobilization of forces and, as I have said, long term mobilization is no longer appropriate. However, the concept of citizen soldiery remains as valid today as in 1920 and at the founding of the Republic.

Today, however, it is national policy to build toward an all-volunteer, professional armed force. Without participation by the citizens in selective service, we are moving away from the concept of citizen soldiery.

The American Legion supports the personnel of our armed forces. We are convinced that they represent the highest type of individuals who serve our nation. But we are not convinced that the professional armed force is in keeping with the American idea of free government.

Nor are we convinced that it is an effective way to fight our nation's wars. There is a belief—in which I concur—that the principle cause of the Southeast Asia disaster was the professional army approach. There were draftees in the armed forces, but the army fighting the war was primarily professional. The Reserves were never called into action and for that reason the nation never realized the full participation of its people.

I believe that a military effort which lacks the full support of the American people is foredoomed to failure.

The total force policy provides an opportunity for active participation of our citizenry. But if it is to be a viable program, it must be fully and intelligently implemented. We must have a commitment to man the force, to equip the force and to train the force. The American Legion, The Reserve Officers Association and others who share our convictions must carry the fight to insure that commitment.

#### OUTSTANDING AMERICAN AND COMMUNITY LEADER

**HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate an outstanding American and community leader on receiving yet another commendation for excellence in retailing and community service.

Bert Boeckmann, owner-president of Galpin Ford Square in Sepulveda, Calif., has recently won a national Time Maga-

zine Quality Dealer Award for 1974. This award program annually honors outstanding new car dealers for "exceptional performance combined with distinguished community service." As an example of his selfless nature, when accepting the award, Mr. Boeckmann stated:

I feel the honor is a tribute to my entire organization for its business and civic-minded efforts.

Under Boeckmann's direction Galpin Square has grown from its original 1-acre facility to a 13-acre compound employing over 200 people. His idea for "Galpinized" vehicles have been widely imitated, and he is recognized as the developer of the Surf Van, Pinto with Targa Bar and specially designed vinyl roofs. In addition to the Quality Dealer Award of 1974, Boeckmann was the recipient of the Brand Names Foundation National Automotive Retailer of the Year Award in 1969. This is one of the most prestigious industry honors in the country.

For his active role in community service, Boeckmann has won the San Fernando Valley Conquistador Award, presented annually to the businessman with the most outstanding performance in business, civic and community affairs. He is a trustee of the West Valley Community Hospital; advisory board member of the North Valley YMCA; director of the Valley Business and Professional Association, and a member of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Community tributes to Boeckmann also include citations of merit for business ethics and civic affairs from Gov. Ronald Reagan, the California State Senate, the County of Los Angeles, and former Mayor Sam Yorty on behalf of the city of Los Angeles.

Bert Boeckmann is an individual who combines the best of what is right with the American free enterprise system, with the willingness to contribute his energies to his community. I commend him to my colleagues' attention.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69

**HON. HUGH L. CAREY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following amendment intended to be offered by me to H.R. 69:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED  
OFFERED BY MR. CAREY OF NEW YORK

Page 28, beginning with line 5, strike out everything down through line 18 on page 58, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 101. Section 102 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") is amended by striking out "1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1974".

Page 26, strike out the items relating to sections 102 through 113, inclusive.

# SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES DECISIONS REGARDING HOUSE JURISDICTION OVER PANAMA AND INTEROCEANIC CANALS

**HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have been concerned over the recommendations of the Select Committee on Committees concerning the various jurisdictions of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Originally, the select committee recommended abolition of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. In its resolution of March 19, 1974, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was retained with merchant marine, Coast Guard, and fisheries jurisdictions. The committee's existing jurisdictions over the environment, oceanography, Panama Canal, and wildlife have been stripped away. This relegation of the committee to a minor status and the elimination of a substantial portion of its jurisdiction is a matter of great concern to the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and is, we feel, an incorrect decision.

In view of my great concern over this matter, I will insert in the RECORD over the next week or so several statements which I think point up erroneous decisions made by the select committee with respect to the proposed shifting of existing Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee jurisdictions, and which among other things, compel me to oppose the select committee's resolution.

In its deliberations and resolution, Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Committees transferred the jurisdiction of interoceanic canals—including the Panama Canal—and the administration and government of the Canal Zone, from the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to the Foreign Affairs Committee. This transfer by the Select Committee was done, according to the record, at the suggestion of some of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee—page 270 of the record of the Select Committee markup session of February 20, 1974, reference was made to a letter. There does not appear to be other rationale or reasoning in support of such a transfer.

In fact, the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has had jurisdiction over the Panama Canal, the Canal Zone, and interoceanic canals in general since 1935 when it moved from Interstate and Foreign Commerce to Merchant Marine and Fisheries and our jurisdiction was again ratified in the Reorganization Act of 1946 when it was stated that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee shall have jurisdiction over "the Panama Canal and the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation and government of the Canal Zone, and interoceanic canals generally." This Panama Canal jurisdiction just mentioned is a domestic matter and not a foreign affairs matter.

In all these years, the overwhelming work in connection with the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone has been with the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal and the administration of the Canal Zone. In all these years there has been comparatively minimal activity with respect to the foreign affairs aspect of the canal and the zone. There was an attempt to modify the existing 1903 treaty in the period of 1964 and 1967, and there is currently an attempt under way to write a new treaty to supersede the 1903 treaty. However with the exception of treaty discussions and hearings, all of the work that has been done in the canal area has been by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, with respect to its jurisdictional responsibilities.

Set out at the end of the article for the Members' information will be a list of just some of the more recent U.S. domestic laws which apply to the Canal Zone and the inhabitants of the Canal Zone. This list covers everything from the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to the minimum wage laws. Clearly, the operation and maintenance of the canal and the Canal Zone is primarily a domestic and maritime matter. Unfortunately, the Select Committee apparently failed to recognize the relationship of the canal and the Canal Zone to domestic law and maritime commerce, and to recognize that the essence of congressional activity, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, is not a foreign affairs problem but is and always has been involved primarily with the operation and maintenance of the canal and the administration of the zone.

This, and other examples of questionable judgment by the Select Committee, compel me to vote against the Select Committee resolution.

Information follows:

GENERAL LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES HAVING EFFECT IN THE CANAL ZONE—AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1973

## 1973 ENACTMENTS

1. Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973: P.L. 93-159, 87 Stat. 627.
2. Rehabilitation Act of 1973: P.L. 93-112; 87 Stat. 355 (Fed. agencies only).

## 1972 ENACTMENTS

1. Noise Control Act of 1972: P.L. 92-574; 86 Stat. 1234 (applies to Fed. agencies only).
2. Consumer Product Safety Act: P.L. 92-373; 86 Stat. 1207.
3. Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972: P.L. 92-532; 86 Stat. 1052.
4. Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972: P.L. 92-522; 86 Stat. 1027.
5. Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act: P.L. 92-513; 86 Stat. 947.
6. Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments: P.L. 92-500; 86 Stat. 862, 875 (expanded certain oil pollution provisions to C.Z.).
7. Automobile Information Disclosure Act of 1972: P.L. 92-359; 86 Stat. 502.
8. Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972: P.L. 92-261; 86 Stat. 103 (extends Civil Rights Act of 1964 to fed. employees).
9. Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972: P.L. 92-255; 86 Stat. 65.

## 1971 ENACTMENT

1. P.L. 92-187; 85 Stat. 644—equal treatment for married women federal employees.

## 1970 ENACTMENTS

1. Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act: P.L. 91-695, 84 Stat. 2078.
2. Economic Stabilization Act of 1970: P.L. 91-379; 84 Stat. 796.
3. Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970: P.L. 91-648; 84 Stat. 1909.
4. Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Treatment Act of 1970, as amended, P.L. 91-616; 84 Stat. 1848.
5. Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970: P.L. 91-596; 84 Stat. 1590.
6. Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970: P.L. 91-513; 84 Stat. 1236.

## 1969 ENACTMENTS

1. National Environmental Policy Act of 1969: P.L. 91-190; 83 Stat. 832.
2. Amendment of Contract Work Hours Act: P.L. 91-54.

## 1968 ENACTMENTS

1. Gun Control Act of 1968: P.L. 90-618; 82 Stat. 1213.
2. P.L. 90-616; 82 Stat. 1212 (waiver of collection of overpayments of Federal pay under certain circumstances).
3. Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968: P.L. 90-577; 82 Stat. 1098.
5. Consumer Credit Protection Act: P.L. 90-321; 82 Stat. 146.
- 50 U.S.C. App. 469 (Selective Service System).
- 50 U.S.C. App. 2021-2032 (Export controls).
- Public Law 89-267, October 19, 1965, 79 Stat. 990 (Transfer of certain Canal Zone prisoners to custody of Attorney General).

## UNITED STATES CODE PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO THE CANAL ZONE—AS OF JANUARY 1966

- 5 U.S.C. 2211 (Compensation of Governor of Canal Zone).
- 7 U.S.C. 608a (Sugar Quotas).
- 8 U.S.C. 1101(9) and 1201, 1202 (issuance of visas to C.Z. residents by "consular officers" as designated by Governor).
- 8 U.S.C. 1185 (providing for authority for imposing restrictions on departure of aliens from the United States, defined to include the Canal Zone (See 22 CFR 46.6 vesting such authority in Governor of C.Z.)).
- 8 U.S.C. 1403 (confers citizenship on persons born in C.Z. or R.P. one of whose parents is a U.S. citizen).
- 8 U.S.C. 1452 (Certificates of citizenship of persons claiming citizenship under 8 U.S.C. 1503).
- 10 U.S.C. 312 (Exemption of executive officers of Canal Zone from militia duty).
- 10 U.S.C. 4342(8) (Appointments to Military Academy).
- 10 U.S.C. 6954(8) (Appointments to Naval Academy).
- 10 U.S.C. 9842(8) (Appointments to Air Force Academy).
- 12 U.S.C. all (Foreign banking corporations in "Panama and the Panama Canal Zone or other insular possessions" as depositaries of public monies).
- 12 U.S.C. 1748-17481 (Armed Forces Housing Mortgage Insurance).
- 12 U.S.C. 1751-1775 (Federal Credit Unions).
- 14 U.S.C. 91 (Control of movements of vessels in Canal Zone waters to safeguard Naval vessels).

## 1967 ENACTMENT

1. Flammable Fabrics Act Amendments: P.L. 90-189; 81 Stat. 566.

## 1966 ENACTMENTS

1. P.L. 89-710; 80 Stat. 1104—to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the C.Z.



2. National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966: P.L. 89-563; 80 Stat. 718.  
3. Federal Claims Collection Act of 1966: P.L. 89-508; 80 Stat. 308.

RECORDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA PRESENTS ANNUAL CULTURAL AWARD TO REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1974

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I note that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) is the recipient of the Annual Cultural Award recently presented by the Recording Industry Association of America. No one is more deserving of the recognition this award brings.

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., has long been one of the Nation's most effective champions of cultural and artistic endeavors. He is the architect of much of the landmark legislation that has marked the steady growth of Federal support and encouragement of the arts and humanities.

I want to congratulate the RIAA for presenting this year's award to FRANK THOMPSON, Jr. The association has chosen well. And, I want to congratulate and pay tribute to an able colleague whose leadership and exceptional skills as a lawmaker have contributed so much to the advancement of the arts and humanities and to the enrichment of the cultural life of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the citation by the RIAA on the occasion of the presentation of the award at its annual awards dinner in Washington March 13, 1974. And, I also include Congressman THOMPSON's eloquent and timely remarks on receiving the award:

CITATION—THE SIXTH ANNUAL RIAA CULTURAL AWARD IS PROUDLY PRESENTED BY THE RECORDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA TO REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

In recognition and deep appreciation of his continuing legislative leadership in behalf of the arts and culture in the United States. Since becoming a member of the House of Representatives in 1955, his has been a voice that has consistently urged the Congress toward greater involvement in furthering the arts and education. He not only authored the legislation which established the National Cultural Center, but authored the bill to have it designated as John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. He sponsored bills that created the National Council on the Arts and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. He authored the bill that preserved from demolition the historic Patent Office Building, now the repository for the National Collection of Fine Arts. He was the principal sponsor of the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act and of the Higher Education Act, and was the author of the VISTA program. Today he is the principal sponsor of legislation to create within the Library of Congress the American Folklife

Center to collect, preserve and propagate the ethnic songs, dances and folklore that are part of our nation's heritage. Because he has recognized the responsibility of Government to encourage and support a flourishing program of art and culture in this country, and because he has succeeded in spreading this interest and involvement among others, the Recording Industry Association of America is proud and delighted to present him with its Sixth Annual Cultural Award.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR. ON ACCEPTING RECORDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION AWARD, MARCH 13, 1974

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Anyone in political life would be deeply honored, as I assuredly am, to receive the award you have presented me tonight. It is a prize I shall always treasure—a lovely memento of many years of happy and fruitful association with leaders of America's cultural community.

But your generous award has very particular significance to me just now, in the midst of a historic crisis in our country over the nature of our constitutional system and the role which that system assigns to the politician and public servant. In a very real sense, it is a crisis of confidence—confidence in our institutions, in our traditional national purposes, in our political leadership, and ultimately in ourselves—over our ability to deal with the great challenges facing our Nation.

Obviously, the illusion-shattering experiences of Watergate are partly to blame. But as shocking and disturbing as that affair has been, our national loss of confidence goes much deeper, down to a dark wellspring of despair over our evident failure as a nation to cope with the steady depletion of our natural resources, the wanton desecration of our human environment, the awful decay and poverty in the hearts of our cities, the loss of purpose in our daily work, the inferior quality and aesthetic ugliness of our industrial output, the shallowness of our education, the crassness, the crowding, the crime—the list seems to have no end.

In a long thought-provoking article which recently appeared in the New York Review of Books, Robert Heilbroner posed the question, "Is there hope for mankind?" In the sense that these problems cannot be solved except at the most fearful human cost, Heilbroner's answer was simply, "No, there is not."

Is it any wonder, therefore, that lesser mortals such as Congressmen, who are supposed to come up with the practical solutions, are assaulted by despair and a loss of confidence in themselves? Is it any surprise, either, that growing numbers are withdrawing from politics this year, complaining that they have lost their zest for lawmaking, that the frustrations are too great, the achievements too small, and their constituents too demanding?

Yet here—tonight—you have provided testimony that the system has not outlived its usefulness; and you have reminded me how much remains to be done, through our combined efforts, in behalf of our Nation's cultural development.

Let me cite just a few areas that are high on my own list—and, while I'm at it, put in a plug for your support:

AMERICAN FOLKLIFE PRESERVATION ACT

Perhaps my favorite is an idea aimed at preserving and supporting American "folk-life"—the whole gamut of songs, crafts, and lore which groups of Americans have handed down from one generation to another. I am a sponsor and ardent supporter of a bill which would create within the Library of Congress a Folklife Center with two exciting and complementary functions: One, to preserve these folk arts by collecting, documenting, and

publishing characteristic examples; the other, to make these same arts available in living form to the public by sponsoring performances, exhibits, and festivals of local folk art around the country.

What opportunities such a Center would open up for both imaginative scholarship and creative expression.

RAILROAD DEPOT CULTURAL CENTERS

Another example close to my heart responds to two areas of particular concern to me: historical preservation and community development. I have long had a love affair with the old passenger train depot, that once-bustling center of human activity which now stands sadly idle in hundreds of blighted downtown areas across the country. My idea is to make these unused depots available to the disadvantaged communities around them, for use as cultural centers and for all sorts of community get-togethers.

What better way to help solve our crying need for such facilities than to put these marvelous old buildings back to work?

A HOME FOR THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT

One last example: the National Endowment for the Arts, with over \$60 million in funds this year and a staff of almost one hundred, still has no permanent home of its own here in Washington. I'm encouraging a plan which would rescue a familiar old Washington landmark from the wrecker's ball, turn it into a home for the Endowment, and also provide a colorful, vibrant center for Washington's own lively arts and crafts. The building I mean is the mock-ferce old Romanesque Post Office Building on Pennsylvania Avenue with its distinctive clock tower, its marvelous interior galleries, and its spacious, sky-lighted central courtyard—an ideal festival setting.

What better way to revitalize our Avenue of the Presidents for the Nation's bicentennial?

Before I end, let me turn once more to Heilbroner, who draws some interesting conclusions from the dismal outlook he describes for mankind. *The greatest single threat to survival*, he asserts, *is man's own angry frustration*—that after so much effort, so little has been accomplished; and that before such vast challenges, so little is apt to be done.

Heilbroner's lesson is pertinent to our political crisis of confidence: however bleak the outlook for managing the multiple challenges which tomorrow holds, there is no excuse for copping out today—no justification for doing nothing. The politician isn't obsolete yet, not if he enjoys the cooperation and support of public-spirited groups like the Recording Industry.

I thank you deeply for your award. I shall honor it as a tribute to the mutual trust and confidence which have grown up, through years of labor on both sides, between the Congress and the cultural community. And I pledge to you my continuing concern for the well-being of the performing arts in America.

CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 12

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, within the next several months, the Supreme Court will consider the case of United States against the State of Maine. At stake is the question of authority over

the petroleum-rich lands off the coast of the eastern seaboard States. Presently, the individual States retain jurisdiction over the first 3 miles offshore, while the Federal Government controls the Outer Continental Shelf area beyond that initial area. However, the 13 Atlantic coastal States are now contending, on the basis of charters granted them while they were still colonies under English rule, that they should have sovereignty over the entire extent of the coastal shelf.

The Court's decision has tremendous implications for the development of our natural resources on the OCS and the control over the revenues generated from these resources. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that modern drilling techniques could recover nearly 200 billion barrels of oil and 850 trillion cubic feet of natural gas from the American Outer Continental Shelf.

In my own mind, there are major environmental and economic questions to be considered before any decision to commence OCS development can responsibly be reached. But if these questions are to be explored, the issue of relative State and Federal rights and responsibilities has to be resolved first.

Regardless of the Court's final decision, the proposed Federal Oil and Gas Corporation has been conceived so that it could function under either jurisdiction. The bill states that—

The Corporation shall have the power to explore for natural gas and oil on Federal, State, foreign, or private lands; *Provided*, That exploration on State lands shall be in accord with leasing or other State land disposition or utilization programs.

Whichever way United States against Maine is decided, Mr. Speaker, the units of government which end up with authority over petroleum reserves on the Shelf will find that the Oil and Gas Corporation has the flexibility to operate under its authority.

#### 101ST ANNIVERSARY OF PUERTO RICO'S EMANCIPATION

### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 101st anniversary of Puerto Rico's existence without that most heinous of all crimes—slavery. Until March 22, 1873, the repugnant and horrifying practice of buying and selling human beings was rampant on that most tranquil and beautiful of islands. The protection for this odious commerce came from the representatives of Imperial Spain who fostered this trade for personal aggrandizement and profit with no concern or feeling for those poor and indigent persons who were the chattel of this commerce.

In Puerto Rico, as elsewhere in the world, there are those who when they see a wrong being perpetrated commit themselves totally and irrevocably toward the eradication of that wrong. Those men in Puerto Rico who fought fiercely and suc-

cessfully were a small group in number but they had as great an impact on Puerto Rican history as any group. Their names are hallowed in the hearts of the people of Puerto Rico: Roman Baldorioty de Castro, Jose Julian Acosta, Ramon Emetario Batances, Segrundo Ruiz Belvis, Julio L. de Vizcarondo. These patriots were a few of the men who championed the cause of anti-slavery and through their untiring and unselfish efforts set the stage for freedom in Puerto Rico.

Using the conscience of the world as their most potent weapon, these freedom fighters argued, petitioned, and propagandized until they forced the entrenched bureaucracy of the government of Spain to grant to the slaves of Puerto Rico the freedom that should have been theirs since birth.

With the final eradication of slavery in Puerto Rico, free men everywhere who had long held such human bondage to be the most abominable of crimes rejoiced equally with those who were newly freed.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of satisfaction that we hail the occasion of Puerto Rican Emancipation Day, for as free men in a free society we know the value and the merits of liberty and dread the cause of slavery and oppression.

Freed from the devastating effects of slavery, the people of Puerto Rico have pulled together, as descendants of both free men and slave did their share, to establish their island as a leader in the ranks of all democratic states.

Their love of liberty is unsurpassed, their democratic spirit inextinguishable as they stand today, a credit to the great traditions of freedom in the Western World.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TITLE I OF H.R. 69

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the requirements of House Resolution 963, I include here the text of an amendment which I may propose to title I of H.R. 69, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1974.

This amendment simply raises the ceiling of the State entitlement in the title I allocation formula from 120 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure to 150 percent. The lower committee ceiling penalizes States which are displaying leadership in expenditures for the schooling of their children and rewards States making minimal effort. The 150 percent ceiling will simply allow States to be reimbursed under title I at levels reflecting actual spending and should be a spur to those States still not making a maximum effort to provide quality schooling.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. BADILLO

Page 30, line 4, strike out "120 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "150 per centum".

Page 30, line 5, strike out "120 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "150 per centum".

Page 31, lines 21 and 22, strike out "120 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "150 per centum".

Page 31, line 23, strike out "120 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "150 per centum".

#### WE NEED A NATIONAL RESEARCH DATA BANK

### HON. HAROLD B. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, during fiscal 1975, which will begin in a little over 3 months, the Federal Government will provide almost \$20 billion for research programs. This will be a billion dollars in excess of the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Some of my colleagues feel that a substantial sum could be saved if research spending were judiciously curtailed, while others believe that a great deal more ought to be made available for their favorite programs. Regardless of whether they want more or less to be earmarked for research, I am sure they would like to have access to a National Research Data Bank which would be established if a bill that I have introduced becomes law.

Such a facility ought to be available not only to Congressmen and their staffs, but to the executive branch and State and local governments as well. Business and industry, labor, agriculture, and private individuals ought to have access to all information and data developed by governmental research except for that which ought not to be disseminated to the general public for reasons of national security.

A research data bank would become a reality if a bill that I introduced more than a year ago were enacted into law. H.R. 145, the National Research Coordination Act of 1973, which I put in the hopper on the opening day of the 93d Congress, provides for the development, establishment, and maintenance of a National Research Data Bank by the Comptroller General of the United States.

My bill provides that, for each research program being conducted with Federal assistance, the Data Bank shall identify the program, including the name of the program, the authorizing statute, the specific administering office, and a brief description of the program and its objectives; describe the program structure, including the method of research being utilized, and the expenditure patterns; provide additional financial information, including current authorizations and appropriations of funds, the obligations incurred for past years, the current amount of unobligated balances, other non-Federal sources of assistance including amounts, and other pertinent financial information; identify the appropriate officials who are administering the program; identify any closely related programs; and provide any other information which the Comptroller General may feel is necessary to a complete understanding of the scope and purpose of the research program.

An annual catalog, containing a sum-



mary of all except classified matter, would be published by the Comptroller General after the Data Bank had been in operation for 12 months.

Every year Congress is asked to approve new research activities, even though its members have no idea of how many similar programs already exist. Before we embark upon any more ventures in research we ought to set up a

systematic method of coordinating and evaluating the mountain of data that has previously been collected at Federal expense.

A tabulation that I have prepared shows the amounts that were obligated for research in the fiscal years 1973 and 1974 and the sums that will be obligated for fiscal 1975, broken down by departments and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Committee on Government Operations, to which my bill was referred, to schedule hearings on H.R. 145 at an early date. The National Research Data Bank is a necessity if we are to be able to appropriate wisely for research and if the research is to be readily available to those whom it is intended to benefit.

The tabulation follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	1973 actual	1974 estimate	1975 estimate		1973 actual	1974 estimate	1975 estimate
<b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY FUNCTIONS</b>				<b>Energy:</b>			
Conduct of research and development:				Reactor research and development.....	256	290	350
Research, development, test, and evaluation:				Controlled thermonuclear research.....	37	53	82
Military sciences.....	457	426	431	Nuclear materials (production).....	33	40	44
Aircraft and related equipment.....	1,881	1,658	1,832	Applied energy technology.....	10	15	12
Missiles and related equipment.....	2,141	2,112	2,340	Other programs.....	9	9	12
Military astronautics and related equipment.....	421	594	525	Reactor safety research.....	34	41	48
Ships, small craft, and related equipment.....	634	633	726	Physical research.....	241	250	268
Ordnance, combat vehicles, and related equipment.....	381	460	512	Biomedical and environmental research.....	93	98	112
Other equipment.....	1,548	1,687	2,090	Space nuclear systems.....	39	26	27
Programwide management and support.....	525	592	712	Research and development facilities.....	348	387	411
Other appropriations.....	394	411	413				
Research and development facilities.....	146	201	189	Total obligations.....	1,710	1,816	1,997
Total obligations.....	8,528	8,774	9,770	<b>NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION</b>			
<b>NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION</b>				Conduct of research and development.....	480	530	549
Conduct of research and development:				Research and development facilities.....	57	39	49
Manned space flight.....	1,136	1,056	1,125	Total obligations.....	537	569	598
Space sciences.....	662	588	540	<b>DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</b>			
Space applications.....	205	175	184	Conduct of research and development.....	311	358	396
Space and nuclear research and technology.....	82	69	75	Research and development facilities.....	38	32	20
Aeronautical research and technology.....	151	168	166	Total obligations.....	349	390	417
Supporting activities.....	252	149	256	<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>			
Research and program management.....	722	745	750	Conduct of research and development.....	371	393	412
Research and development facilities.....	79	101	151	Research and development facilities.....	3	11	8
Total budget plan.....	3,289	3,151	3,247	Total obligations.....	374	404	420
Total obligations.....	3,154	3,442	3,278	<b>DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE</b>				Conduct of research and development.....	254	287	345
Conduct of research and development:				Research and development facilities.....	26	88	55
National Institutes of Health.....	1,338	1,745	1,662	Total obligations.....	280	375	400
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration.....	122	157	129	<b>DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE</b>			
National Institute of Education.....	107	101	130	Conduct of research and development.....	191	210	266
Health Resources Administration.....	53	61	71	Research and development facilities.....	8	12	11
Office of Education.....	58	55	115	Total obligations.....	199	222	277
Social and Rehabilitation Service.....	53	50	33	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</b>			
Food and Drug Administration.....	30	35	38	Conduct of research and development.....	181	174	150
Center for Disease Control.....	33	38	34	Research and development facilities.....	23	13	150
Social Security Administration.....	18	25	27	Total obligations.....	204	187	150
Office of the Secretary.....	21	21	34	<b>DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</b>			
Assistant Secretary for Human Development.....	12	15	24	Conduct of research and development:			
Health Services Administration.....	12	12	12	Veterans' Administration.....	74	85	94
Assistant Secretary for Health.....	8	16	18	Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	58	65	70
Research and development facilities.....	43	71	33	Department of Justice.....	35	52	56
Total obligations.....	1,887	2,403	2,261	All other.....	176	132	128
<b>ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION</b>				Research and development facilities—All other.....	15	24	25
Conduct of research and development:				Total obligations.....	358	358	373
National security:				Grand total obligations.....	17,578	18,940	19,942
Weapons research.....	61	58	59				
Weapons development and testing.....	394	383	393				
Naval reactor development.....	149	154	162				
Waste management.....	6	12	17				

<sup>1</sup> Reflects the transfer of certain research functions to revenue sharing accounts.

<sup>2</sup> Reflects the transfer of certain research functions from the Social and Rehabilitation Service to the Assistant Secretary for Human Development and the Office of the Secretary.

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

## CONSUMERS REPORTS ENDORSES PURE FISH BILL

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn that the editors of Consumer Reports have endorsed H.R. 10150, the Pure Fish and Fishery Prod-

ucts Act of 1973, which I introduced last year.

They correctly point out that the need for this legislation is no less important than that which led to the establishment of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's meat inspection program.

I include herewith Consumer Reports' statement on H.R. 10150, and a related article about frozen shrimp which, I believe, indicates the need for this legislation. I commend the following, which

appeared in the March issue of Consumers Reports, to those of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD who appreciate the bounty the sea has to offer:

### WHY FISHERY INSPECTION BILLS FOUNDER

Bills calling for mandatory sanitary inspection of fishery vessels and plants usually surface in Congress every year, often in both houses. Without fail, they sink without a trace by the session's end. There is mandatory continuous Federal inspection of meat and poultry—why not of seafood?

The industry lobbies violently against such regulation. Its arguments have been successful, apparently, for two reasons:

1. Because the whole processing-distribution system, from boat to wharf to plant to wholesale storage to retail sale, is unwieldy, and the Federal Government seems reluctant to implement so widespread a regulatory administration.

2. Because, in contrast to the large national production of meat and poultry, imported fish and shellfish almost double the domestic catch, and much of the foreign production could not be regulated.

But just because much of the seafood comes from other countries is no excuse for us not to impose quality controls on what is sold here. Only one arm of Federal enforcement, the Food and Drug Administration, now has any real power to supervise the quality of seafood sold in interstate commerce or imported from foreign countries. Once in a while, FDA inspectors may examine foreign shipments unloading in U.S. ports. Once in a while is not enough to check out shrimp caught, for example, in India, shipped to Mexico for processing, and distributed here as a Mexican product. Once in a great while, the FDA has recalled a bad batch of shrimp shipped interstate.

Last fall, another bill was introduced in the House by Representative Jonathan B. Bingham (D., N.Y.) aimed at giving the FDA broad authority to regulate the harvesting, processing, and retailing of fish and shellfish. CU strongly endorses the bill (H.R. 10150). In essence, it would:

Prohibit the sale of fishery products beyond a specified expiration date and require this date to show on the label.

Require retailers to store fish products at proper temperatures and prohibit the sale of refrigerated fish products.

Call for the grading of all fish products.

Convert the voluntary program of the National Shellfish Sanitation Program into a mandatory program under which both harvester and processor must operate.

Authorize the FDA to establish standards at which waters should be placed off-limits to harvesters, these standards to include metallic contaminants and coliform bacteria levels.

Provide for mandatory surveillance over all phases of fish production by giving the FDA the authority to inspect fishing vessels, processing establishments, and sales outlets.

As long as there is greater demand for shrimp than there is supply, voluntary self-regulation will not encourage industry to improve product quality. Immediate passage of H.R. 10150, or a similar bill, would be a long-overdue step toward that end.

#### WHO WILL MEND THE FROZEN-FOOD DISTRIBUTION CHAIN?

That's a poser. Give some credit to a group of Federal, state, and local health officials without legal clout—the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the U.S. (AFDOUS). Back in 1961, AFDOUS adopted a frozen-food code that requires frozen foods to be maintained, with small tolerances, at 0° F from packager to consumer. Applaud also the few states that have made the AFDOUS code law.

But debit severely the Federal Government for failing to adopt and legally enforce any proposal that could guarantee citizens wholesome frozen foods. As CU has pointed out over and over, voluntary self-regulation by industry just doesn't work. (CU is preparing a petition to the FDA urging adoption of the AFDOUS standards, with some modifications, as Good Manufacturing Practices for the frozen-food industry.)

The AFDOUS code needs legal teeth beyond the bite of a few states. The food industry's appeals for Good Manufacturing Practices apparently fall on their own deaf ears. One of those voluntary proposals, issued by the Frozen Food Coordinating Com-

mittee, is a statement of purpose to the effect that "industry's goal is to maintain reasonably uniform frozen food product temperatures of zero degrees F or lower and to insure their proper care, from packer to consumer." Sounds familiar.

The American Frozen Food Institute (a member of the Frozen Food Coordinating Committee) has inaugurated a consciousness-raising program, a "Mark of Zero" sticker campaign. Packers can buy "Mark of Zero" stickers at cost and put them on cartons of frozen-food products to remind handlers to keep the temperature at zero. The National Fisheries Institute also industry-based, helps promote the "Mark of Zero" campaign and, more significantly, supports legislation for mandatory periodic inspection of fishery products.

If industry really wants to safeguard frozen foods in transit and storage, there are low-cost devices that will do a far more effective job: little temperature indicators to be attached to each package before it's frozen. Freezing, usually at -30°F, turns one type of indicator yellow, for example. If the temperature of the package ever goes above 0° F, or any preset temperature, the indicator turns red—and remains red—warning handlers, retailers, and consumers that the contents have suffered a quality loss.

Why haven't you seen those simple temperature monitors on the frozen foods you bring home? Not just because it might cost the manufacturer a few cents per package, surely little enough to pay for the assurance of good quality on a high-cost item like shrimp. But because you obviously wouldn't buy red-flagged packages, nor would the retailer accept delivery of them. Someone has to absorb the cost of the damaged packages, and no one's ready to do it. The best hope is that the Food and Drug Administration will police the distribution chain, as outlined in a proposed Fishery Inspection bill, which follows:

#### FROZEN SHRIMP

The less that happens to a shrimp—from the time it hits the trawler's deck to the moment you thaw it in your kitchen—the better it's likely to taste. It's just common sense: Once a shrimp is taken out of its natural habitat, its quality as a food deteriorates rapidly. To retain as much natural flavor and texture as possible, shrimp must be handled as little as possible, frozen quickly, and kept at a constant low temperature during distribution. So at every step along the way—harvesting, processing, distributing—time and temperature control are of the essence.

This judgment is borne out by CU's test results. The only shrimp tested that earned respectable Ratings judgments were *shell-on shrimp*—four out of the five brands were rated Good to Very Good or better. Their processing time is the shortest, devoted only to freezing and packaging. Judged far inferior as a group were 17 brands of *raw-peeled shrimp*; their production takes an extra step or two. *Cooked-peeled shrimp* spend even more time being processed and are also more susceptible to storage changes, which presumably accounts for the wretched showing of the six brands tested.

It did not seem to make a great deal of difference whether the shrimp came from U.S. waters or were imported, though the labeling often did not state the country of origin, so we could not be sure. The U.S. produces about 55 per cent of the shrimp sold here annually, harvested mainly from the continental shelves of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and from the Gulf of Mexico. Imports come from many sources—mainly Mexico, Central and South America, and India. But the distance a shrimp travels is apparently far less crucial in determining quality than the care with which it is han-

dled in harvesting, processing, and distribution.

Why is processed shrimp—the seafood industry's most valuable product—so uniformly disappointing? If we take a close look at the shrimp's sea-to-supper journey, it will be clear—perfectly clear, unfortunately.

#### HARVESTING

Harvesting methods vary according to the distance from port, the trawler's facilities, and the size of the trawler's hold. Generally, the catch is emptied on the deck, where the shrimp are separated from trash fish and other undesirables. In southern waters, where the air and deck temperatures can get extremely hot, the shrimp are beheaded immediately, washed by the basketfull in sea water, and layered in ice in the trawler's hold.

If the shrimp boats are so small that they return to port each night, the day's catch may not be iced this way—it is sold immediately at dockside to processors' agents. Many larger vessels carry sufficient crushed ice to permit them to stay on the fishing grounds for a week or more. Even more modern are trawlers with refrigerated holds. The shrimp they deliver aren't awash in ice water.

Though these harvesting procedures vary, it is obvious that once the delicate shrimp are swept out of the sea, they are prey to mishandling. Exposed to air too long on the deck, they can develop black spot, a discoloration of the shell that mottles the flesh unpleasantly and is a signal to wholesale buyers that the shrimp may be partially spoiled. Later, down in the holding pens, other defects may develop to impair part or all of a catch's overall quality and wholesomeness: off-flavors and off-odors specified by the terms "bilgy," "fishy," and "putrid."

Bilginess results from bacterial enzymatic action encouraged by packing shrimp so tightly in the holding pen that the cold air can't circulate. But even when there is enough oxygen present, aerobic bacteria in the shrimp may promote an objectionable fishy odor and flavor. Still other bacteria are responsible for a putrid flavor.

Again, time and temperature are the crucial factors; defects are most likely to develop when the shrimp are refrigerated for a long time or held for a shorter time but at higher temperatures. Since a trawler's total catch over a number of days is often processed at one time, all the harvesting defects are not likely to come together in a single box or bag. You may simply get a shrimp or two that lay at the edge of the pen, poorly iced, or a few bilgy shrimp deprived of air at the bottom of the heap.

#### PROCESSING AND DISTRIBUTION

When shrimp arrive at a processing plant, they're washed free of ice and put on a conveyor for plant inspectors to look over (they remove broken, discolored, and decomposed shrimp, as well as any extraneous matter). On the same ride, mechanical graders separate the shrimp, generally into four size categories: jumbo, large, medium, and small. From here, the shell-on shrimp are simply beheaded (if the heads aren't already off), packed in waxed paperboard cartons, weighed, and frozen. After freezing, the shrimp are usually given an extra spray of water to lock them into a block of ice designed to keep them from drying out.

Peeled shrimp go through additional steps—shelling and deveining, procedures usually performed by machines. (Cooked shrimp may be peeled and deveined either before or after the cooking.) Prior to freezing, they're soaked in a phosphate solution, commonly sodium tripolyphosphate, to prevent dehydration during storage. Most peeled shrimp, whether raw or cooked, are frozen individually on metal trays and are packaged in plastic bags.

At least, that's how the processing is supposed to go. But there are many obvious op-



opportunities for foul-ups. Casual inspection of the about-to-be-processed shrimp may not weed out those with evident harvesting defects. Again, careless handling of shrimp that have been peeled and deveined may allow damaged shrimp, pieces of shell, bits of vein, even whole legs or heads to wind up in the final packaged product.

Should the shrimp get too long a bath of sodium tripolyphosphate, their cooked texture will be undesirable. And if imported frozen shell-on shrimp are thawed for peeling and deveining and then refrozen, they suffer an additional quality loss.

Another weak link in the processing chain is the indifferent way in which many batches of shrimp are graded for size. Unless the mechanical grader is strictly supervised, a package of shrimp labeled large, for example, may yield some large, some small, and some minuscule. There are instances, also, of packaging that fails to seal the frozen shrimp from dehydration.

Once the shrimp leave the processing plant they have to be stored—first in refrigerated warehouses, then in transit in refrigerated trucks, and finally in the retailer's freezer cabinets. At every stage of this distribution cycle it's essential that the storage temperature be held below 0° F.

Under good conditions, even carefully processed frozen shrimp deteriorate with time. Under haphazard storage conditions, with fluctuating or above-zero temperatures, wholesomeness and quality fall off rapidly: protein breakdown turns the flesh tough, fibrous, and rubbery; fat oxidation produces salt-fish or rancid flavors as well as strong odors; a change of color, known as yellowing, shows up after cooking as the shrimp take on a jaundiced look.

#### BUT WHO CARES?

There is no mandatory inspection by the U.S. of the sanitary conditions on fishing vessels or in processing plants; nor is there any mandatory grade labeling at the plant. There is no Federally enforced method of ensuring proper storage temperatures throughout the wholesale and retail chain. There is not even a simple legal requirement that every package leaving the plant bear a clearly visible processing date.

What is there, then? A voluntary grade standard established by the U.S. Department of Commerce for frozen shell-on shrimp and a voluntary plant-inspection program. "Voluntary" means just that. If a processor wishes to have his plant inspected and his shell-on shrimp graded for quality, he invites—and pays—an official of the National Marine Fisheries Service of the USDC's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to do it. Naturally, few packers will issue such an invitation so long as they can sell all the shrimp they can get their hands on.

#### WHAT WE FOUND

CU shoppers bought 28 brands that our market survey of 20 cities throughout the country indicated are most widely available shell-on, raw-peeled, and cooked-and-peeled. Immediately after purchase, the samples were packed with dry ice in insulated hamper and air-shipped to CU's food laboratory. On arrival, they were promptly transferred to freezers set below 0° F for the time needed to code each sample for testing by CU's consultants.

Evaluating 11 or 12 samples of each brand, CU's seafood consultants checked out and scored their physical defects when frozen, when thawed, and when cooked. Then came the all-important sensory tests; and odor and flavor must be the chief criteria for judging shrimp quality. It was possible, in these sensory tests, to pinpoint the odor and taste defects and trace their origin. Thus, if the Ratings downgrade certain brands for bilgeousness, fishiness, or for putrid off-flavors and odors, blame poor harvesting procedures. Damaged and broken shrimp are

processing defects. Rancidity and fishy flavor and odor can result from improper storage.

By the time we finished compiling the physical and sensory defects, there was very little good to be said for any of the shrimp tested, except the shell-on type. The Ratings tell the sorry story.

#### TESTS FOR WHOLESOMENESS

Two samples of each shrimp brand rated were given a microbiological examination. The tests included a total plate count of all the bacteria present (to assess the product's overall sanitary quality) and tests for streptococci, coliforms, and *Escherichia coli* (more specific indicators of fecal contamination). We also ran tests for staphylococci, generally associated with food poisoning.

Coliform bacteria usually do not survive in the frozen state; fecal streptococci are far harder. Thus, while the *E. coli* and coliform counts were negligible (and the staphylococci too), the Ratings note where both samples of a shrimp brand turned out to have total plate counts and fecal streptococci contamination higher than we believe should occur in wholesome food products.

Many of our bacteriological findings were corroborated by sensory judgments. Off-flavors, off-odors, and quality deterioration are the natural result of bacteriological activity.

There's been concern recently over the presence of heavy metals—mercury, arsenic, lead, and cadmium—in seafood. The FDA has already set a tolerance of 0.5 parts per million for mercury in fish. In the chemical analyses, every sample of shrimp scored well below the FDA mercury limit, and although there are not as yet official limits of arsenic, lead, and cadmium for fish and shellfish, all our shrimp had low and probably tolerable levels of those.

#### WHAT LITTLE YOU CAN COUNT ON

Since processors generally package their shell-on shrimp in cartons, you have no way of knowing what you're getting unless the carton or its wrapper spells out the number of shrimp and their size. Even then, if the inconsistent sizing that we encountered is typical, you may not get just exactly what you want.

A voluntary grade standard for raw, shell-on shrimp specifies the number of shrimp per pound in eleven size designations. For example, jumbo shrimp should mean 21 to 25 shrimp to the pound; large, 31 to 35; medium, 43 to 50; and small, 51 to 60. Only two of our boxed, shell-on shrimp brands described the shrimp size, but neither gave the count. In the Ratings, we list the range of shrimp per pound for every brand tested.

Peeled shrimp, both raw and cooked, came in printed plastic bags, so you can look them over before you buy. But some of the bags reveal less than we think they should. We'd like to see all such shrimp packaged so at least half of one side is clear, see-through plastic. Often what you don't see is a lot of odd-sized shrimp.

While looking through the foggy bag, note whether the shrimp are separate or in a clump. Most shrimp are individually frozen. Such shrimp should be clearly separate. A clump of shrimp sticking together suggests thawing, then refreezing. Avoid such packages. (The Ratings note which of our shrimp claimed to be individually frozen.)

#### SHRIMP AND NUTRITION

Shrimp is a good source of easily digested protein and, because of its low fat content, is a dieter's friend. A four-ounce serving, which contains about 100 calories, should provide an adult male with nearly one-third of his Recommended Daily Allowance for protein. He also gets phosphorus (25 per cent of his RDA), iron (18 per cent), calcium (nearly 10 percent), and niacin (21 per cent). Unfortunately for those who have to limit their intake of cholesterol, shrimp is loaded with it—about 140 milligrams in four ounces. (Four ounces of red meat, by comparison,

provides about 80 mg. of cholesterol. The American Heart Association suggests limiting the intake of shellfish to not more than four ounces twice a week.)

#### THE CLOUDED PRICE PICTURE

In the months since we bought our shrimp, the food-price picture has gone completely out of focus, and so has the general availability of shrimp itself. Though the world's yearly shrimp catch has not diminished in quantity, less is reaching the U.S. retail market, and prices are higher than those we paid last year.

Shortly before this issue went to press, we surveyed the Metropolitan New York area and found that prices for raw, peeled shrimp ranged from 18 to 53 per cent higher than those we paid for the same shrimp earlier in 1973. Price hikes for cooked-and-peeled shrimp ranged from 13 to 30 per cent. (We weren't able to price any of the raw, shell-on shrimp brands because we couldn't find similar package sizes.) Thus, we cannot provide realistic prices in the Ratings. One thing is clear, though: there is no relationship between cost and quality or between cost and shrimp size.

The Ratings show that you get many more cooked-peeled shrimp per pound (154 to 462) than you do of the other types we tested. They are obviously much smaller shrimp. This is typical of cooked shrimp and comes about because (1) the smaller sizes are more easily peeled after cooking, (2) they end with a cooked texture more uniform than the larger sizes, and (3) the larger sizes would become too expensive when processed this way.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

If you buy shell-on frozen shrimp, you're likely to get reasonably good quality, though you take a chance on the size and number you'll find in a given package. True, you have to go through the nuisance of shelling and deveining. But that should be worth the trouble if you really like shrimp. Shrimp frozen with the shell on is as close as you'll come to the flavor and texture of fresh-caught shrimp. With frozen peeled shrimp, whether cooked or raw, you won't get anything near the real thing, judging by our samples.

#### KHJ-TV EDITORIAL ON VETERANS CEMETERIES

##### HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial which recently appeared on KHJ-TV in Los Angeles concerning the burial of our veterans. I believe that the situation described merits our earliest attention.

The editorial follows:

We find that the number of veterans of America's wars who are by law entitled to burial in places like Arlington National Cemetery or a Sawtelle in West Los Angeles now goes into the millions. Of course, there is an even greater problem: there is no more room in those national cemeteries. We at KHJ-TV believe it is a national disgrace that no action is being taken to meet this urgent need. Many believe that the greatness of a nation can be observed in the way it either honors or fails to honor its war dead. In a land where the Federal Government owns vast areas of unused land we can see no excuse for not providing appropriate facilities for a final resting place for those men and women who so often at great cost have served our country. It is

the least we can do, and we urge our viewers who agree to call upon their elected Representatives to support those measures now before the Congress to do something about it.

# **AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS: A WAY TO END RACISM IN EDUCATION**

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps all of my colleagues will examine the William Raspberry article appearing in the March 15 issue of the Washington Post which emphasizes an attack not just on present racism, but on the effects of historical racism:

## **FIGHTING CAMPUS DISCRIMINATION**

(By William Raspberry)

It may be awkward to talk about blacks and Jews having been civil rights allies for so long, but it has to be said: The fight against "affirmative action" programs designed to help blacks and other minorities into the American mainstream is being led by Jews.

It first became noticeable in 1972 when the American Jewish Committee launched its attack on "quotas," and it has reached something of a peak with the DeFunis law school "reverse discrimination" case now pending before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Not only is DeFunis himself reportedly a Sephardic Jew, but pro-DeFunis *amicus curiae* briefs have been filed by the Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith and the Jewish Rights Council. In addition, there has been less formal support by a number of other Jewish organizations and individuals.

On the other side are arrayed the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the National Conference of Black Lawyers, the NOW Legal Defense Fund and the American Indian Lawyers Association.

Why the rift between these groups and the Jewish community, long considered their "natural" ally? Perhaps the "why" is easier to divine if attention is paid to the "when." The Jewish-led assaults on quotas and other "affirmative action" efforts reached their current intensity when the equal-rights fight moved from the hiring halls and government offices to the halls of academe.

For a number of reasons, some cultural and some, no doubt, stemming indirectly from anti-Semitism, Jews are on America's campuses—as students and as faculty—out of all proportion to their numbers in the general society.

And it may be that attempts at making the campuses more representative of the country are seen by Jews as attacks upon their special preserve. The AJC's antiquota campaign, for instance, coincided with what was seen as a HEW push to get more blacks on university faculties. The DeFunis complaint is that he was passed over for law school admission in favor of blacks and Chicanos who scored less than he on the entrance tests.

Jews and Jewish groups were among the supporters of "affirmative action" when it meant opening up jobs and promotions for nonwhites. (It is well to remember that even in the early days, "affirmative action" meant more than mere colorblind nondiscrimination.)

But when "affirmative action" went to college, it suddenly dawned on Jews that it is

not possible to cure one group's underrepresentation without affecting another's overrepresentation. And that, we are told, is "reverse discrimination."

Fortunately, the debate is not simply between blacks and Jews; increasingly it is coming through that Jews themselves are not of a single mind on the question of "affirmative action."

Joseph Rauh Jr., protesting what he sees as a "slow but perceptible swing to the right" among his fellow Jews, has taken a strong stand in favor of "affirmative action." So, too, have the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the National Council of Jewish Women.

Listen to the latter two groups on the DeFunis case: "In our opinion, the Marco DeFunis case against the University of Washington represents neither a case of discrimination on the part of the university nor a quota case against Jews."

"We believe that the risks of discretionary preferences—though real—are not so large as the risks of endangering all necessary affirmative action programs to bring disadvantaged and minority groups into the mainstream of educational life."

"As Jews we must continue to fight for all of our rights and causes. However, our long history for social justice demands that we not turn our backs on other minority groups seeking the same advantages so long withheld from them."

"Eliminating the blot of national racism in our country requires sacrifice and accommodation by all Americans so that future generations will be free of this bitter horror. We do not believe that Jewish groups should seek to undermine legitimate affirmative action programs by equating them with 'quotas' and 'reverse discrimination' where such charges are not warranted by the facts."

That is a strong, gutsy statement. It may, with luck, help to refocus the debate on the real issue: the necessity of attacking not just present racism but the effects of historical racism.

Some people may conclude that nothing can be done about the past. But if they do, let them say so straight out and not play semantical games about the differences between "quotas" and "affirmative action" and "reverse discrimination."

## **THE INDEPENDENT BUSINESS—AN ENDANGERED SPECIES**

**HON. RICHARD T. HANNA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, among the many problems which directly or indirectly stem from the current petroleum shortfall is the shortage of petrochemical feedstocks and the resulting crisis in the plastics industry. I know that the members of the California delegation have been receiving numerous pleas for help from plastic fabricators. Since last fall thousands of our constituents have lost jobs in this industry only because the raw materials were not available to their employers. Many of us have consulted the Cost of Living Council, the Commerce Department, and the Federal Energy Office to determine what could be done about the shortage of petrochemicals. The results of the inquiries have been confusing and frus-

trating. Data supplied by these agencies on a national scale indicate something quite different than the reality of layoffs experienced in our communities. We naturally wonder, if the national supply of petrochemicals is adequate and if there has been no dramatic increase in exports, why are the companies we hear from not able to get supplies?

The answer to this question came to my office in the past few days and is, I feel, an important indicator of the kind of economic failing that will be experienced by other sectors in the future. What is happening in the plastics industry is that the independent fabricators are being denied supplies by the large chemical companies who turn petrochemical feedstocks into petrochemicals. These companies continue to produce petrochemicals but supply them to their own fabricating plants first. They either undersupply or in some cases refuse any supplies to independent fabricators. As a result, whatever extent of petrochemical feedstock shortage exists, the independent plastics manufacturer bears the entire brunt of that shortage while the larger chemical company continues to fully supply its affiliates.

If we look at the production cycle one step back we find the same phenomenon. Petrochemical feedstocks are produced by the major oil companies as part of the overall crude oil refining process. The major oil companies not only own the crude, own the refineries and its products, but in many cases own chemical plants which produce petrochemicals. They make sure that their plants receive feedstocks, at the expense, in many cases, of independent chemical companies. These chemical companies in turn discriminate against independent fabricators in preference to their own.

What we see here is horizontal integration where one large corporation is in a commanding position in each of the several stages of the economic process of turning crude oil into usable consumer products.

At each stage in this process we find independent operators bearing the entire weight of shortages and going out of business. This obviously reduces competition to an unhealthy degree. I submit to my colleagues that this phenomenon we see today throughout the petroleum cycle will be seen over and over in the years to come as other basic raw materials come into short supply.

I have had the opportunity to raise this general problem with Mr. Simon at a recent meeting of the California delegation. Mr. Simon's response was, while not altogether positive, at least instructive. As far as the refining is concerned and the gasoline retailing, FEO regulations are intended to protect the independent operator by requiring the majors to supply them at prescribed allocation levels. The delegation tried to make clear to the Director that regulations and performance are two different things and that the facts indicate that independents are going out of business every day for lack of supply. It is obvious that FEO lacks the police force to effectively ad-



minister and enforce its will on the major oil companies. Given the diversity of the petroleum industries, especially when you get to the plastic fabricating level, the situation may defy policing in the normal sense of the term.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that there are two directions in which the Congress needs to move in order to remedy this problem. First of all, we must look at the existing petroleum allocation authority. Mr. Simon, Director of the Federal Energy Office maintains that FEO authority ends with the refining of the petrochemical feedstock. He says that his mission extends only to energy-related petroleum products and that the feedstocks are not energy-related. If this interpretation is valid, then the Congress is guilty of an oversight. We can correct that oversight by revision of the petroleum allocation authority to encompass all petroleum by-products.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce take a very careful look at this phenomenon in light of an existing antitrust statute. We still hold out the goal of maintaining a competitive marketplace as the best protection for consumers. We may very well find that we are entering a period analogous to that of a century ago when natural economic forces were found to be contrary to the public interest. Surely we can all agree that the Congress should not allow independent operators in any of the petroleum-related activities to be leveraged out of business by larger competitors who dominate the entire production cycle.

#### RUINING OUR YOUTH FOR A PROFIT

#### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the prime purpose of growing opium-poppies in Turkey has been in recent years the addiction and ruination of the lives of young Americans for a profit.

There has been no question about this. Both the Government of Turkey and our own have admitted it and commendably, have tried since 1971 to do something to correct it.

The task has not been easy, because the drug-producing poppies long constituted an easy and highly enriching cash crop for Turkish farmers. The pods were reaped and then sold to middlemen who sent them moving through the nefarious narcotics system to turn up as heroin in the dark streets and back alleys of our country.

Facing this problem, we, in customary fashion, tried to use tax money to recruit the assistance of the Turkish Government in diverting the efforts of poppy growers to other crops. Some \$35.7 mil-

lion was pledged to compensate the Government for lost revenues and to make up losses to the farmers.

But now, Mr. Speaker, we learn that this program is heading for collapse. The Turkish farmer appears far less interested today in what happens to certain of our youth than he does his own pocketbook. He has put political pressure on the newly elected Prime Minister Bulet Ecevit and he, in turn, is ready to get the opium-poppy production under way again.

According to a Scripps-Howard report, word of this has been given our officials by Turkey's ambassador, Melith Esenbel, who is quoted as saying that Prime Minister Ecevit intends to honor his campaign pledge to the Turkish farm voters to resume poppy growing.

Ambassador Esenbel, a true diplomat, added some gloss to the picture, however. He explained, the Scripps-Howard story said, that the Prime Minister's intention is to limit the matter to a strictly supervised seed production on Government farms. But no one here needs to be fooled for a moment. Who will get these seeds? They will go to the poppy growers and will be sown in due time and the problem for us will be back where it was before the 1971 deal was made.

What can we do about it? We have no right, certainly, to interfere except by persuasion in the affairs of another sovereign state and, if Turkish politics dictates a revival of poppy growing for the U.S. drug market, then that can be considered Turkey's business. But, fortunately, there is something we can do beyond protesting. We can stop playing sucker to this nation which shows so little concern for us.

Government reports show we gave Turkey in 1971, the year the antipoppy program started, a total of \$171 million in outright foreign aid, largely gifts and grants for which no repayment was expected. This figure, so I am told, has been increased annually since then, because of Turkey's supposed cooperation with us. In addition, Turkey has been getting \$60 to \$70 million a year from us in direct military assistance as a so-called NATO ally. Right now, according to Scripps-Howard, the country is seeking \$170 million in credits here for the purchase of two squadrons of U.S.-built F4 Phantom jets.

Thus it is clear that we Americans do have more than an appeal on humane grounds to make to Prime Minister Ecevit and his Government on the poppy issue. We can stop our handouts on the proper assessment that any country which has so little regard for us as to seek to profit from one of our most critical problems has no right to on free U.S. dollar. We have helped Turkey in the past in the belief that her friendship had value to us and to the free world generally. But this all seems hollow now. What good is a supposed friend who would help destroy thousands of our youngsters?

I call upon our aid people to shut off the giveaways to Turkey the very mo-

ment we have evidence of a new Turkish opium-poppy crop being planted.

#### MAIL HANDLING NEEDS COMPETITION

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Americans are becoming increasingly accustomed to higher postal rates and a steadily deteriorating Postal Service. Under a Government monopoly in the area of first-class mail delivery we have been subjected to the typical results of bureaucratic management: inefficiency.

At one time all postal boxes received collections after 5 p.m. Today, only 50 percent of them are collected after 5 p.m. Saturday mail deliveries may now be curtailed in downtown city areas. When CARE, the international relief organization, tried to rush into the mail a postcard appeal for funds to aid victims of Nicaragua's Christmas earthquake the result was that eight carloads of mail were mislaid for 9 days. By the time they were located, the earthquake was no longer big news and the response indicated this. The U.S. Postal Service is still trying to find out what happened. Stories such as this, unfortunately, are legion.

Postal Service, with respect to first-class mail, remains a Government monopoly. Discussing this fact John L. Ryan, former chairman of the U.S. Postal Rate Commission, testified before the House Subcommittee on Postal Service that—

The business of the Postal Service is part monopoly and part competitive. There is competition . . . for most fourth and third class mail; second class will become competitive as increases bring prices to the threshold which will permit a profit. Letter mail, for our purposes first-class, is protected by a statutory monopoly and has no direct competition.

The first-class postal monopoly means, in simple terms, that Americans pay more for less service. Mr. Ryan noted that—

When Postal Service costs increase . . . they petition the Rate Commission for price increases to redress the imbalance. From a practical point of view, the price level of the competitive services has been set by the market. If competitors' costs have also gone up there may be some leeway, but experience has indicated it will be small. Any income requirement that cannot be produced by these competitive services falls on first-class. Since the Postal Service was organized, its costs seem to have increased faster than its competitors.

Mr. Ryan urges an end to the Government monopoly with respect to the delivery of first-class mail. He points out that—

Open competition has always been the condition which best serves the customer, short of compelling theoretical or practical evidence to the contrary. Such evidence has not been produced concerning mail service.

In any case, it is not properly up to the proponents of competition to prove their case. It is up to the monopolists to prove the case for monopoly, and I don't believe that they can do so.

The time has come to end this unfortunate Government monopoly. To this end, I have introduced H.R. 433 which would serve this important purpose.

At this time I wish to share with my colleagues these excerpts from the testimony of John L. Ryan, former Chairman of the U.S. Postal Rate Commission, before the House Subcommittee on Postal Service on January 24, 1974:

#### MAIL HANDLING NEEDS COMPETITION

(By John L. Ryan)

(The following is excerpted from testimony given before the House Subcommittee on Postal Service on Jan. 24, 1974, by Mr. Ryan, former chairman of the United States Postal Rate Commission.)

It appears to be the impression of many people that, by the application of skill, knowledge and hard work, the Postal Rate Commission can somehow hold down postal rates and improve service; it cannot. It cannot even apply much independent judgment as to what individual rates should be and, in my opinion, should not have such powers beyond the current extent. It can, and I believe has already, made some imaginative contributions in the matter of mail classifications, but in the matter of rates and services, it is limited by real circumstances it can't and should not be able to control.

The business of the Postal Service is part monopoly and part competitive. There is competition, both direct and indirect, for most fourth and third-class mail; second-class will become competitive as increases bring prices to the threshold which will permit a profit. Letter mail, for our purposes first-class, is protected by a statutory monopoly and has no direct competition. The variable costs of many of the large volume classes are intermixed and cannot be definitively separated.

When Postal Service costs increase to the extent that expense will significantly exceed income, they petition the Rate Commission for price increases to redress the imbalance. From a practical point of view, the price level of the competitive services has been set by the market. If competitors' costs have also gone up there may be some leeway, but experience has indicated it will be small. Any income requirement that cannot be produced by these competitive services falls on first-class. Since the Postal Service was organized its costs seem to have increased faster than its competitors.

#### SPECIAL RATES

The situation is further complicated by all kinds of special rates, the nature of the Postal Service's costs, the condition and accuracy of their record and date collection, their interpretation of cost attribution. But these are simply decorations on the regulatory cake.

The Commission cannot set rates above competition without pricing the Service out of that particular market. This would reduce volume, the costs of which are mixed with other classes and cannot be reduced proportionately, producing higher costs for the other services. Higher costs would then require higher prices, forcing one service after another out of existence, until only the monopoly service was left.

The Commission can alternatively hold competitive prices at market levels and absorb the balance of increased expense in the monopoly service. But that is a fairly simple procedure requiring limited judgment. And I see no way to really wiggle out from this dilemma with a satisfactory solution under current conditions.

It seems to me there are only four choices: (1) Abandon the break-even concept of the Postal Reorganization Act which will throw much of any increase in expense on the backs of the taxpayers; (2) Continue as we are going, which will increasingly load a larger burden on the first-class mailers; (3) Put all of the Postal Service's product lines under statutory monopoly protection; (4) Remove the monopoly protection from letter mail and allow competition across the board, at the same time freeing the Postal Service itself from monopoly requirements.

If there are proponents of 1, 2, 3, they can argue their own case. To me the last choice is so persuasive that it is really the only one. It will reduce mailing costs to the general mailer and improve service to everyone.

Official comments by legislators, letters to the editor, a wide variety of public sources indicate mail service is unsatisfactory. In addition to paving the way to the solution of the rate dilemma described above, I am convinced that real progress in mail service can only come when the law is revised in such a way as to permit private persons to compete with the Postal Service in the collection and delivery of letter mail. (It is my understanding that H.R. 433, introduced in January 1973, by Rep. Philip Crane, R-Ill., if passed into law, would produce this result.)

I believe that under all but very unusual market conditions free competition provides better customer service at a lower price than monopoly and regulation. In fact, public utility regulation came into existence as a proxy for market forces in those unusual conditions economists and legislators came to recognize as producing a natural monopoly, a market condition whereby the lowest cost and best service result from the existence of a single producer.

I do not believe there is any substantive evidence that letter mail service has any of the economic characteristics of a natural monopoly. In fact, there is some historical indication in the statutory monopoly franchise was given the government in the first place to protect the U.S. mails from private competition.

Even if I am wrong and the Postal Service is a natural monopoly with respect to letter mail, no harm will be done by repeal of the private express statutes. In this circumstance, private enterprise will simply fail to compete effectively.

On the other hand, if the processing of letter mail is not a natural monopoly, the existence of competition to the Postal Service will bring to mailers all the advantages of a free market, lower prices, better and more specialized services, choice of patronage, progressive application of innovation and technology.

And further, this situation will improve the lot not only of the mailers, but of the Postal Service itself. There has been demonstrated in our proceedings no conclusive evidence that under current or anticipated capacity rates the Postal Service displays economies of scale, that is decreasing unit costs with increasing volume. It is quite possible that a decrease in volume in letter mail would decrease unit costs, inasmuch as poor customer service strongly suggests that major portions of the letter mail system are operating in excess of optimum capacity. In any case a lower volume would permit more orderly processing regardless of effect on unit cost.

Competition in some utility services in which broad areas of the public have an interest has produced a concept which has been given the pejorative title of "cream skimming," the concentration of service effort to lower-cost areas, to the supposed neglect of higher-cost areas. To the extent that this is thought of as a disadvantage to customers, it can be so only under monopoly. Under open market conditions so-called cream skimming is the very essence of the division

of labor which provides customers with the opportunity to select what is for them the optimum quality at the lowest price, thereby assuring the absence of undue discrimination.

#### FREEDOM OF CHOICE

An example in the postal service area of the value of competition and concomitant division of labor is apparent in the movement of small packages. Here, as you know, the Postal Service does not have a statutory monopoly and competes rather directly with United Parcel Service and a variety of other local and regional common and contract carriers. As a result, the shipper in many areas has a choice of services with different characteristics and can select that most suited for his requirements.

It is also interesting to note that one of the major specific expenditures of the Postal Service toward improvement in service and costs in directed in large part toward parcel shipment, where there is direct competition, and, in balance, toward bulk mail, another class of service in which competition exists. I do not say this in criticism. It is a perfectly proper and beneficial response to competition.

There is no way for me or anyone else to forecast the shape of a market for postal services open across the board to private business and the incentive of competition. I can confidently forecast that in such circumstances in a few years time mail service to the citizens in this country will dramatically improve and in a few more years there will be startling new technology in the way mail is handled. And there will be lower real costs and hence prices for everyone.

Open competition has always been the condition which best serves the customer, short of compelling theoretical or practical evidence to the contrary. Such evidence has not been produced concerning mail service. In any case, it is not properly up to the proponents of competition to prove their case. It is up to the monopolists to prove the case for monopoly, and I don't believe that they can do so.

#### EXTENSION OF FACILITIES ON THE ISLAND OF DIEGO GARCIA

#### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the Defense Department supplemental budget request for fiscal year 1974 (H.R. 12565) contains a provision to build up facilities on the remote United States-United Kingdom island base at Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. The Honorable LEE HAMILTON's Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia was sufficiently concerned about this proposal to hold 5 days of hearings on it. My own Armed Services Committee voted approval of this project and the entire supplemental budget after barely more than 5 hours of hearings.

I believe that the testimony of Earl C. Ravenal before Mr. HAMILTON's subcommittee clearly sets forth the important questions and, as this statement will probably not be published before H.R. 12565 is ramrodded through the House, I would like to take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Ravenal puts it well:

The ultimate question, of which Diego Garcia is only an early test, is whether we



must have a zero-sum world, a symmetrical set of military establishments, an uptight balance of power, a policy that is not subject to our control but is mortgaged to the moves of other nations. If this is not the direction in which the United States ought to go at this juncture of history—and I think it is not—then we do not need this enlarged facility at Diego Garcia.

No one should be under any illusion at all that the Armed Services Committee has taken time to consider this question.

Mr. Ravenal's full statement follows:

AMERICAN STRATEGY IN THE INDIAN OCEAN:  
THE PROPOSED BASE ON DIEGO GARCIA  
(Statement by Earl C. Ravenal)

Mr. Chairman, there has been enough expert testimony so far on the proposed base on Diego Garcia to establish the essential facts within a reasonable range. The United States now operates a modest communications installation on this leased British island, with limited supporting facilities, such as an 8,000 foot airstrip and housing for a small number of personnel. Now the administration proposes to enlarge the base to accommodate additional functions and provide for additional contingencies in the region: It wishes to lengthen the runway to 12,000 feet, deepen the harbor, build additional barracks, and construct oil storage facilities. The administration presents this request as (1) a military convenience, and (2) a geopolitical necessity, to increase our presence and reach in this area, to match expected increases in the Soviet presence as a consequence of the opening of the Suez canal.

Mr. Chairman, the action of this Committee on this administration proposal will not depend on any additional details of fact. Nor should the action of Congress be limited to a debate about this or that particular feature of the proposed military base. Nor is the issue primarily procedural. You have admirably moved to lift the veil of secrecy in which this action has been shrouded by the Pentagon and by the entire Executive Branch for seven years.

And you have rightly insisted that this action be subjected to thorough scrutiny by Congress, and that Congress be fully informed by the Executive, so that it may exercise its responsibility. But, if Congress is satisfied with the formal niceties of information and consultation, then nothing much will have been done. The issue should be considered on its merits, in the light of Congress' conception of the strategic needs of the United States and its conception of the proper role of the United States in the world.

In other words, I think Congress should do two things about this administration request: First, it should be cautious and skeptical about it; that means being wary about estimated costs and about rationales. These are inflatable, unstable, fickle. But caution and skepticism are not enough. Though it is legitimate for Congress to probe a request of this kind and to insist on information, this could easily lead to the abundant provision of information by the Executive Branch, and then to almost inevitable approval by Congress. So, second, Congress should examine this proposal in all its implications for the security position of the United States; and this should mean, I think, rejecting it.

First, I want to talk about the rationale and the cost of this base. I have had some experience with this. The proposal to build a base on Diego Garcia first emerged in the Defense Department in summer 1967. At that time, I was Director of the Asian Division in Systems Analysis, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The proposal came to my department for analysis and recommendation to the Secretary of Defense.

Though the proposal was accompanied by a complete survey by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the possible contingencies that could occur around the arc of the Indian Ocean, and though it mentioned investing this island with a panoply of military facilities, the main thrust was to create an oiling station for carrier task forces transiting from Norfolk, Virginia to battle stations off Vietnam.

We succeeded in demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Defense that it would cost more, and take more time, to refuel at Diego Garcia than out of the Persian Gulf, as we were then doing—and of course we all hoped that this requirement would not last forever. The cost of this proposed facility was about \$26 million. We all thought that, if ever started, the base would eventually cost over \$100 million (and I think we might have been pretty good prophets). In our study we also rebutted the notion that any of the two dozen contingencies mentioned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff would require or respond to the use of Diego Garcia. In some cases it was reasonable to assume that a country that had been attacked would offer us ports, airfields, and staging places if it wanted or deserved our help.

In other cases Diego Garcia, being more than a thousand miles from the tip of India, would be too remote to be of any direct use at all. In still other cases military intervention, from any base, could not control certain kinds of trouble, such as slowly developing political instability. We also pointed out that an American initiative at that time would promote an American-Soviet arms race in yet another geographic area that had, up to this time, been spared that infliction.

Having lost the first round, unexpectedly, the Navy and the Joint Chiefs of Staff decided, the next spring, 1968, to revive the proposal for building a base on Diego Garcia. Meanwhile, over the winter of 1967-68, the Navy had been studying the "Southern Hemisphere" as a new growth area, and urgently wanted to nail down Southern Hemisphere bases, or base rights, principally at Singapore and Diego Garcia. This time the rationale and the bureaucratic setting were different: The proposal to build the \$26 million base was presented as a sort of "Option B," sandwiched between a minimum option—doing nothing—and a maximum option—the whole list of functions originally conceived by the Joint Chiefs of Staff: oil storage, communications, air staging and operations, staging of ground forces, forward basing of submarines and other vessels—at a cost of about \$55 million. The rationale for Option B was two-fold: an "austere" naval communications facility, and a forward base for nuclear submarine deployments. The proposal of the heavy Option C was designed to make Option B, the original request at \$26 million, look good—in fact, look like the obvious statesmanlike and prudent compromise.

Again, my department undertook to hold up our end of the debate. We did another study, once again concluding that no base was necessary; that communications would soon be provided by satellite and other technological innovations; that all the political liabilities remained; that the base would still stimulate a competitive naval build-up in the Indian Ocean; that contingencies, if even amenable to American intervention, could be handled at lower cost by *ad hoc* and temporary deployments of small contingents from our Pacific Fleet. But this time a new Pentagon administration approved Option B, the so-called "austere communications facility." Later there was yet another round of challenge by us, in connection with the inclusion of the installments of the \$26 million in the defense budget; but essentially the issue of the base itself had been determined.

By now, well over \$40 million must have been spent on this "austere" facility. Now, in the wake of the Mid-East war, we are presented with an expansion proposal, involving another \$29 million, and going a long way toward making Diego Garcia the large multipurpose base envisioned in the original Joint Chiefs of Staff proposal of 1967. And we are confronted with yet another rationale: Now we have the prospect of Soviet ships steaming through the Suez Canal. Of course, no one is asserting any direct military threat to the United States in any of this, even if the Soviets were to be able to triple their current Indian Ocean deployment of twenty ships to sixty (roughly what they keep in the Mediterranean). It is simply a question of maintaining our presence and our influence.

So the rationale game is something like a shell game. Or, in another image, it is something like giving a fresh news lead to an old story that comes out of the newspaper morgue. This curious progression of trendy and newsy rationales, for persistent projects and initiatives, does not necessarily mean, of course, that there is no validity in any of these rationales. But it gives us cause for healthy skepticism.

As for the cost game: first of all, it should be conceded that this request is not, in itself, exorbitant, at least by today's inflated standards of defense values. Another \$29 million is, after all, only half the cost of one B-1 bomber; or twice the cost of an F-14; or less than a half day's expense for the Vietnam war at its peak; or less than 3% of the cost of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, and less than 1/2 of 1% of the full cost of deploying that carrier forward. If this base will do half the things that its ardent advocates from the Defense and State Departments say it will do for us, in military and geopolitical terms, then one could call it an astounding bargain.

But in spite of this, Congress has seen fit to question this request. So, obviously, the cost must not be the point. Congress perceives that something much more important, some matter of posture or principle, is at stake here. And Congress is right. The question that must be addressed squarely is whether we want a continuous presence in the Indian Ocean at all; whether we discern a pressing national interest in maintaining a tutelage over regions literally on the other side of the globe; whether we would be ready to look with equanimity on Soviet deployments, even increased deployments, in this area; whether we would allow the eventual exercise of naval responsibilities by some of the large littoral states, such as India, Indonesia, Pakistan, or Australia; and generally whether we would be willing to let events take their course around the rim of the Indian Ocean. We would not, of course, allow ourselves to be excluded from normal commercial, and even occasional military, access to this ocean; we would simply continue to assert the doctrine of freedom of navigation on the high seas. But we would abjure influence and control over political-military events in this region.

So I would put the essential issue involved here in these fundamental and broad terms, and not, ultimately, on the plane of cost accounting or sorting out official and kaleidoscopically shifting Pentagon and State Department rationales. On that plane, answers are subject to expert, privileged, narrow, and technical testimony and information, and Congress and the public are at the mercy of the Executive Branch. The real point is that the decisions should turn on questions that are accessible to all concerned citizens, and certainly to Congress. No one, no matter what his expertise, has a monopoly on questions of national strategy—that is, the larger goals the United States should set for itself in the world. Congress need not abdicate these determinations to the Executive or the military on any grounds

of expertise, private information, or prerogative.

I am not one of those who would depreciate the capacity or the determination of the Soviets to extend the global reach of their navy, or their propensity to impress and occasionally intimidate nations that they can reach with this military arm. But let us even assume that the Soviets will increase the number of ship days in the Indian Ocean; that they will continue to show their flag in the ports of the littoral states; that there will be occasional political disturbances and insurgencies; that factions will sometimes come to power that are less than pleasing to Americans and less than favorable to American interests; and, finally, that these possibilities are somehow related to each other.

The question is still: do we, even then, want to introduce a permanent U.S. naval presence into the Indian Ocean, build a large, gold-plated base on Diego Garcia, and eventually form a separate Indian Ocean navy? Must we continue to track and match Soviet moves wherever they make them, anywhere in the world—base for base, ship-day for ship-day? Despite the Nixon Doctrine, the diplomatic opening to China, and the thickening of relations with the Soviet Union—all the things for which this administration has taken lavish credit—is this still a "zero-sum" world? Is a Soviet gain automatically our loss? I submit that such an attitude would be completely open-ended and without profit for us.

Rather, I would count on indigenous nations to do what they themselves can to withstand political pressures and even military threats. And I would strongly imply that it should not be the continuing business of the United States to divert its resources and its attention to countering Soviet moves wherever in the world they might make them; or to defending any friendly country against pressures by all other countries; or to preventing any discontinuous political change even if it is promoted by the infusion of outside arms.

I would have thought that this was the course that proved so disastrous in Vietnam, the course that we had, as a nation, decided to give up; the course that virtually every American politician and statesman, publicist and analyst rejected when they denied that we would continue to be "the policeman of the world." What has happened to this almost universal lesson of the past decade? I have heard of collective memory; this seems to be collective amnesia.

The ultimate question, of which Diego Garcia is only an early test, is whether we must have a zero-sum world, a symmetrical set of military establishments, an uptight balance of power, a policy that is not subject to our control but is mortgaged to the moves of other nations. If this is not the direction in which the United States ought to go at this juncture of history—and I think it is not—then we do not need this expanded presence in the Indian Ocean; we do not need this enlarged facility at Diego Garcia.

I would urge Congress to take this issue, involving a tiny atoll a thousand miles out in a distant ocean, as the occasion to begin to set an altered course for our foreign policy.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69

### HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following amendment introduced to be offered by me to H.R. 69:

#### AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. MEEDS

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 needs for grants under this part, and (B) 50 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)".

#### THE GREAT PROTEIN ROBBERY: NO. 19: THE STUDDS-MAGNUSON 200-MILE BILL

### HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on May 19 of this year the schooner *Roseway* will leave Gloucester, Mass., for a sail to Washington, D.C., to dramatize the plight of our domestic fishermen. This 48-year-old schooner is the last active pilot schooner under sail in the United States and last summer fished commercially for swordfish off the Georges Banks. I am proud to say I am a sponsor of this trip.

This ship is being sent to Washington to show that our domestic fishermen are concerned over the loss of our valuable marine resources to the larger, more modern foreign fishing fleets which quite literally are sweeping the oceans clean of all marine life. These men, whose very livelihood is being threatened by this foreign overfishing, support the prompt passage of the Studts/Magnuson 200-mile fish conservation zone bill. They want passage of this bill now while we still have fish left to protect. I would like to enter in the RECORD at this time an article from the first issue of the *Massachusetts Spy*, a newspaper devoted to news of the American Revolution Bicentennial celebration:

#### SEA MARCH ON WASHINGTON

BOSTON.—The Schooner, *Roseway*, Boston Pilot boat, has been dubbed a revolutionary, but not by the British. This revolutionary has been chosen to lead a "sea march" on Washington in May to dramatize the plight of the American fisherman.

The Schooner *Roseway*, which served the city's harbor from 1941 to 1971, will lead a trip to Washington to push for support of the 200-mile limit bill introduced by Rep. Gerry Studts, (D-Mass.) and Sen. Warren Magnuson (D-Washington). Passage of the legislation would prevent foreign vessels, from fishing within 200 miles of the American coastline.

The *Roseway* is the last active pilot schooner undersail in the United States, and according to Boston Harbor veterans, she "performed this job with unforgettable finesse."

The Schooner *Roseway's* trip to Washington will be the second of its type in the history books. It was not too long ago in 1933, The *Gertrude Thibold* graced the waters of

the Potomac to meet with President Roosevelt about a very similar matter, federal assistance regarding tariffs and wages.

This trip however, will carry a lot more political "muscle," having as its supporters Cong. Studts, Rep. Richard Silva, Gloucester (whose uncle lead the trip on the Thibold), Sen. Magnuson, and many other governmental officials to include Massachusetts Governor Francis Sargeant.

According to *Roseway* Skipper and Part Owner John D. Mahoney, of Cohasset, the trip will be approximately four days each way and with a week spent in Washington an estimated round trip time of two weeks.

#### ROSEWAY

It was on July 19, 1973 that the *Roseway* breezed into Boston Harbor with an escort provided by fireboats of the City of Boston and The Massachusetts Port Authority. The 130-foot lady, under full sail, proudly cut the waters and commanded the harbor's attention, as if she were something special, and she was.

To those who sailed on her, like Capt. Matthew J. Hughes, The *Roseway* was a lady who braved northeast gales and seas to meet ships entering the harbor; a job he recalls, that pilot boats aren't able to do anymore.

The *Roseway*, built in 1926, in Essex, Mass., by Harold F. Hathaway, who was an attorney for the Boston Street Railway Company in the 30's, is owned and operated by a group of young sea buffs known as the Schooner Restoration and Sailing Society, who operate out of Long Wharf in Boston.

This past summer the *Roseway* spent her days doing commercial swordfishing off Georges Banks, averaging two weeks at sea per trip. But that was not to be her single claim to fame either, as she has been mentioned to retrace the trade routes to the Orient acting as a goodwill ship during the Bicentennial years.

But for the present, the *Roseway* is resting in Gloucester where she is being refitted and overhauled to prepare for a spring of wind-jamming and her trip to Washington. It looks like the *Roseway* will capture the spirit of '76 in the spring of '74.

#### ENERGY FROM ABOVE

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, last night's Washington Star-News reprinted a letter to the editor from the Honorable Mike McCormack, a distinguished Representative from the State of Washington. The subject was solar energy and the letter referred to a recent editorial carried in the paper.

Mr. McCormack's clarification of the topic is most important and I recommend the article to my fellow Members of Congress and the general public.

I would also like to point out that Congressman McCormack is chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy of the Science and Astronautics Committee. He is a scientist and an expert in his own right on all forms of energy, especially solar, and nuclear energy.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Star-News, Mar. 20, 1974]

#### LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

#### ENERGY FROM ABOVE

SIR: Your recent editorial, "Energy From Above," calling attention to the fact that



solar energy may become an economically attractive source of heat and electricity, made several points which I believe require clarification.

May I first commend the *Star-News*, however, for emphasizing that, as our era of cheap fossil fuels comes to an end, government programs can do much to help assure development and demonstration of solar energy technologies, and help provide incentives to industry and our citizens to encourage the use of solar power.

There are a number of ways in which solar energy can be used, but all suffer from the handicap that solar energy is diffuse energy. In the United States, an average of seventeen watts of solar energy strike each square foot of exposed surface. Therefore, it must be collected from a large area.

In order to obtain the high temperatures and large amounts of heat required to generate electricity from solar energy, huge "solar farms" have been proposed for the desert areas of the Southwest. However, even the most enthusiastic advocates of such a project point out that a solar power plant would be far more expensive than a conventional plant using coal or nuclear energy. For these reasons, and the remoteness of the location, such plants are not economically competitive today.

It is also technically possible to convert solar energy directly to electricity, as NASA has been doing with silicon solar cells to power its satellites. The problem with this approach is again economics—the cost of manufacturing such cells must be reduced by a factor of about 100 in order for them to be economically feasible for commercial production of electricity.

#### USE IT WHERE COLLECTED

One attractive and economic way of using solar energy is to use it as heat where it is collected. That is, rather than trying to convert solar energy into electricity, use it for heating buildings and water. Technology for this use is presently in hand, and air-conditioning with solar energy will probably take only about two years of research and development.

The market for such solar heating and cooling is huge. Twenty-five percent of this nation's present consumption of energy is used for heating and cooling buildings and water—as much as we use to produce all of our electricity.

It was this use of solar energy—the heating of buildings and water and for air-conditioning—that was the subject of solar energy bill passed last month by the House and referred to in your editorial. As the author of this bill—"The Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1974"—and chairman of the subcommittee on energy which prepared it, I have pointed out a number of times that this is not a comprehensive solar energy research and development bill. It authorizes \$50 million over the next five years, providing only for a specific demonstration of the hardware needed for solar heating and cooling. It utilizes technology which is presently available, or soon will be.

This bill—H.R. 11864—which passed the House by a vote of 253 to 2, and the similar S. 2658, do not compete with the \$50-million, administration solar energy program to which you referred.

The President's budget assigns \$50 million for long range research and development in solar energy to the National Science Foundation for fiscal 1975. The foundation has an excellent record of accomplishment in basic and applied research, but it does not have the authority to carry out the demonstration program called for in H.R. 11864. Thus, we designated the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, with its outstanding record of developing, integrating, and procuring complex hardware systems with rigorous schedules to administer the manufac-

ture of the many solar heating and cooling demonstration units required. The Department of Housing and Urban Development will then administer the installation of these 4,000 units in each region of the country, and will evaluate their performance over a five-year period.

#### MUST HAVE RD&D PROGRAM

If we are to employ solar energy in this country, we must have a carefully planned research, development and demonstration program which will examine the limitations and opportunities it offers, and which will make the hard technical and economic judgments which will determine if it is really a practical source of energy to use.

We will also need tax and mortgage incentives to encourage the widespread use of solar energy for heating and cooling. This legislation is being drafted, and the complex legal regulatory problems that may arise are being studied.

I believe solar energy is ready to be used. It cannot possibly have a really significant impact on our total national energy consumption for several decades, but we need to get started. We need to demonstrate its technological and economic feasibility as soon as possible. Solar energy is secure energy. Our imports of sunshine cannot be cut off, nor do they add to our trade deficit. I believe that we will demonstrate that solar energy can be employed for heating and air-conditioning, and that it will be economically feasible.

MIKE MCCORMACK,  
Member of Congress.

#### AMERICA'S HERITAGE

### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following speech, America's Heritage, was delivered recently in Indianapolis by Mrs. Mattie Coney, head of Citizens Forum, to the members of Freedoms Foundation Auxiliary. Mrs. Coney is known nationwide for her civic work and leadership, and her words, timeless in their meaning, have a message and guide for us all. I enclose the speech as it was reprinted in *Civic Communique*, for February 1974, an Indianapolis publication distributed free to churches and civic organizations in the Indianapolis area.

The speech follows:

#### AMERICA'S HERITAGE

The following is a copy of a wonderful speech delivered by Mrs. Mattie Coney to members of Freedoms Foundation Auxiliary members in Indianapolis. I wish that citizens everywhere could read and retain the spirit of her message.

Mrs. Coney is nationally known for her many civic endeavors.

PHIL HUNT, Editor.

Today's ever-echoing cry is freedom. We hear it so often and called for so loosely that the question is prompted: do we know what freedom really is? Much is going on under the banner of freedom, but freedom is not found in resentment or lust or hatred. By its very nature freedom is incompatible with such attitudes and actions.

In America we pride ourselves in a heritage of freedom that is unknown in many parts of the world. The opportunity for individual achievement and the level of achievement have been magnets that have drawn people from many parts of the world to our

shores. But if our understanding of freedom does not rise above the desire for personal gain at the loss of others, there is grave danger that the freedom we now enjoy will not long endure.

In the last several years I have traveled to many cities and in a national meeting held at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, under the auspices of freedoms foundation, I met with representatives of most of the major cities of these United States and these are some of the findings at that meeting that are typical of conditions all over America. There are congested and over-crowded housing, an increase in crime, both adult and juvenile. Penal institutions over-flowing and asking for new money for more buildings. Crumbling and broken streets, and sidewalks. Street after street of shabby and unpainted houses. Old store rooms empty and deserted that once housed thriving businesses.

A closed factory building that once employed a thousand men; dirty and rat-infested alleys with scores of children using same for their playgrounds. A fine old church building now operated as a business college, another great and imposing church building used as a poverty center. Hospital after hospital over-crowded and with long waiting lists of patients in need of medical care. Too few and over-worked doctors and nurses.

One of many of the little old side streets in our cities; the corner laundromat used for washing dirty linens in public and also used as a hangout for young children and loud and boisterous adults, another empty and boarded up place of business; then a tavern with its almost shuttered window and lights turned low—reeking with stale and foul odors of beer, wine and whiskey.

A few doors down the street, another dilapidated store building with sleeping rooms above, a den of prostitution, a place for marijuana and even LSD; further down the street, "Sign carrying" pickets (protestors against work) trying to close up and cause to fail, a small machine shop.

Further down the street you will find a busy and bustling church. People smiling and laughing making ready to board the big cruiser buses and into their shiny new cars ready for a poor peoples march, to seek jobs and food—many of them left their jobs and will bypass many more jobs and opportunity on their way to Washington. Now add to this poverty and riches, greed and apathy, despair and irresponsibility compounded by illiteracy and you have a pretty sad picture. Multiply this by two or three hundred and you have the sordid and decaying side of the American cities as of this minute.

Not only do these conditions sadden me but they also leave me with a degree of anger. When I think that these are the same cities that our fathers and grandfathers built and paid for in cash money, hard work, honesty and integrity, yes, they were your fathers and mine.

The real anger arouses in me when I realize that these are the cities in our America that those of us in our generation have allowed to decay and become corrupt. We have not only placed a mortgage in the physical properties of our cities, we have mortgaged our very safety of living by allowing the breaking of law and the permissiveness of courts.

We have mortgaged our common sense and good judgment in order to have sophistry in our high courts.

We have mortgaged the very foundation of representative government by falling in our responsibility to send Christian men, with common sense and mature judgment, into our offices of government.

We have mortgaged our self-reliance and willingness to work, just for a quick trip for quick handouts.

We have mortgaged our children's discipline by substituting play and recreation for work and chores. We have mortgaged "Hope

for respect" from our children in failing to set the proper examples in good manners and courtesy.

When you get right down to the "core" we have just about mortgaged away our freedoms for expediency and easy living.

The next time someone tells you that we have an affluent society, you can tell them that our affluency is mortgaged and that it is not going to be paid for.

Now, some of you may say, well, these problems are the problems of the big cities, or you may say they are the problems of government. No my friends, they are the problems of Americans. They are your problems, problems of the church and as an American citizen, they are my problems. I accept my responsibility and I'll say it is a challenge to stand up and take your stand for freedom and what is right in the sight of God, but that is why I am here—to tell you I am an American—I am here to tell you I am a believer—yes, a believer in the sound and high principles laid down by our forefathers—the principles of free enterprise and the profit system.

I am a believer in this America that has had the strength and the productive power to render aid and assistance to more than ninety percent of the world's nations. Can you think of another such nation?

Now comes a time when America needs to take stock, make an appraisal of her stock, size up the theorists and weigh them against the practical and the basic. Square off at the sophisticated and so-called intellectual and stand him up beside a true and honest patriot.

Quit kidding ourselves about American affluency and count how many things and characteristics we have mortgaged to the hilt.

America needs now a new growth in leadership and civic responsibility. Every man, woman and child has a place in community responsibility. Every civic club and every member of a civic club has proclaimed himself as being willing to lead and share his part of responsibility. It is your responsibility to imbue your entire community with a sense of involvement in citizenship and Americanism.

Freedom is a two-sided coin involving two concepts: liberty and equality. And the real foundation for this freedom is law. Freedom has always come through establishment of law. Indeed, there is no liberty nor equality in anything without law.

A young man may wish to become a great athlete but with that success comes the mastery of a great many rules . . . A disciplined learning process; practicing no legislative act can decree a man a good athlete. He must earn this right by facing up to the requirements.

Today, rights and privileges are demanded on the basis of justice, and genuine freedom includes justice, this we can't deny. But some rights and privileges can't be ordered. Again, they must be earned.

Freedom will never be found through lawlessness, since the very basis of liberty is law.

Today's disorder and chaos, resulting from extremists activities, retards rather than advances freedom. In the cry for freedom, the chains of requirements have been discarded, thus in place of a free-for-all policy we have a free-for-all.

To expect the privileges of freedom without the responsibilities is folly, because responsible freedom is the Only kind that can endure.

I think that freedom is slipping from our grasp because too many people are ignorant of our times. They have been ostriches and have buried their heads in the sand of self pity and selfish pursuits so long that they are not aware of the fact that something is happening that will change the course of our nation, our lives, and the lives of those to come.

We are fighting a war without preparation.

Too many do not know the enemy. . . . This one is different.

We have been thinking communism has its heart in Russia and China and Socialism is tearing at England, so why be concerned?

The barrage of communistic and socialistic ideas which are impinging upon us are causing some Americans to be dazed, others dismal, a few defeated (better red than dead) and many perplexed.

Their ideological warfare is taking its toll among us. Beachheads have been established because we haven't been willing to prepare ourselves by becoming knowledgeable. We have been drifting.

Freedom is slipping from our grasp because we have been unwilling to live like free men—bearing responsibilities.

The men and women in early years faced the forest with axe in hand, ready to carve out a place to call home. They were free men and women making their own way. They did not ask the government to fill their tin cups in order for them to rest in ease.

We are wavering in our stand for freedom because of our complacent attitude. We have had the audacity to think that what happened in other countries could not happen in the United States of America.

Twenty years ago we would never have thought that there would be clubs on our college and universities campuses who are giving of themselves in an effort to overthrow our way of life.

In your balmy period you could never have believed that dedicated teachers would leave our elementary schools because they could not stand the profanity, vulgarity, disrespect and frequently physical abuse that some of our teachers have to endure.

It is an established fact that most of our teachers are bargaining and imploring for placements in the primary grades. They are fearful of what they have to face in grades 4 through high school in many schools throughout America.

Would you ever believe that the parent groups have diminished in attendance that in order to have an appreciable audience for a parent-teacher program that you have to have fifth, sixth and seventh grade children to fill up the seats in an Auditorium?

About the only way to get a President for a parent group the principal has to coerce a young parent of a beginning pupil because she is so unaware of the lack of interest that most parents have in their children that she will be unable to carry out a successful program.

This country swarms with people, native born, who are not, cannot be and ought not try to be Americans.

They are those who . . . will not try to be Americans.

They are those who will not trouble to vote. No doubt these people have value of a sort, but not political value . . . as far as running the country is concerned, they count not at all. There is no point in talking to them about Americanism, for they are incapable of being effective citizens of any country.

The time has come when direction must be established. We have the sacred trust of liberty to bear.

Are we capable of bearing such a trust . . . or is our character so sleazy that we shall step from beneath the load and bow in submission to bureaucratic slavery?

History is repeating itself. The call is for patriots, men and women of courage, honesty, tolerance, energy and steadfastness.

We must rise to the challenge of our times if America is to stand . . . we cannot do otherwise. It is we in this room and others like us who must awaken others to the perils that menace liberty.

Perhaps you are thinking, what can we do? We are so few. When our country was so young in 1776 it was established that only

about one-third of the population was for independence, but they were enough.

We can start by reforming ourselves. The reformation for liberty has to begin with us. As we become aware of the times and the dangers which confront us, we must spend some time in introspection. Ask yourself questions about anything that is presented of national importance—How will it effect others as well as myself?

Is it really the best thing for our country? If it is not for the best, what can I do about it?

We must be doers not merely dreamers and listeners.

If we can understand of what freedom really is, then we can work together for the development of the sharing of both responsibilities and privileges that accompany it.

Arise as one who knows God in personal encounter and serves him, realizing that in his service one helps to lift his country from the mundane toward the heights.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 69

#### HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proposed amendments to H.R. 69:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. TREEN

Page 28, line 9, strike out "1977" and insert in lieu thereof "1975".

Page 50, line 25, insert "(1)" immediately after "(d)".

Page 51, immediately after line 2, insert the following new paragraph:

(2) Section 144(a)(1) (as redesignated by section 109 of this Act) of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, not to exceed \$500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. TREEN

Page 28, line 9, strike out "1977" and insert in lieu thereof "1975".

Page 50, line 25, insert "(1)" immediately after "(d)".

Page 51, immediately after line 2, insert the following new paragraph:

(2) Section 144(a)(1) (As redesignated by section 109 of this Act) of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, not to exceed \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. TREEN

Page 28, line 9, strike out "1977" and insert in lieu thereof "1976".

Page 50, line 25, insert "(1)" immediately after "(d)".

Page 51, immediately after line 2, insert the following new paragraph:

(2) Section 144(a)(1) (as redesignated by section 109 of this Act) of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, not to exceed \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976."

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 69, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. TREEN

Page 28, line 9, strike out "1977" and insert in lieu thereof "1976".



Page 50, line 25, insert "(1)" immediately after "(d)".

Page 51, immediately after line 2, insert the following new paragraph:

(2) Section 144(a)(1) (as redesignated by section 109 of this Act) of title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, not to exceed \$500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976."

## NATIONS DEPENDENT ON EACH OTHER

**HON. DAVID R. OBEY**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if there is one bright spot which has emerged from the energy crisis it is that people here and abroad are more and more aware of the fact that nations are dependent, to one degree or another, on each other, and that none of us can isolate ourselves from the problems of the others.

As has become very obvious, many nations are absolutely dependent on others for fuel to keep their economies alive. Some are dependent on others for basic foodstuffs or technical assistance. Even here in the United States we are highly dependent on far less prosperous and developed nations—such as Gabon, Peru and Bolivia and Malaysia—for basic raw materials such as tin, aluminum, and mercury. In 1972 our trade deficit in minerals was \$6 billion, and that could rise to \$20 billion by 1985.

In the New York Times yesterday James Reston wrote an article reflecting on this international interdependence and the possibility of future worldwide shortages of food, fuel, and raw materials. The article was sobering because it pointed to a number of authorities who believe that unless nations work together—avoiding such things as rigid trade controls and totally self-serving monetary policies—even world peace could be jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Reston's article does not paint a rosy picture of the future, but it is one we should all read carefully. The article follows:

McNAMARA LOOKS AHEAD

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—One of the charges made against officials and press alike during the oil crisis was that they did not alert their peoples in time to the magnitude of the problem. They saw the trend but not the stupendous dangers ahead, so now they are looking forward to even more serious world economic crises.

Here for example is Robert McNamara, president of the World Bank, asserting with almost missionary zeal that the rich nations have not yet calculated the economic and human consequences of quadrupled oil prices or even begun to grapple realistically with the food and fertilizer shortages he sees ahead.

A few years ago he protested publicly when C. P. Snow, the British scientist, predicted at Fulton, Mo., that before long the world would be watching "millions" of human beings on television dying of starvation. Now, he says, he is not so sure Lord Snow was overly pessimistic. One or two more seasons of bad weather, he observes, and the human

family will be enduring unimaginable disasters.

Helmut Schmidt, Minister of Finance of the Federal Republic of Germany, is almost as gloomy about the divisions among the advanced nations at a time when the world economy, despite rent boom conditions, is entering a phase of extraordinary instability.

Writing in Foreign Affairs for April, he sees a struggle for the distribution of essential raw materials developing in the world, with most nations looking to their own selfish interests and avoiding cooperative planning necessary to meet their common problems.

"It is a struggle for the distribution and use of the national product, a struggle for the world product . . ." Mr. Schmidt says. "The struggle over oil prices may be followed tomorrow by a similar struggle over the prices of other import raw materials. And since what is at stake is not just pawns on a chessboard, but the peaceful evolution of the world economy and the prosperity of the nations of the world, we need a politically sound philosophy if we are to win this dangerous fight."

Mr. McNamara's experts at the World Bank estimate that India alone will have to find an additional \$1 billion a year just to pay the increased cost of oil at present prices. In addition, the hundred poorest countries of the world, where two billion people exist, 40 per cent of them in semi-starvation, the rise in fertilizer prices will cost them an additional \$1 billion, which of course they do not have.

This year, he notes, the advanced nations of the world will have to pay \$5.3 billion more for the same amount of oil products they consumed in 1973. The increase for all the poor nations will be \$10 billion. Meanwhile, the increased revenues to the oil producing states this year will be on the order of \$63 billion, about half of this going to Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, Abu Dhabi and Libya.

"Were no other changes to affect international trade," McNamara says, "the 1973 current account surplus of the developed nations would turn into a deficit of \$41 billion and the 1973 current account deficit of the developing nations would double to \$23 billion."

"Such deficits," he concludes, "threaten the stability of the economies of the oil-consuming nations throughout the world. Individual nations may seek to finance the details by unilateral, beggar-my-neighbor policies of drastic exchange rate adjustments and severe trade restrictions. But such efforts to expand exports and restrict imports, if pursued by many nations, can only lead to a worldwide deflationary spiral. . . ."

These anxieties are shared by Secretary of State Kissinger and the departing Secretary of the Treasury, George Shultz, yet while U.S. official development assistance to the world amounted to 2.79 per cent of the U.S. G.N.P. in 1949, it is now only .22 per cent, and the House of Representatives rejected last Jan. 23 U.S. participation in the replenishment of the International Development Association funds for the poorest nations.

Mr. McNamara called this at the time "an unmitigated disaster" and ever since he has been running around the world trying to persuade the rich nations to calculate the consequences of the coming world disorder. He got some promise of help from Iran (\$200 million at 8 per cent interest and \$150 million a year for soft long-term loans at 2 per cent) but he will have to get many more advance commitments to keep the international development assistance program going after July 1.

This is the somber prospect that helps explain Washington's irritation with the current squabbles among the allies over the procedures rather than the substance of the world economic crisis. Mr. Kissinger is alarmed by the disarray he sees in the world

and exasperated with the slowness of coming to grips with it—sometimes exasperated at his own exasperation.

Mr. McNamara notes the fact that the most fighting has taken place in the poorest regions of the world and equates political stability with economic stability. Helmut Schmidt comes closer to the bone.

"In the short run," he says, "there is at least a point beyond which economic stability would be in jeopardy. And that point is reached whenever the industrialized countries are confronted with intolerable adaption and reorganization problems incapable of being solved at short notice and are thus driven into employment crises or toward an even higher rate of inflation. I do not wish even to contemplate a point—at least theoretically conceivable—beyond which the irrational use of force might ensue. . . ."

## MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

**HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the national scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. I am very pleased that the winning contestant from the State of Maryland is a resident of my congressional district. She is Susan Lynn Kraus, and she lives in Adelphi, Md. Susan's speech exemplifies the patriotism and American spirit that is still thriving in our youth of today. It is with great pleasure that I offer Susan's presentation "My Responsibility as a Citizen" for the RECORD.

## MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A CITIZEN

(By Susan Kraus)

"These are the times that try men's souls." These words, though spoken by Thomas Paine nearly two-hundred years ago, are still relevant today.

Politically, we have found our leaders to be men with feet of clay rather than heroes to be emulated. Economically, our dollar is more unstable than it has been for four decades. Environmentally and ecologically, there are shortages in fields essential to life's maintenance.

Though I am troubled by these trying times, I am not discouraged. Rather, I am more aware of my country's need for responsible citizens. I, personally, will strive to meet this need with the view that "I am not everyone, but I am one; and though I cannot do everything, I can do something."

In order to make a purposeful contribution, I must first know of my country's past—its hardships in order to strengthen my faith, its traditions in order to strengthen my loyalty, and its progress in order to strengthen my pride.

In studying my country's past, I can gain insight into my citizenship responsibilities by comparing the development of America to the construction of cloth. All cloth begins with threads—threads which have no form but yield to the desire of the weaver. Our country, too, began with the discovery of new land—land without formation or usefulness. But soon, it yielded to the desires of

men—men who were to occupy it and weave it into a pattern of progress.

Some of our early weavers placed their lives upon the loom of time to start the pattern of freedom. Other daring and hard-working weavers added quantity to the fabric of America through the discovery of new territory—thus opening new opportunities for all free citizens. These weavers have shown me that I must give of myself for my country as did my forefathers who were faced with the hardships of the Revolutionary War. Also, the frontiersmen have shown me that I, too, must open new opportunities for my fellow citizens. I cannot do this by adding quantity to America's cloth, but I can do this by adding quality, such as sharing my love with someone who reaches out for me, sharing my praise with someone who looks up to me, and sharing my time with someone who needs me.

Further insight into my citizenship responsibilities can be gained by examining the fibers of the threads that have kept our fabric intact. Two necessary fibers—Education and Religion—have always been sources of built-in strength. From these fibers, I have become aware of my responsibility to pray, such as in times of distress, as did George Washington at Valley Forge; my responsibility to exhibit virtue, honesty, and truth as in the days when the greater part of our citizens could proudly say, "My word is as good as my bond;" and my responsibility to be a dedicated student as was Abraham Lincoln.

Though it is important that a weaver—as well as a citizen—know of his fabric's strengths, it is also important that he know of its limitations. Among the past limitations of America's fibers were internal stresses which caused the Civil War and almost ruined our fabric with tears; the isolationism which brought on World War I; and the preoccupation with an economic depression which precipitated World War II.

From an understanding of my country's past limitations, I have become even more aware of my responsibilities as a citizen. I must share in the responsibility of keeping our threads free from tangles in order to allow the pattern of progress to proceed smoothly. This program will lead to more growth—whether we are weaving a bolt of cloth, a citizen, or a nation.

As a citizen, I must always strive to make a purposeful contribution to my country's growth. To insure this, I must practice the fundamentals that have been woven into my life by skillful weavers: faith, pride, benevolence, God-consciousness, loyalty, and patriotism. Only then will I be prepared to pass to others these basics—unsoiled by mistreatment and unspooled by weak threads. For I am adding another thread from the shuttle of my life to the still growing fabric of America.

#### FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

#### HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of legislation to develop and implement Federal standards for youth camp safety, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the leadership of the State of Connecticut in securing the safety of children at camps throughout the State by initiating required, systematic reporting.

Dr. Harold S. Barrett, deputy commissioner in the office of public health, has completed a report of Connecticut youth camp fatalities and hospital admissions.

This report, which appeared in the Connecticut Health Bulletin, follows:

#### REPORT OF CONNECTICUT YOUTH CAMP FATALITIES AND HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS (Harold S. Barrett, M.D., M.P.H.)

##### INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Youth Camp Licensure Act was passed by the 1969 Session of the General Assembly to become effective in the 1970 calendar year. Regulations were adopted quite promptly but were not approved until early June 1970. These regulations did not require any reporting of morbidity or mortality specifically in camps other than was regularly required by law.

As the result of the experiences in the 1970 season and also because of legislation pending before Congress a careful search of the literature was made for statistics regarding morbidity and mortality in camps. Information was obtained from the National Safety Council, the American Camping Association, and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. Testimony presented in Congressional Hearings was checked and reviewed. Three pertinent articles in the medical literature were identified and careful surveillance of papers for identification of reportable morbidity (communicable disease, food poisoning) was conducted.

Since there were no guidelines available from any source it was decided to set up regulations requiring reporting of fatalities, and also to require reporting of any illness or accident requiring hospital admission. The latter was a pioneering effort in this field. It was concluded that there were no fatalities during the 1971 season, there were no morbidity incidents, but one serious accident (loss of sight of an eye) did occur. This accidental eye injury was not reported until a lawsuit was started, and could not satisfactorily be checked.

##### REPORTING OF FATALITIES

During the 1970 camp season two fatalities by drowning came to staff attention. One was a first year camper in an agency residential camp. An investigation disclosed trained staff, adequate facilities and practices, and problems with obtaining information from the family regarding physical and mental problems and medications. The other drowning was that of a staff member in an agency day camp—which was unlicensed and would not have been allowed to operate in the fashion in which it was being conducted had it been subject to inspection and licensing.

During the 1972 season these regulations were first given special attention. It is felt that no fatalities occurred, but that there were still probably a number of hospital admissions which were not reported. Most of the cases which were reported had incomplete data and were reported late. Therefore no great significance is to be attached to the 1972 information, although it is presented for comparison purposes.

Starting in 1973 a concerted effort was made to focus attention on preventable accidents and reporting. The camp inspectors from the state health department called attention to this regulation, and the letters transmitting licenses stressed the requirement. During that year there was a noticeable improvement in reporting, although the method was not that required in the regulation, and the information was incomplete. However, because of the timing, decision could be made to investigate promptly, and therefore better detail was obtained on cases of concern under the camp Licensure Act.

##### Summary of fatalities at youth camps, Connecticut, 1970-1973

1970-2—Drowning, 1 camper, 1 staff, both fully investigated.

1971-0.

1972-0.

1973-1—Drowning, camper, fully investigated; 1—Cardiac trauma, aspiration of vom-

itus, staff, not fully investigated, out-of-state trip.

Of the fatalities, all were male, and two have occurred since reporting was required. One happened in a Boy Scouts of America camp involving a mentally retarded registered scout, and was the only drowning incident of this nature, (that is, during supervised activity) reported nationally by the Boy Scouts of America during the first 3 quarters of 1973. The other involved a YMCA day camp staff person on an out-of-state trip and it has not yet been possible to get all information needed to complete the investigation.

##### ACCIDENTS LEADING TO HOSPITALIZATION

Accidents and illnesses that required hospitalization for campers and staff for 1972 and 1973 included six fractures and five cases of appendicitis. All incidents reported were from residential camps. Combined totals of registered campers and staff for day camps and residential camps were an estimated 79,922 in the 1972 season and 74,595 in 1973. Hospitalizations reported were about the same for 1972 and 1973, with 11 and 10 respectively, as shown in the following table. Site investigations are shown in parentheses:

##### YOUTH CAMP ACCIDENTS AND ILLNESSES, REQUIRING HOSPITALIZATION, CONNECTICUT, 1972, 1973

Cause	1972	1973 (to Oct. 15, 1973)
Appendicitis.....	2	3
Fractures: Arms 4 (2). Leg 1.....	(2) 5	1. Arm 1 (reports not received).
Uncontrolled seizures—C.P.....	2	
Perineal hematoma.....	1	
Bladder infection.....	1	
Drowning.....		1 (1).
Sickle cell disease.....		1 (1).
Tonsillitis and bronchitis.....		1.
Pneumonia and pleurisy.....		1.
? Appendicitis.....		1 (reports not received).
Hepatitis.....		1 (1) (not camp related).

##### TYPES OF CAMP REPORTING INCIDENTS

The total number of applications for license made in 1972 and 1973 is shown in the following table for comparison purposes:

##### RESIDENTIAL AND DAY YOUTH CAMPS BY TYPE OF SPONSORSHIP, CONNECTICUT, 1972, 1973

Type	1972		1973	
	Day	Residential	Day	Residential
YMCA.....	28	6	27	7
BSA.....	2	17	3	13
GSA.....	23	10	18	9
4-H.....	0	4	0	4
School.....	12	5	13	6
Grange.....	0	1	0	1
Newspaper.....	1	1	1	1
Cerebral Palsy Association.....	0	1	0	1
Sports.....	3	14	6	13
Retarded.....	11	1	9	3
Blind.....	0	1	0	1
National ethnic groups.....	4	3	5	2
Nonprofit—Not otherwise stated.....	25	13	29	8
Private independent camps.....	30	21	25	23
Church.....	17	20	12	17
Total.....	156	108	148	109

In 1972, 4 reported incidents occurred in private independent camps, and 7 in agency camps (2 Young Men's Christian Association, 3 Society for Crippled Children & Adults, 1 Girl Scout of America, 1 Boy Scout of America). The incidents in handicapped children were entirely related to the crippling condition, and therefore are of no significance to the purpose of the Camp Licensure Law. The distribution of incidents among camps licensed by category in 1973 was all in nonprofit camps, sponsored as follows: 2 Y.M.C.A., 2 4-H, 1 School, 1 Newspaper, 1 Grange, 1 Church (2 hospitalizations), 1 Cerebral Palsy Association (handicapped campers).



## WHY ESEA NEEDS AMENDING

## HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, since introducing H.R. 10639, the Freer Schools Act last October, my office has been deluged with mail on this bill. At last count, I had received more than 1,200 letters in support, 4 against. The vast majority of the letters come from parents who are very concerned over the innovative programs funded until titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Act—ESEA: programs in humanism, behavior modification, sensitivity training. In short, programs designed to change a student's values and attitudes, to modify his or her behavior to conform to the norms prescribed by a psychology/education elite.

Are such programs beneficial or harmful? Should our public schools be attempting to change and mold student's attitudes and values? Or should schools be emphasizing basic education in the cognitive skills such as reading and mathematics?

Since this is a major issue that will face the House of Representatives when the provisions of H.R. 10639 are offered as amendments to H.R. 69 next week, I thought my colleagues would be interested in the following letter from Mrs. Jane Rachner of St. Paul, Minn. Mrs. Rachner holds a Ph. D., with a major in history and philosophy of education and a minor in psychology. She has taught in elementary school and has lectured at various colleges on general psychology, child development, and reading theory.

The letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO LIBERALS ABOUT THE NEED  
TO AMEND E.S.E.A.

(By Jane Rachner)

What gives a conservative the right to address a letter to liberals? Being brought up in the humanistic tradition of the Unitarian church, being a member of A.D.A. from 1949 to 1973, being taught by some of the most successful promoters of behaviorism gave me an understanding of the liberal viewpoint. How then could I have become a conservative in education? The answer is simple. Science tells us to believe what we observe, and I have seen year after year of so-called "innovative programs" in education sponsored by government money do more harm than good to the children they purport to serve.

Some of the most enthusiastic support for Representative Earl F. Landgrebe's "Freer Schools Act," H.R. 10639, comes from opponents of humanism and behaviorism and other conservatives but all of us should be applauding Rep. Landgrebe's bill. It attempts to put government money behind the kind of basic education which will give future generations power to read and reason instead of behind the attitude-molding instruction which E.S.E.A. now rewards through many of the Title I and Title III grants.

It is not just religious and/or political conservatives who see the need of reforming government spending in education so as to encourage a renewed emphasis on developing children's power in the basic skills of reading and arithmetic. An ever-enlarging group of liberals is beginning to realize that in education wasted money means wasted lives.

Attitude-teaching has been insidiously on the increase for the past twenty-five to fifty

years at the expense of other more important training. Giving children equal minimum essentials for competence in the fundamental symbol systems out of which our civilization is constructed is an absolute necessity if each child is to have an opportunity for socio-economic mobility equal to every other.

Inexperienced or mentally lazy teachers may like the emphasis on attitude-teaching which E.S.E.A. supports with government money and which it will continue to support if H.R. 69 passes. Such teachers may welcome it because it is such an easy thing to teach. Only an exceptionally obtuse school child could fail to get an A on an attitude test if he wanted an A. However, the most experienced and dedicated teachers want the satisfaction of giving children tools with which they can garner knowledge. They wish to enable children to either control their environment or escape from it in the delightfully vicarious or otherwise constructive ways which reading and thinking power make possible.

PROTECTION OF VETERANS'  
PENSIONS

## HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to insure that recipients of veterans' pensions and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced, or entitlement thereto discontinued, because of increases in monthly social security benefits.

This bill is the culmination of my long series of legislative efforts to aid those veterans and dependents who suffered cuts or losses in their pensions because of the 1972 social security increases. In the 93d Congress alone, I have already sponsored three different bills aimed at alleviating the distress of these individuals: H.R. 1305, exempting all social security benefits from the determination of annual income of World War I veterans; H.R. 1306, providing that one-half of any social security increase be disregarded in the determination of annual income of all veterans; and H.R. 2686, raising the annual income limitation for veterans by \$600.

Last December, a Senate amendment to H.R. 9474, increasing non-service-connected veterans' pension benefits, would have increased the annual income limit by \$400 and thereby provided relief to most of those who had been stricken from the rolls or had their pensions reduced because of social security increases. But the Senate amendment was deleted upon the solemn assurances to the Members of both Chambers that the situation would be remedied in pension reform hearings early this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is now the end of March. Next month, and again in July, social security benefits will be increased. But the promised reforms have not materialized, and the cost of living continues to increase at a staggering rate.

Last June, I testified before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on behalf of the three bills previously mentioned, to protect veterans' pensions. During that

testimony, I quoted from two of the hundreds of letters I had received since the VA reduced pension and disability benefits on January 1, 1973. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to these quotes once again:

I am almost 75 years of age and a diabetic. My wife is in poor health and has been for over seven years. Our only income is social security plus the Vets pension. I received notice yesterday my pension has been cut from \$97.98 to \$85.26 per month. True, this is only \$12.72 per month cut, but let me tell you it hurts us an awful lot, as our health problems require so much extra cash. Living costs have not gone down. . . .

I am a veteran 80 years of age, of WWI. Last year my VA pension was \$67.76 per month. I received notice today that beginning January 1, 1973 my pension would be reduced to \$42.86 per month due to a 20 percent increase in my social security, which amounted to \$35.00 per month. The 20 percent increase was for everybody but the veteran. This cut in pension reduces my SS increase to \$10 per month instead of \$35.00.

Since those letters are written to me, the cost of living has increased another 10 percent; the cost of food alone has risen more than 22 percent. And yet these same individuals will have a scant 8 months to utilize the 11-percent social security increase before the boom falls on them once again and their pensions are further reduced. By this time, the cost of living and the price of food and health care will have risen even further. We are in an inflationary cycle which is literally starving to death our older Americans and veterans who are trying to live on fixed incomes.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing my bill as a matter of simple justice. A blanket exemption of all social security benefits from the annual income determination is the least that we can do to aid our veterans in these circumstances. Next January cannot see yet another period of such agony for millions of Americans who have served their country in the Armed Forces, and contributed to social security as hard-working citizens. These people have earned both benefits in full, honorably and fully, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which will permit our veterans to receive social security without penalty to their veterans' benefits.

LOS ANGELES LITHUANIANS SPEAK  
OUT

## HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian Americans of Greater Los Angeles experienced on February 17 another bittersweet celebration commemorating the 56th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

On that occasion, these courageous people adopted a resolution stating their determination that the Soviet domination over Lithuania should be terminated.

It is a credit to our Government that

the United States has not, and will not, recognize this subjugation by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to submit this resolution by the Lithuanian American Council of Los Angeles, Calif.:

#### RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian Americans of Greater Los Angeles area, assembled on this 17th day of February, 1974 at Marshall High School, Los Angeles, in order to commemorate the Lithuanians Independence Day hereby state the following:

Whereas on February 16, 1918 the ancient Lithuanian nation after a long struggle proclaimed itself as a free democratic Republic of Lithuania and was recognized as such by all the nations and was installed as a full member of the League of Nations;

Whereas the Soviet Union after forming mutual assistance pact with Hitler and on June 15, 1940 broke all her agreements and treaties and forcibly occupied Lithuania, and even now this Stalin-Hitler pact is still in force and Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are occupied by Russian Communist government;

Whereas the Soviet Union through a program of mass deportations, labor camps, resettlement of the peoples and importation of new settlers from Russia continues to change the population and its ethnic character and commits the genocide of this small but ancient nation;

Whereas these occupants after more than 30 years of persecutions and constant acts of terrorism were still unable to suppress the religion and aspirations of these peoples to be free as shown by the fact of the 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics under threat of severe punishment had the courage to sign a petition to the Secretary General of the United Nations charging Soviets with the religious persecutions;

And whereas there is still no free communication between Lithuania and other countries including United States. Only 5 days visits by special permits are allowed in one city in the assigned hotel which is under surveillance as not to permit to visit the country and relatives in their places of living. Furthermore, the gift packages to Lithuania are charged prohibitively high duty as to the most unfavored country and so to exploit this sad situation.

Therefore be it resolved that the American of Lithuanian heritage demand that the Soviet-Hitler pact at last be terminated, permitting the Lithuanian people to exercise their sovereign rights. We also deplore the fact that this occupation and terrorism was permitted to exist for more than 30 years and thousands upon thousands of lives were lost.

That knowing the methods and modes led by Moscow, we consider the cultural exchanges in present form as one way exchange, benefiting the red propaganda in the entire United States with failure to represent the American way of life there.

We believe that human consideration between the nations and people must take precedence over trade benefits or political concessions.

We are watching with utmost gratitude all the endeavor of President R. M. Nixon and of the members of both Houses to stop red aggression and bring peace.

We also trust that the President will recognize these facts and will take a firm stand during pending negotiations and also instruct his representatives in Security Conference at Geneva to do the same.

As we approach the end of the 20th Century we are ashamed that our civilization is able to tolerate conditions where police states with their slave camps and "hospitals" are allowed to exist.

We beg all the freedom loving peoples to unite and use their means to repeal the brutality rule over peoples and nations.

#### OIL INDUSTRY ADVERTISING

### HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the oil industry has spent millions of dollars on an advertising campaign to carry its side of the energy crisis to the American people. Television commercials and newspaper advertising reach millions of citizens. The moneys spent on these multimillion dollar advertising campaigns can be used as a tax deduction by the oil industry—a special tax favor that gives the oil industry percentage rate of tax on income which allows these companies to pay a lower percentage of tax on income than does the average citizen.

A vicious cycle results. The oil industry spends millions on advertising—which they get tax favors on. The average American cannot wage such an advertising campaign for obvious reasons. Therefore, except for what we glean from news broadcasts, the oil industry can defend their high profits, and proclaim their innocence against charges that they have caused or could have prevented the energy crisis.

A recent article in *Environmental Action*, "Brainwashing at Public Cost," discusses this issue and I would like to insert it in the *Record* at this time for my colleagues own information:

#### OIL ADVERTISING: BRAINWASHING AT PUBLIC COST

(By Lee Stephenson)

The oil industry has bombarded the American public with a multimillion dollar advertising campaign in recent months carrying its side of the energy crisis. Prime-time television has frequently carried colorful messages, and major newspapers and magazines have had dozens of full-page advertisements with huge bold headlines—all to proclaim the companies' innocence of any wrongdoing.

But the one thing the companies haven't said in their multimillion dollar campaign is that they are getting the public to pay for most of it.

The cost of nearly all of the advertising—all but that which advocates specific changes in legislation—can be deducted from taxable income as a "legitimate business expense" by the oil companies, according to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Thus the companies have an indirect public subsidy in their campaign to defend their high profits and proclaim their innocence against charges that they have caused, or at least could have prevented, the current energy crunch.

Although all American industries can use the same deduction, this provision in connection with other special tax favors gives the oil industry a percentage rate of tax on income far lower than the average for U.S. industry. In fact, the companies pay a lower percentage of tax on income than does the average citizen.

The deduction includes all of the costs of advertising, including fees to advertising agencies, preparation and the purchase of expensive print media space or electronic

media time. For instance, a 60-second commercial carried coast-to-coast on the NBC evening news program costs \$27,000 and a full-page advertisement in the *Washington Post* on weekdays costs about \$4670.

Such a television commercial reaches millions of homes (the 60-second spot during the NBC news program reaches about 9.5 million) and full-page newspaper advertisements may reach hundreds of thousands. Most of the energy-crisis-related newspaper ads have appeared in limited markets, such as New York City and Washington, D.C., to reach "decision-makers." However, some companies have taken their ads to wider markets. One full-page newspaper ad in late January by Mobil Oil, which reprinted four earlier messages under the headline "Don't read these ads if you've made up your mind about oil profits," was placed in nine large newspapers with a total circulation of approximately six million. A single ad in late January by Exxon headlined "Exxon plans to spend nearly \$16 billion over the next four years to help get more energy to you," was run in newspapers in the top 50 advertising markets in the country with a combined circulation of over 30 million.

Electrical utilities have also jumped on the energy advertising bandwagon in recent months, and these companies have a special public subsidy the oil companies do not have. Investor-owned public utilities, which are regulated by state public utility commissions, often have their customers pay for company energy crisis advertising by including the costs in the rates consumers pay. Although some public utility commissions have begun to restrict the inclusion of consumption promotion and controversial issue advertising in the utilities' rate base, in most cases customers still pay for advertisements suggesting steps to meet the energy crisis, criticizing environmental controls, promoting nuclear power, and advocating rate increases and the suspension of clean air regulations.

The energy company advertisements have also been criticized for misrepresentation and deception. Calling the recent oil company and utility advertisements a "multimillion-dollar propaganda blitz," six members of Congress petitioned the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) in January to require proof of claims made by companies on energy and environmental issues. In 1971 the FTC started a program to investigate product claims made by companies, but non-product or so-called institutional advertising has never been monitored by the FTC.

The six petitioners include Senators Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), Thomas McIntyre (D-N.H.) and Frank Moss (D-Utah), and Representatives Les Aspin (D-Wis.), Benjamin Rosenthal (D-N.Y.) and Andrew Young (D-Ga.). The companies cited in the complaint include Shell Oil, Tenneco, Champion International, Mobil Oil, Exxon, Pacific Power and Light, Wheelabrator-Frye, General Electric, Amoco Oil, and the Investor-Owned Power and Light Companies.

A second official complaint to the FTC was filed in January by Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Russell Train in response to a Chevrolet advertisement advocating the removal of automobile emission control equipment. The ad's claim that an increase in gasoline mileage of up to 25 percent could be achieved by removing the equipment is "grossly inflated and misleading," according to Train, who asked the FTC to investigate the advertisement and to "prevent such misleading advertisements from occurring in the future."

Richard Herzog, the FTC's assistant director for national advertising, said the Commission has also had an "unusual number" of other letters complaining about the companies' advertisements. But although Herzog acknowledged that he was heading the Commission's review of the complaints, he



refused to characterize the work as an investigation and would not speculate as to when or what type of response the FTC would make. Other Commission sources have said a large investigation of energy advertising is underway and have predicted the FTC would take some action to control non-product energy advertising.

FTC Chairman Lewis Engman has said he favors some curb on image advertising intended to enhance the companies' commercial well-being. However, Engman and FTC investigators have had a difficult time defining the purposes of institutional advertising and do not think that all forms should be controlled under any circumstances. The FTC is very reluctant to tamper with political ads which advocate a legislative position on a controversial issue. The right to express such an opinion—no matter how obnoxious—is guaranteed by the First Amendment. However, when false or misleading information is used to justify such a position, or when an institutional advertisement is clearly intended to improve a company's product appeal or stock marketability, the FTC is considering action.

The only other federal agency that exercises control over company advertising is the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) under its Fairness Doctrine. That set of regulations requires television and radio stations which present one side of a controversial issue to also allow "reasonable opportunity" for the presentation of contrasting viewpoints.

The initial determination of the fairness issues is left up to the local broadcasters, and most stations claim to meet this requirement with their news and public affairs programming. However, the stations are ultimately responsible to the FCC for the balance they present in these controversial matters, and complaints received by the Commission are supposedly taken into account when the local broadcaster's license comes up for renewal every three years.

The content of advertising presented by a station is also subject to the Fairness Doctrine, and if the opposing viewpoint to an oil industry advertisement is not given a "reasonable opportunity," individuals or groups can file a complaint with the FCC. Few complaints are filed and even fewer decided in favor of the complainants, although there are some instances of success.

In 1973 a citizen's electric utility monitoring group, the Georgia Power Project, and two other local organizations complained to the FCC about a series of Georgia Power Company advertisements in support of a pending rate increase. One broadcaster in Atlanta and a second in Augusta had refused to allow the groups to respond to the company's messages. The FCC ruled in favor of the groups in December of 1973, requiring the stations to allow response times to the groups and setting an important Fairness Doctrine precedent.

The other potential area under FCC regulations for a different viewpoint from advertisements is the public service announcements (PSAs) that local television and radio stations carry. There is no requirement for any specific quantity or subject matter of such announcements, but it is understood the licensee will carry some messages of public interest free of charge.

PSAs most often take the form of broadcasting notices of community meetings or using messages supplied by the Advertising Council. The Council is a non-profit, public service corporation which conceives and pays for the production of advertising messages on a variety of public issues. The ads are then supplied free of charge to radio and television stations to use as PSAs.

The Council's work has been widely praised, but the organization has met some criticism for conflict of interest due to its industry- and business-dominated board of directors. For instance, the Council prepared a cam-

paign for Keep America Beautiful Inc. (an organization composed mainly of container and beverage manufacturers) suggesting that "People start pollution, people can stop it." The Advertising Council has thus helped to lend credence to the beverage industry's contention that consumers are more responsible for litter and pollution than the industries which create millions of tons of throwaway containers yearly.

The board of directors of the Advertising Council is composed entirely of manufacturing, retail, utility, insurance, advertising, publishing and broadcasting corporations. Moral: Don't expect the Advertising Council to produce any public service announcements countering energy company claims.

Of course, the FCC has no control over print advertising, which is why company newspaper and magazine messages are more prone to heavy advocacy. Most television advertisements by the oil companies present a low-key message to minimize Fairness Doctrine problems. But, as newspaper advertising executives readily point out, the public owns the air waves and thus has a right to regulate their use; industrials or companies own the press. Again, a constitutional issue is involved.

The *Washington Post's* Vice President for Advertising, Joseph Lynch, told *Environmental Action* there is no limit on the amount of advertising space a company or group of companies can buy and said there shouldn't be. Lynch did say the *Post* regularly screens such advertising for libel, obscenity or factual problems, and said that several oil company ads had recently been questioned and two sent back to the companies for different statistics. But he admitted the newspaper is not in a position to investigate the statistics or alleged facts used and "unless we know for sure that it isn't true" the ad is likely to run.

The *Post's* ombudsman, Robert Maynard, said he had received no complaints about the volume of energy company advertising in the newspaper, but added that he thinks the volume of such advertising presents a problem. Maynard said contrasting viewpoints probably could not be adequately presented by the use of the letters-to-the-editor column, guest columns, or even editorials, and said "I don't know what could countervail that [the volume of ads] short of having the same amount of money" to buy advertising space. Maynard also said that although the news columns of the newspaper had devoted considerable space to energy problems and some of the company claims, the volume of company advertising seemed to outweigh the exposure of alternate viewpoints.

*Environmental Action* could not find a single advertisement in a major newspaper or magazine which attempted to counter the energy company line. Groups contacted that have charged the companies with misrepresentation or falsehoods said they simply did not have the money to answer the company claims through advertisements.

A San Francisco-based non-profit communications firm, Public Interest Communications Inc., has asked the *San Francisco Examiner* for regular full-page advertisements free of charge to respond to the oil companies. But there is apparently no precedent for a major newspaper to give free advertising space to an individual or group to balance or respond to advertising campaigns. The *Examiner* has not announced a decision on the request.

The outlook for opposing viewpoints on the air waves is equally complicated. A Washington public interest group, the Media Access Project, is preparing a Fairness Doctrine campaign to force television networks to air counter-industry ads. However, the group says its chance of success is limited because the FCC is likely to rule that the ads are adequately balanced by network news programs.

In an attempt to give citizens the materials to launch a counter-industry energy advertising campaign, Public Interest Communications has prepared a full set of newspaper, magazine, radio and television advertisements. The group is offering the materials at cost to individuals and groups to either purchase or solicit free advertising time from the media. But a spokesman for Public Interest Communications said the group thinks people should not try to buy time because the public has a right to free access to the media.

## INFLATION AND THE BUDGET

### HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 year ago, I took the floor of this House to review the fiscal policies of the Federal Government and to point my legislative finger at "big spending, big taxing, and big inflation." In all of my meetings with the citizens of the 10th Illinois Congressional District, I find that the No. 1 problem of 1974 is inflation.

From July of 1971 to December of 1973, the Consumer Price Index rose at the average rate of 5.5 percent per year, despite the fact that we had wage-price controls. Our biggest price rises have been in the food and fuel areas of our economy.

Congress must develop a policy of restraint in spending if we are to successfully stop inflation.

The House of Representatives has approved a policy of setting a ceiling on Federal spending by its approval of the Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1973. In keeping with the provisions of that legislation, I have introduced a concurrent resolution limiting appropriations for fiscal year 1975 to \$295 billion, which is the projected income of the Federal Government during the same period.

Congress and only Congress is responsible for the determination of the Federal budget. The President can only suggest and recommend. It is Congress that legislates and acts to determine the budget.

Arthur Burns, Chairman of the FRB, urged Congress to trim the President's proposed fiscal 1975 budget of \$304.4 billion with a projected deficit of \$9 billion.

I agree with Arthur Burns that Congress can take the President's budget and cut it. However, I also know that this will not be done unless Congress sets a spending ceiling. A projected inflationary rate of 8 to 9 percent per year should be unacceptable to the American people. Unless the voters make their views known to the Congress, deficit spending will continue and an unacceptable inflationary rate will continue.

Let me again review big spending, big deficits, and big inflation.

#### BIG SPENDING

In 1960, the United States spent approximately \$92 billion on a unified budget basis. In 1965, spending was \$118 billion. In 1970, it was \$196 billion. In

1975, proposed spending amounts to \$304.4 billion.

#### BIG DEFICITS

In the last 10 years, we had deficits in the Federal budget in every year but one, and the total financing of spending by deficit borrowing exceeds \$130 billion.

#### BIG DEBT

In 1960, the Federal debt was \$290 billion. In 1965, the Federal debt had risen to \$323 billion. In 1970, it had climbed to \$382 billion. At the end of 1975, it is projected to exceed \$500 billion. The interest on the Federal debt will amount to approximately \$29 billion in fiscal year 1975.

#### BIG INFLATION

What is the answer to inflation? Since 1971, we have had four phases of wage and price controls. Price controls have never been effective over a long period of time. Instead, they create shortages and scarcity. The usefulness of wage and price controls has come to an end, and I do not believe that Congress will extend the Economic Stabilization Act, nor do I think that it will provide selective standby controls. This probably will prompt some additional price rises; but if we will stop deficit spending, the economy will adjust to increase the supply of products and decrease prices.

The challenge is squarely presented to Congress to stop inflation by providing a balanced budget and create confidence in the people of the United States and in the world that the Government of the United States is fiscally responsible.

It is time for Members of Congress to think of the next generation and not the next election.

### A GIANT IN THE FOOD INDUSTRY

#### HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the city of Fremont, Mich., and the Nation lost a giant of the food industry with the passing of Mr. Daniel F. Gerber.

A business which began from the most mundane circumstances, the need to strain a few peas and carrots for his own child, and which he developed into the largest manufacturer of baby food in the world, will always bear his imprint.

But even more, he was one of the finest gentlemen we have ever met. His reputation for integrity in business and his personal life are rarely matched. The Nation has lost one of its truly great citizens in the passing of Daniel Gerber.

The following article, which appeared in the New York Times on March 18 catalogs the life history of this outstanding resident of my district in Michigan:

DANIEL F. GERBER IS DEAD AT 75; BROUGHT BABY FOODS TO MILLIONS

FREMONT, MICH., March 17.—Daniel F. Gerber, who introduced strained baby foods to millions of Americans, died last night after a brief illness. He was 75 years old.

His company, the Gerber Products Com-

pany, is the largest baby-food manufacturer in the world and sold \$278-million in baby foodstuffs last year. It accounts for 60 percent of all baby foods sold in the United States, and also manufactures its products overseas.

Mr. Gerber, a native of this small town in west Michigan, joined his father in 1912, in what then was called the Fremont Canning Company, a small, local food processor.

In 1927, when Mr. Gerber's daughter, Sally, was ill, the family doctor suggested that the Gerbers strain some peas for her to eat. At that time, strained baby foods were available only in some areas of the country, and were sold only in scriptures.

#### ACROSS THE NATION

In 1929, Mr. Gerber put baby foods on grocery store shelves across the nation. Other manufacturers soon followed. The company name was changed to the Gerber Products Company in 1943, and Mr. Gerber became its president two years later. He held that post until 1964, when he became chairman of the board.

Three years ago, the manufacturer gave up the chairmanship at his own request, but he remained as a director and chairman of the company's executive committee. Mr. Gerber was also chairman of the Old State Bank of Fremont at his death.

#### MORE ITEMS INTRODUCED

As Mr. Gerber's line of baby foods increased, he introduced related items such as powder, plastic pants and dishware for babies.

The manufacturer was active in trade, professional, church and civic organizations. The city's Gerber Memorial Hospital was built chiefly with family funds, and Mr. Gerber helped to establish a civic center for Fremont.

He was graduated from St. John's Military Academy in Delafield, Wis., and the Babson Institute of Business Administration, Babson Park, Mass., and maintained an active interest in both schools throughout his life.

Mr. Gerber was also a member of the First Church of Christ, Scientist, and served on the boards of such organizations as the Nutrition Foundation of New York and the United Negro College Fund.

Survivors include his widow, Dorothy, 5 children and 18 grandchildren.

A private family service was scheduled for tomorrow, with a community memorial service Wednesday at Fremont High School.

#### CULTIVATED NEW MARKET

Like an earlier Michigan manufacturer named Henry Ford, Mr. Gerber was not so much an inventor as an imaginative pioneer in cultivating an unsuspected mass market for a relatively simple basic product.

His first kitchen experiment convinced him that putting cooked peas through a strainer by hand took too much time and energy out of a mother's life. A market study suggested that women who did not want to spend 35 cents at a drug store for strained baby food would buy it in quantity if it sold at regular grocery stores for 15 cents. Late in 1928, he began advertising in Child Life magazine, offering six cans by mail for a dollar and a coupon that included the address of the customer's regular grocer.

This gave the Gerber salesman a foot in the grocery door. Soon they were driving cars with horns that sounded the tune of "Rock-a-Bye Baby." Sales rose sharply from 590,000 cans in the first year, to 1 million a week in 1941 and 2 million a day in 1948.

From the start, Mr. Gerber was careful to get the approval of a physician for his product. When he brought some of his first cans of strained peas, carrots and spinach to a Grand Rapids pediatrician, he was told: "You don't realize what you have there. I

never knew Henry Ford, and I always wanted to meet a multimillionaire."

Mr. Gerber served as an Army sergeant in France in World War I and was awarded the Croix de Guerre.

### NO TAXES ON UNRECEIVED INTEREST

#### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a new problem now besetting our senior citizens. It has particular impact on senior citizens having low incomes of such size that it is not feasible for them to itemize deductions on their income tax.

In 1973, the banks were permitted to raise their interest rates as high as 7½ percent on certificates of deposit. Many senior citizens had long-term certificates paying only 5¼ percent and were, of course, anxious to convert them to the higher interest-bearing certificates.

When an individual cashes his old certificate of deposit to convert it to the new higher interest certificate, the banks assess a penalty comprised of the loss of the interest for one quarter and a recomputation of the interest rate from the 5¼ percent certificate of deposit down to the passbook rate of 4½ percent. This loss of interest and the recomputation result in the forfeiture of a certain amount of interest. However, banks are reporting to the Internal Revenue Service the full amount of interest, including the amount of forfeiture, as gross income.

The inequity is in the payment of taxes on the total amount of interest reported. If an individual itemizes his deductions, the amount of the forfeiture may be deducted. Persons of low income who have relatively little in the way of itemized deductions and who, therefore, use the standard deduction must pay taxes on the gross amount of interest. They pay taxes not only on the amount of interest received, but also on the amount of interest which they forfeited and never received.

The solution is to have banks report and have individuals pay taxes only on the net amount of interest an individual receives in a given year. The amount of forfeited interest would be subtracted from the gross amount of interest before taxes are assessed.

To remedy this situation, I have introduced H.R. 13669, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to insure that forfeited interest is not included in an individual's gross income. No one should have to pay taxes on income he never receives.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 13669

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain interest forfeited by reason of premature cancellation of certain savings deposits shall not be included in gross income and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,



SECTION 1. Treatment of certain interest income.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically included in gross income) is amended by adding after section 83 the following new section:

"SEC. 83. INTEREST ON CERTAIN TIME SAVINGS DEPOSITS.

"Gross income includes interest paid or accrued during the taxable year on any time deposit savings account with any person or institution described in subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 6049(b) (1) but only to the extent not forfeited during such taxable year by reason of the premature cancellation or withdrawal by the taxpayer of all or part of such account."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part II is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 84. Interest on certain time savings deposits."

SEC. 2. RETURNS REGARDING PAYMENTS OF INTEREST.—Section 6049(b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to returns regarding payments of interest) is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) any interest forfeited during the taxpayer's taxable year which is not includible in gross income under section 83 (relating to interest on certain time savings deposits);"

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply to interest paid or accrued after December 31, 1973, in taxable years ending after such date.

## LUCKIEST MOTHER IN THE WORLD

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article by Mr. Thomas Keating, of the Indianapolis, Ind., News, which appeared in that paper on March 20, 1974.

It is a brief but inspiring account of courage, determination, and faith, on the part of Mrs. Nellie Albrecht, of Indianapolis, who, in the face of family tragedy, rose to the challenge. The article follows:

LUCKIEST MOTHER IN THE WORLD

(By Thomas R. Keating)

Out in a small, white stone house on Millhouse Road between Camby and Valley Mills, a family of five managed what well may be an unprecedented achievement in Indianapolis, in Indiana and quite possibly in the nation. The driving force behind this success story is a modest, 58-year-old woman who walks with a limp, speaks always in soft tones and commands a huge amount of respect.

Her name is Nellie Albrecht and when it comes to bringing up children, Dr. Spock is a minor leaguer.

Back in the mid 1950s, Nellie's husband, Carroll Albrecht, a tool and die inspector at Allison's, suffered a fatal heart attack.

He hadn't been sick and his unexpected death left Nellie with four children to rear by herself, a frightening prospect for any woman.

Then, to add to her worries that she would

not be able to do the job properly, Nellie became seriously ill one day and was taken to the hospital.

After extensive examination, it was determined she had multiple sclerosis, a disease that has left her with a permanent limp and a weakened condition that requires her to rest periodically each day.

When she received this news, Nellie worried about herself and her illness, of course, but most of all she worried about how she could provide discipline and leadership for her two sons and two daughters and how she could be both father and mother with only half her energy and health.

Then, too, there was the problem of money. All she had were modest Social Security benefits and what she would be able to earn at a job, which would have to be part-time because of her condition.

So she got a part-time job as a receptionist for a doctor at the Indiana University Medical Center and a second job typing at her home, a chore she could do between rest periods in the evening.

She vowed to do the best she could for her children and pray a lot that they would turn out to be good and responsible people.

In 1956, the first of Nellie's children, James, was a senior at Decatur Central High School. Not only was he a basketball and track star, but much to his mother's pride, he was valedictorian of his graduating class.

James went on to be graduated from Purdue University and is now a veterinarian at Carmel.

In 1959, Nellie's second child, Judy, was graduated from Decatur Central, and defying all odds, she, too, was class valedictorian.

Judy later was graduated from the Indiana University School of Nursing and is now married to a doctor and the mother of six children at Winter Park, Fla.

It was 10 years later, in 1969, before Nellie's third child, John, was a senior at Decatur Central. Young people were supposed to have changed a great deal during this decade and rearing a youngster was said to be far more difficult.

But in Nellie Albrecht's family, nothing had changed.

John, also was No. 1 in a class of 220, to make it three in a row. He is now in his first year at I.U. Medical School.

The last of Nellie's children, Jeanne, is a senior this year at Decatur Central and—what else—last week she was informed she is No. 1 in a class of 222 and will be the fourth valedictorian in four tries for the Albrecht clan.

There quite possibly may not be a family anywhere that can match that record.

"We've never had much money," Nellie said, "but we've been blessed in many other ways. All of the children have paid their own way through college by getting scholarships and earning money during the summer."

"I was never as 'A' student or anything special," she concluded, "so, I'm sure I must be the luckiest mother in the world."

Her four children just laugh at that. They have no doubt who the lucky ones have been.

## THE ROOTS OF THE HOUSING PROBLEM

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, four decades ago, Franklin Delano Roosevelt pointed out in sorrow that one-third of all Americans were ill-housed. The Depression has long passed. The United States has the highest standard of living

in the world. However, there are still 13.1 million families in this country who are "housing deprived."

The Joint Center for Urban Studies at Harvard University and MIT reports that its estimate of the inadequately housed is conservative and that the actual figures might be higher. But 13.1 million families represents 21 percent of the Nation's households, a major proportion when weighed against our national wealth and resources. The statistics are even higher in certain geographic areas, reaching 25 percent in the Newark metropolitan area and 28 percent in and around New York City.

With new housing starts far below what is needed to even keep our heads above water, the implications for progress in the near future are clear. Over one-fifth of our population live in physically inadequate housing or overcrowded conditions or pay excessive rent. Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, has estimated that new housing starts are running at only 75 percent of the number needed just to keep even. To make a significant impact on the housing shortage will require a degree of commitment from both Government and private industry which we have yet to see.

The White House has blundered badly over the past 5 years in the housing area. The most recent actions such as the ill-timed, ill-advised moratorium on Federal housing subsidy programs and the proposed housing allowances would be counterproductive, discouraging new construction and renovation. At the same time, the administration's mismanagement of the economy has resulted in an increase in interest rates, putting mortgage money out of the reach of low- and middle-income families who seek to build or buy homes.

In New York City, rent decontrol has led to a spiraling of rents to the maximum levels allowed by law. In major cities across the country, the abandonment of sound housing by landlords continues. Once abandoned, the cities are unable to properly maintain them and they soon become refuges for addicts who strip the buildings of materials they can sell for its junk value.

True, some cities like Wilmington, Del., and Philadelphia have started urban homesteading programs. Other local governments are planning such programs as well. The potential for a significant improvement in the housing shortage through the renovation of abandoned buildings is limited, however, and only a relatively few of the 13.1 million families who are "housing deprived" will benefit directly from this approach.

A major financial commitment by the Federal Government, working in cooperation with private builders with technological know-how, is required if we are to build the number of units of new housing which we need. The present situation will only get worse as interest rates continue to rise, building materials remain in short supply and rents increase even more as landlords pass on higher fuel costs to their tenants.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt wasn't wrong in his vision of decent housing for

all Americans. It is just taking a lot longer than he could have imagined.

# U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS— TRANSPORTATION POLICY

## HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, at their mid-winter meeting held on February 1, 1974, the Executive Committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors adopted a series of policy statements dealing with our country's transportation needs.

Chicago's Mayor Richard J. Daley, co-chairman of the Transportation Committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors presented his committee's views to the Executive Committee of the conference at this recent meeting. Since the conference's position on this matter calls for a balanced, flexible approach to solving the needs of our urban areas, both large and small, I know that my colleagues will find these proposals of considerable interest. I would therefore, like to insert them in the RECORD at this point:

### TRANSPORTATION—FEBRUARY 1, 1974

The U.S. Conference of Mayors Transportation Committee urges adoption of a new national program for improving and expanding public transportation—The U.S. Conference of Mayors National Transit Legislative Program for 1974. It should include, at a minimum—

1. \$3 billion a year for five years for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration's capital grant program;
2. \$600 million a year in Federal financial assistance for transit operating costs;
3. \$400 million in 1974 to help expand transit operating fleets;
4. Ultimate creation of a single Transportation Trust Fund;
5. Elimination of impediments to the contract authority procedure;
6. Immediate action on developing a National Urban Transit Plan and Policy; and
7. Elimination of any impoundment of transportation appropriations by the Office of Management and Budget. (A copy of the National Transit Legislative Program for 1974 is attached.)

In addition, the Transportation Committee urges—

1. that the Congress and the Administration immediately amend the charter bus provision in the Federal-Aid Highway Act to enable public bodies and operators to engage in charter operations;
2. continued funding for rail and commuter rail projects;
3. that the Highway guidelines and regulations assure that decisions are made at the local level, that elected local officials play a key role, that state control over planning and project selection is minimized, and that comprehensive transportation planning is performed by an agency agreed upon and responsive to elected local officials;
4. DOT and UMTA policy and programs that encourage and provide incentives to expand bus production and to promote bus R&D; and
5. Congress, AMTRAK, DOT, and UMTA carefully examine the feasibility of encouraging the use of existing rail lines for commuter service.

### NATIONAL TRANSIT LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR 1974

A massive positive national program for improving and expanding public transportation facilities and operations in our urban regions, as well as in smaller communities, is now mandated by a combination of critical factors. Besides the sheer necessity of providing greater mobility for people as a prime public service, these critical factors also include the pressing necessity to utilize efficiently—and conserve—our sources of energy and the real threat that life itself, as we know it in our urban areas particularly, could become grievously injured if drastic measures are not taken to protect the environment.

Our new national program for improving and expanding public transportation must have a thrust comparable to the all-out effort and support that we have given to space exploration. Furthermore, this new thrust for public transportation must be elevated to the crash-program level comparable to space exploration, free from the time-consuming restraints of red tape that so often hampers the legislative and administrative process.

With such a thrust as the over-riding objective, the following program is proposed for action in 1974:

A combined effort by Congress and the Administration to increase to at least \$3 billion a year the capital grant program of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. This program should be assured for a minimum of \$15 billion for the next five years, with full realization that this outlay may have to be increased as time goes by because of inflationary pressures and the identification of new needs.

A combined effort by Congress and the Administration to provide, for the first time at the federal level, an adequately funded program of financial assistance in the operation of public transportation systems. State and local governments no longer can bear the responsibility of providing financial assistance for transit operations alone. The time for federal government help is long overdue. As a beginning, the federal government should provide \$600 million a year in financial assistance for transit operating costs.

The adoption by the federal government—again through a combined effort by Congress and the Administration—of an emergency program calling for an outlay of at least \$400 million in 1974 to help expanding transit operating fleets as quickly as possible. For the most part, such an emergency program would be directed toward placing more buses on the streets. It also would require the co-operation of the automobile manufacturing industry in tooling up to produce the buses we need. In this respect, we must think in terms of crash-efforts that were successful in providing aircraft in times of war.

An immediate refinement of the Federal Highway Act, which, as adopted in 1973, gave public transportation, for the first time, a share of the assured source of funds of the Highway Trust Fund. Such refinement of the Federal Highway Act should be directed not only toward placing public transportation on a par with consideration given highway improvements, but also toward national and region-wide planning on the basis of total transportation needs. The ultimate goal should be the creation of a single Transportation Trust Fund.

The elimination without any further delay of all impediments which thus far have made ineffective the highly desirable procedure to providing federal aid for transit improvements through the so-called contract authority procedure. This procedure, already incorporated in federal legislation, is designed to assure the necessary funding over a period of years—such as a span of five to ten years—so that public transportation systems can

carry out the large projects which cannot be accomplished overnight or in a single year. This contract authority procedure is an excellent idea, but it must be made to work.

In taking this immediate action, we must, of course, keep in mind long range goals—such goals as developing a National Urban Transit Plan and Policy. Such a national plan and policy should be developed as quickly as possible.

It has been suggested that a National Urban Transit Plan and Policy should be developed by the Department of Transportation and Congress by 1977. There is, however, a real danger in setting such a deadline four years from now. It could lead to procrastination providing we do not set earlier deadlines for planning. While longer range planning may be an ideal objective for many reasons, we also should not lose sight that planning is also an immediate and continuing process. Immediate and continuing planning must go hand in hand with long range planning.

Most important of all is the mandate for immediate action at the federal level.

Coupled with the need for immediate action is another extremely important factor.

A massive program with increased funding for public transportation will have little chance of success if Congress and the Administration do not provide the assurance that large appropriations of funds will actually be provided for public transportation systems.

There must be the immediate elimination of the impediment that has stalled many transportation improvements in recent years.

That impediment and barrier has been the impounding of transit appropriations by the Office of Management and Budget.

To appropriate funds for public transportation but then to impound the funds is a practice that no longer can be tolerated.

Such was not the case for space exploration. Such cannot be the case if we are to meet the pressing needs for improved and expanded transportation on earth.

### THE SOUR FRUITS OF DÉTENTE

## HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, in the February issue of *Bridge*, the Boston College magazine, there appeared two articles under the heading of "The Sour Fruits of Détente" by Dr. Yuri Glazov. Dr. Glazov, presently senior lecturer in Slavic and Eastern languages at Boston College and a constituent of mine, was a professor in the field of linguistics at the University of Moscow and held a research post in the Soviet Academy of Sciences. He was dismissed from both positions following the publication of the first collective letter of protest sent abroad from the Soviet Union, which he cosigned.

In March 1972, a letter signed by Glazov and four other intellectuals appeared in the *London Times*. Within a week he received a visa to leave Russia.

Mr. Speaker, in these articles Dr. Glazov critically examines the trend of current Soviet-American relations and détente in light of the treatment of Soviet dissidents. In the past, I have spoken out many times in support of Soviet Jewry and against widespread Soviet domestic repression. I strongly urge my



colleagues to take note of the following perceptive and insightful articles bearing on the future course of our foreign policy:

THE SOUR FRUITS OF DÉTENTE  
(By Yuri Glazov)

I lived in Russia for forty-two years and I am now beginning my second year in America. While in Moscow, I was in love with America. Now that I am here in Boston, I frequently pray for Russia.

When Stalin died twenty years ago, I understood that evil could come to an end, but John Kennedy's assassination ten years ago made me realize that evil's hired men had come alive again and had to be opposed. I felt my turn had come to speak out in Russia though a consoling death was still the reward for too many truth-seekers. For saying just a few words of truth, I paid the price of losing my teaching and research positions, and, for the next four years, the authorities experimented to see whether a man who had been deprived of his livelihood could survive. Many of my friends who had been engaged in human rights activities were finally graciously permitted to leave the country and I was among them. It was the contacts with the West that made the Kremlin leaders release those who in other times would have died unnoticed in the prison camps of Siberia. That is why "detente" between Russia and America touches thoughtful Russians so deeply.

Yet many of my friends are still tortured in the cave of the Kremlin Cyclops who keeps on babbling about socialism. But few believe that balderdash. Most people sense that General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev wants to preserve the status-quo and the luxurious life style enjoyed by the ruling elite. While Brezhnev may be thinking "après nous le déluge", the day he openly would utter these words would be the day of his downfall. Among his many problems the worst is that he is locked into the system created by his predecessors. Brezhnev's best defense is to take the offense.

Common Russian people respected Stalin, made fun of Khrushchev and ignore Brezhnev. But to remain in power even Brezhnev needs the people's support. He promised them foreign sweaters, Italian cars and as usual a lot of food. He restored quite a few features of traditional Russian life. The Orthodox Church is no longer openly abused, provided the priests cooperate with the State Secret Police and supply the relevant facts about religious trouble-makers. Unlike the thirties and forties, millions of people are no longer sent to prison camps. But to live safely, one should keep one rule: not to speak aloud what one is thinking. Starting in 1965, Brezhnev cleverly began to stifle Russian intellectuals who sought to defend their human rights.

The Soviet rulers have their friends and foes: their main enemies being "American imperialists", Chinese communists and Russian intellectuals. Americans rebuke the Kremlin leaders for still being communists. The Chinese attack them for being bad communists. The intellectuals inside the country assail them for being double-faced bureaucrats.

As far as America is concerned, the Kremlin gamblers assumed that the ambitious and short-sighted Richard Nixon would continue to play into their hands. Until recently, they forbade their party-controlled press to criticize the President of the main "imperialist" country. As for Henry Kissinger, the Kremlin leaders looked on him as a real treasure. For a while, they made the White House believe they were ready to play its Neo-Meternich game.

Richard Nixon saw in Leonid Brezhnev his friend in need. They resemble each other. Both are masters of party intrigue; both ex-

posed a conservative line, chasing liberals and intellectuals as their personal enemies. Both think that only victories outside the country can save their reputation at home. Both exploited the fact that the Russian and American people want peace and "detente."

But Richard Nixon overlooked the fact that his partner in "detente" was more experienced in international gambling. Brezhnev's highly qualified brain-trust advised the General Secretary to play a smart trick on the White House, just at the point when the Watergate crisis reached its nadir.

Russia was in a strong position. The war in Vietnam was officially over and Soviet leaders were rejoicing for they had feared that only China would benefit from that devastating war. As a result of supporting India in the Indo-Pakistan War in 1972, Russia was enjoying a certain moral prestige.

The time was ripe to do something about the Middle East. The Soviet Leaders' goals were obvious. Fired by an animal-like anti-Semitism, they sought to create a blood-bath in Israel and to undermine the country financially. Thus, they thought to break the enthusiasm of the Russian Jews (that source of intellectual non-conformism), letting would-be emigres, old and young, know that in Israel they might perish under Soviet made bombs.

It was high time to satisfy the Arabs' angry demands for a war with Israel; to test Soviet arms against American weapons in the battlefield. The Soviet leaders saw an opportunity to take a good sum of money out of the pockets of rich Arab rulers in return for supplying them with arms and last, but not least, they saw the perfect opportunity to blackmail Europe and America with an energy crisis.

Why not use Mr. Kissinger's wish to achieve "detente" at any price? The Soviet leaders mused. Why not create a fuel shortage in the U.S. and further stimulate the inflation already resulting from the grain deal? Why not provoke the angry feelings of American taxpayers who would resent being milked for the airlifting of weapons to Israel? Why not, while the White House was in chaos, test America's ability to withstand a sudden menace from Soviet paratroopers in the Middle East? If America should make any drastic moves, why not then withdraw, proclaiming astonishment at the President's over-reaction?

Initially, Moscow blocked all attempts to arrange a cease-fire in the Middle East, blaming Israelis as murderers in the Yom Kippur War. But when it became clear that Israel would defeat the Arabs, Brezhnev invited the obedient Kissinger to Moscow to arrange peace in the Middle East.

When, after all these events, Dr. Kissinger stated that Russia had not transgressed the boundaries of its responsibilities, he exposed the depth of his wisdom. After such open support of the militant Arabs, it is now Mr. Brezhnev who appears as the peace-maker.

Mr. Nixon has thus been exploited by Brezhnev. The Soviet Press's unprecedented reserve over Watergate having served its purpose, it is now being encouraged to join the Western media in attacking the American President.

The Middle East triumph has given Moscow greater confidence in dealing with the Chinese dogmatists. While there is not hope that the Chinese will want to establish friendly relations with Moscow in the foreseeable future, Brezhnev is patient and will wait.

Where Brezhnev's patience has been exhausted is in his relationships with his own critics among the intellectuals. Brilliant minds like physicist Andrei Sakharov, biologist Zhores Medvedev and author Andrei Sinyavsky (the list is long) can no longer be endured. Maybe they and all the others should be ejected abroad where they will be very poorly understood. If they do not wish

to leave the country—and in the case of Russian authors and poets, emigration is anything but a joy—they, like Aleksandre Solzhenitsyn, will be threatened with exile to Siberia, or, like author Vladimir Maksimov, with confinement to a mental hospital.

America which some people still look to with hope should not confuse her enemies with her friends. To trust Brezhnev and to ignore the well-known warnings of Sakharov, Solzhenitsyn and dozen other top Russian intellectuals may turn out to be a fatal miscalculation.

No one can understand what is now happening in Russia who does not see her two faces. These two faces, official and non-official, have existed throughout the whole history of Russia. The official Russian face looks to serve the state, while the non-official face reflects thoughtful concern for human beings.

Since Stalin's death, the thoughtful, non-official Russia sought to find a place side by side with the official, red tape Russia. Many great Russians in the past have done their best to change the society which has made men of integrity and intelligence suffer so much pain. But before going to their last home, most of these great men came to the gloomy conclusion that their life-long activities were futile. Russian society has proven to be a stable one. Its official ideology has not lost its roots and thoughtful individuals in Russia have had to acknowledge themselves to be caryatids on which the gigantic state-oriented society stands.

Current comments that Stalinism has now been restored in Russia are pure nonsense. The two recent decades have buried Stalin and his mass repressions, hopefully, forever. Buried with him are the militant Marxist ideology, the cult of a people's leader who is as omnipotent as God, and the constant fear of every citizen for his physical survival. During Stalin's life, those individuals who dared to think even a little and to exchange their ideas with friends lived, from day to day, waiting to be arrested. Soviet authorities, now-a-days, permit their citizens, somewhat graciously, to say whatever they wish in non-official settings, especially when nobody seems to be listening. But, from time to time, they remind their citizens that to speak or write publicly, one has to get permission from the higher levels. Even though the "great" Stalin is dead, even though Stalinism exists no longer, individuals in Russia are still deprived of their right as human beings to openly express their opinions, to enjoy the spiritual freedom granted by God.

In 1956 Nikita Khrushchev had the honor of burying the late Stalin. For a short time thoughtful men were nourished by the illusion that they could now speak publicly of what they saw happening around them. In 1957, Boris Pasternak published his "Doctor Zhivago" abroad. He died in 1960 and his martyrdom put an end to that illusion. (Is there any need to mention the lesson learned in the Hungarian revolt of 1956?) Later, in the fall of 1962, the then unknown Alexandre Solzhenitsyn published in Moscow, with Khrushchev's personal approval, the masterpiece, "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich". The story showed people in Russia how their country suffered from a serious disease that could be treated only by unified efforts.

But Stalin's heirs had no wish to leave their high-paid posts. In 1964, they dismissed Khrushchev and launched an increasingly intensive campaign to silence those intellectuals who for more than a decade had enjoyed relative freedom in their reading and self-expression. In 1966, they put Andrei Sinyavsky on trial. Sinyavsky had committed the crime of publishing some of his prose abroad. This action of the authorities had as its goal, to warn the intelligentsia they would be better off keeping silent. In 1966-1968, more than one thousand intellectuals: scholars, scientists, writers, painters, students and

educated workers sent their government a number of open petitions. In these they expressed their indignation over the unjustified actions of the Soviet authorities in silencing thoughtful individuals by sending them to prisons, mental hospitals, or into exile in remote provinces, not to mention dismissing them from their jobs. In the spring of 1968, Leonid Brezhnev gave orders to silence the Soviet intelligentsia. In August of the same year, he ordered his troops to occupy Czechoslovakia and "normalize" the situation there. That action meant the Kremlin authorities would not be stopped by any moral consideration when they saw a serious threat to their present power.

But many Russian intellectuals refused to keep silent. Academician Andrei Sakharov, General-Mayor Peter Grigorenko, physicist Pavel Litvinov, historian Andrei Amalrik, and dozens of others, publicly expressed their anxieties about the future of their country. Step by step, the authorities began to stifle these voices and to methodically destroy the cultural milieu.

At first, the authorities tried to starve dissidents into silence. When they saw this strategy fail, they changed their tactic. Brezhnev did not view dissident intellectuals as the salt of the Russian earth, which they are, but as the salt in Russia's wounds. He preferred to see them out of the country, not in. Thus, in 1971, the authorities began to grant visas encouraging prominent intellectuals to leave. The State Secret Police has made it difficult and often impossible for these intellectuals to continue to work, even to make a living, so that a number have seen no alternative but to take the visas and leave Russia. The tension created by the police has been so great that some individuals could not face even the alternative. On October 20th, Ilya Gaby committed suicide. He jumped from the tenth floor of his house, leaving his wife a widow and his two small children fatherless.

Recently a famous Soviet mathematician, Yuri Shikhanovitch was declared incompetent to stand trial, was tried *in absentia*, and was sent to a mental hospital. Boris Shragin, a philosopher, who has recently applied for an exit visa was summoned on Tuesday, November 27 by the K.G.B. The wife of the foremost Russian physicist, Andrei Sakharov is being interrogated and threatened by the K.G.B. every three days. And Sakharov now feels he has no alternative but to accept an offer from Princeton University, even though it may cost him his citizenship.

It has become fashionable for Western scholars to rebuke Russian intellectuals for being cut off from common people. But, Western scholars should remember that the common people have allowed themselves to be used for centuries. And when, after decades of silence they finally revolt one day, and only once in a century, they create the bloodiest revolution and hang the guilty and the innocent from the same gallows.

However much the authorities try to hide the "social truth", most of the people are smart enough to reject the official fables about the nearing completion of the communist society. But with living standards as much as five times lower than that of American workers, the "tolling masses" are encouraged to spend their days earning their livelihood and wasting what little leisure time they have, drinking quantities of that traditional Russian spirits: vodka. The average Russian hasn't the slightest idea what is going on in his own country or abroad. However, he is very pleased that his Russia is keeping her position in the world as a strong power. For that aim, he is ready to sacrifice certain advantages in his everyday life.

Thus the average man could and did toast the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. With a glass in his hand, this innocent man exclaimed in "sancta simplicitas" "In 1945, we shed our blood to liberate them! Why, in

hell, do they now want to be free of Russia?" It is hardly surprising that the common people of Russia have trouble understanding their own sons who want Russians to become, once again, responsible human beings.

As for the West, it obviously has its own difficulties to worry about. Many Russians once believed that a day would come when the West would liberate them from the small-pox of communism. This, after all was the propaganda they heard on foreign radio broadcasts. But the events of recent years have made most Russians lose hope. Now, only a few uninformed thinkers share this belief.

Richard Nixon is now praising himself for his success in establishing the detente with Leonid Brezhnev. What detente has brought Americans, they know from last summer's food inflation, last month's Middle East Crisis and the winter's fuel shortage. But America, it seems, must live a little longer, before the average American understands that the detente is like a vast smoke screen behind which thoughtful people in both countries are living a repressive reality that is painfully reminiscent of sad experiences in the recent past, not the least of which was the brilliant campaign of the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy.

For the past 6 months Professor Glazov has maintained an exchange of ideas and facts between the intellectuals of the United States and the Soviet Union through weekly telephone calls to his friend and former colleague, Andrei Sakharov.

The telephone calls are supported financially by grants from the Committee for Soviet Jewry of Sudbury, Mass., headed by Robert Gordon and William Edelson.

On Thursday, January 10, Dr. Glazov placed a call to academician and physicist Dr. Andrei Sakharov in Leningrad, U.S.S.R.

The following are two statements made by Dr. Sakharov during this phone call. They are translated here by Dr. Glazov:

Today, the Secretariat of the Moscow Section expelled Lidia Korneyevna Chukovskaya from the Union of Writers of the U.S.S.R., as in the past they expelled Akhmatova, Zoschenko and Pasternak, and most recently, Solzhenitsyn, Galitch and Maksimov. The reason given for her dismissal was that "she has rolled over and fallen into the anti-Soviet swamp." This I quote from Lidia Chukovskaya's article "The People's Wrath". She wrote this article at a time when the Soviet papers were full of stories branding me a slanderer and an enemy of detente. Among those who spoke in my defense was the strong and pure-hearted voice of Lidia Chukovskaya. Her activity as a publicist is in keeping with one of the best and most humanistic traditions in Russia. She never makes accusations; hers is always a defense. "Not calling for executions, but expressing a thought; speaking out." In the same way as her mentors, the great publicists Herzen and Korolenko she is able and daring enough to say what others who hide behind their titles and honors, dare not.

The President of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. stated in "Literaturnaya Gazeta", the main edition of the Union of Writers of the U.S.S.R., that nothing was threatening me. Why then is the mere act of speaking out in my defense punished by expulsion from the Union of Authors. Does the President really believe that when my friend has received such a blow, I can live in peace, that "not a single hair will fall from my head?" I am proud of my friendship with Lidia Korneyevna Chukovskaya. I bow down before her fearless sincerity and kind-hearted bravery.

A French newsman called me and proposed a number of questions, saying that he would call back later. But then later, we were disconnected and I have decided to make public these questions and answers.

**Question:** Is it true that you and Solzhenitsyn, as George Marchais in France has stated, represent only a solitary group of separate dissidents cut off from the people?

**Answer:** In my opinion, Solzhenitsyn as well as myself, does not express the outlook of any group of dissidents. He expresses his own personal position, his understanding of the people's history and situation. He bases his book *Gulag Archipelago* on his personal experience, stories of witnesses, archival materials and he speaks on behalf of those who have never returned from the islands of this Archipelago. Do many people share his position? Who can answer that, in our country, where Solzhenitsyn's works are not published where they withdraw from the libraries all those small pieces that have been published, where just for reading his book, persons are sentenced to imprisonment and where no sociological research has been done on the extent to which Solzhenitsyn's works are read in Samizdat. But what is more important is this. Is what he is writing about slander or truth? All those, with whom I have ever spoken about Solzhenitsyn, are convinced that he depicts truth.

**Question:** In your opinion, how would the Soviet people and the majority of the laborers react, if they had a chance to read Solzhenitsyn's book?

**Answer:** I am convinced, that the interest in this book on the part of all the reading population of the country would be great even if the attitude varied towards its content. The majority of the Soviet people at all levels of the population know about the crimes and horrors depicted in Solzhenitsyn's book. Some people drive away all thoughts about that. Others are unable to condemn their own past activities, but there are also other people who will see in the book the fate of their fathers, the fate of two generations who disappeared and of whom it is known only that they were "not allowed to correspond." In any case, the moral importance of this book is enormous namely for the people of our country.

**Question:** You and Solzhenitsyn are accused by many of being enemies of socialism. Solzhenitsyn is even called fascist. Is it true?

**Answer:** The first part of your question is not serious, since nobody knows what is the socialism that is supposed to be. Solzhenitsyn and I, we both love the country in which we live. But we love it, not for the reason that the regime is called by one name or another. With unprecedented bravery and talent, Solzhenitsyn fulfills his duty as a writer appealing to our memory not in order to condemn anybody or to execute them, but in order that we may be remembered as human beings. Only that man can call him a fascist who does not want to remember what fascism really means.

**Question:** The crimes about which Solzhenitsyn writes—these are the crimes of the system or of one man?

**Answer:** I think that the deep rooted cause of these crimes does not lie in Stalin's personality. Beginning with first days of the revolution when Stalin was not yet in power, fanaticism, the preaching of class hatred, wickedness, the breaking of the law, had already begun to take their toll. And this was not accidental.

**Question:** What is Solzhenitsyn's health and moral state?

**Answer:** I think Solzhenitsyn's moral state is the state of a man who has fulfilled his duty and that always helps the health. Of course under our conditions, they may do with him, whatever they like. Only people here and in the West, only publicity, only wide and open support can defend him.



# FRIGHTENING SILENCE ON THE HILL

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, ABC News Commentator Edward P. Morgan had hard counsel for us here in Congress, but I believe his words were right on target.

Mr. Morgan says we should demand that President Nixon stop delaying and stop hiding behind the doctrine of "executive privilege" and turn over to the Judiciary Committee the tapes and other information it needs to determine whether he should be impeached.

What is really ironic, as Mr. Morgan points out, is that for months now President Nixon has been saying that it is important that all the facts be known. And yet it is Mr. Nixon who is preventing these facts from coming out.

Following are Mr. Morgan's remarks. I commend them to my colleagues:

## FRIGHTENING SILENCE ON THE HILL

This is Edward P. Morgan with a look at a frightening silence on the Hill.

What we're waiting for is for House Judiciary Committee Chairman Rodino or his Republican Vice Chairman Hutchinson, or better yet both jointly, to address the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, publicly, politely but pointedly and with force, something along the following lines:

"Mr. President, you yourself have repeatedly declared that it is vital to get all the relevant evidence out, so those guilty in the multiple Watergate scandals can be brought to justice with dispatch, and those innocent cleared.

"Yet at almost every turn, the White House has put stubborn obstacles in the path of such proceedings, until it reached a point where the House commanded this committee to examine the mechanics of preparing for your possible impeachment as provided under the Constitution.

"Now it is our turn to be frustrated by your lawyer and by your own actions and public statements. This we cannot further tolerate. It is an affront to Congress and the country.

"You have not, of course, been accused of any crime. So you are not a defendant. But grim circumstances make you, inescapably, a suspect. Now an impeachment, or indictment, and the subsequent Senate trial are not court proceedings. They are a unique political process, used only once in the two centuries of our nation's history.

"But there are similarities with a criminal trial. A defendant in a criminal case cannot dictate how the prosecutor proceeds or what evidence he may have access to. Yet your attorney not only proclaims a most narrow definition of impeachable offenses, as if that itself were law, but turns around and asks a definition from the Judiciary Committee and demands a bill of indictable offenses while refusing to yield tapes and other evidence without which we cannot make a judgment on the impeachability, as it were, of you, Mr. President. How can you possibly justify such a position?

"Ah, we know your reasoning all too well. Your answer is that you are protecting the sanctity of the presidency, that unless you hold a hard line of executive privilege around it it should be dangerously eroded for future occupants of the Oval Office.

"In our considered judgment, that, if you'll pardon the expression, is hogwash. We respect the tradition of executive privilege but

we submit the record shows you have been using it not to protect the presidency but to protect yourself—but making exception to precedent when public pressure forced you to do so. How for example, can you otherwise explain your refusal to yield the tapes Special Prosecutor Cox requested until in the furor over his firing you suddenly changed your mind?

"Opinion polls increasingly show that the presidency has already been demeaned if not disgraced by the felonies committed under the canopy of Watergate. You are the only one who can clear its escutcheon. We are waiting. What are you waiting for?"

Sadly, disturbingly, no such appeal has been made by anybody in Congress.

If there ever was a time for Congress to be righteously indignant over White House intransigence, it is now.

## CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT AND BUREAUCRATIC ACCOUNTABILITY

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, last spring I introduced the Bureaucratic Accountability Act. The aim of this bill was to give the citizen the necessary tools to see that the bureaucracy followed the law and the congressional intent was followed.

Congress itself has an interest in making sure that the legislation it passes actually has an effect on what the bureaucracy does. This is the indispensable first step in reestablishing the constitutional role of Congress. Not only the citizen but also Congress needs new tools in relation to the Federal bureaucracy. For this reason, I am introducing a set of three bills designed to extend the powers of congressional oversight; this objective is to be pursued by strengthening the investigatory powers of the GAO, by defining the situations in which the President may properly withhold information from the Congress, and by circumscribing the capability of the CIA to escape congressional scrutiny.

The first bill is the Continuing Congressional Oversight Act. As the name suggests, its purpose is to regularize congressional investigation of Government agencies by providing for continuing evaluation of agencies by the GAO. The act provides that the GAO will make evaluations on the basis of the usual criteria used in the past and of one added consideration: whether the expenditure of Government funds conforms to congressional intent. In order to regularize GAO evaluations, which are now carried out only at congressional request, the act directs the Comptroller General to report periodically on each department and establishment of the Government, with an eye to both efficiency and conformity to congressional intent. Because of the magnitude of such a task, the bill directs that such evaluations be made once every 4 years for each department or establishment. The findings are to be made public.

In cases where the head of the department or establishment considers that investigation by the GAO will jeopardize the national interest, he or she may, according to the provisions of the act, so notify the Comptroller General and the appropriate congressional committees, and investigation may then be carried out by those committees. The bill thus arrives at a balance between the interests of congressional oversight and those of national security.

The second bill is the Congressional Access to Information Act. The act requires any head of a department or establishment to "appear and give complete testimony, or to provide complete information pertinent to matters of legislative concern \* \* \*" within 30 days of a subpoena or request for such information by any House or committee of Congress, and to certify the completeness of such testimony and information. A failure, substantive or procedural, to comply with these requirements, would cause the Comptroller General to take all measures necessary to cut off operational funds for the department or establishment in question. Under the act, the President, and only the President may direct a refusal of the information requested when such information concerns advice or policy recommendations to the President from members of the White House staff. Such a refusal, according to the provisions of the act, is to be made by the President in a signed written deposition specifying the areas concerning which information is to be denied. The act further assigns to any House or committee of Congress, as appropriate, standing to bring suit in the district court of the District of Columbia for the purpose of compelling disclosure of the contested information when the House or committee involved feels that it cannot accept the refusal of the information in question. The act thus defines the situations in which the President may refuse to provide requested information to Congress, and sets up a procedure by which contested claims can be judicially resolved.

The third bill is the Central Intelligence Agency Disclosure Act. In amending different sections of the United States Code which relate to the disclosure of information by the CIA, the act calls for the provision to the appropriate congressional committees of kinds of information which may now be denied to the Congress on the ground of national security. The intent of the act is to prevent the public disclosure of sensitive information while assuring its accessibility to the appropriate congressional committees.

The third bill is the Central Intelligence Agency Disclosure Act. In amending different sections of the United States Code which relate to the disclosure of information by the CIA, the act calls for the provision to the appropriate congressional committees of kinds of information which may now be denied to the Congress on the ground of national security. The intent of the act is to prevent the public disclosure of sensitive information while assuring its accessibility to the appropriate congressional committees.

## BARRON'S NOT "WITH IT" ON FUTURES BILL

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, Barron's newspaper editorialized on the "Futures Shock" of H.R. 13113, the bill to establish a Government commission with authority over all futures trad-

ing on commodities markets, leaving the impression that it is a monster sure to cripple the functioning and growth of markets.

The authors of this commentary are simply not "with it." The views expressed are not shared by any responsible official in either public or private life with whom I have talked. And because I am a co-sponsor of the bill and a member of the House Agriculture Committee where it was formulated, my discussions have been extensive. Every person without exception has said privately that, on balance, he finds the committee product acceptable, if not excellent. Only in a few instances do private comments differ from public.

Over the years I have seldom found occasion to do other than applaud Barron's editorial commentaries. They usually champion the private marketprice system.

Nevertheless, public confidence in futures trading is so vital and the prestige of Barron's so substantial in molding public opinion that I feel compelled to balance the record.

Futures trading is one of the most hopeful tools of agribusiness growth and stability. Volume has skyrocketed, but it still is only a fraction of what it should be in order to serve adequately the needs of producers and users.

Although regulated markets have been remarkably free of scandals and shady practices, the opportunities for such are immense and ever present. Government regulation is no cure-all, but it helps.

In practical terms, the furor arising from market gyrations a year ago has maintained such intensity that changes in Government regulation of markets is a certainty. The only question is the form it will take. The bill reported by the committee is the product of diligent study by a group of Congressmen sympathetic to the private merchandising system, and especially the interests of producers. The last thing they would wish is to hurt an institution like futures trading which is vital to farmers.

Those who want to see futures trading growth and stability should, I feel, rejoice rather than shed tears over the committee's product. It still faces hurdles. It may be attacked on the House floor by those who, in their zeal, will try to write into the law paralyzing restrictions. Barron's powerful editorial voice would be used to better purpose in defending the bill from such attacks, rather than calling for the bill's defeat.

The March 4 commentary was all the more regrettable, because it left several erroneous impressions concerning provisions and effects of the bill.

In order, here are my comments on the editorial.

#### First, Barron's:

The self-policing commodities trade during its one hundred odd years of existence has suffered no major scandals—surely nothing remotely resembling such disastrous frauds as Equity Funding and Four Season Nursing Homes, both of which the SEC has failed to prevent.

Response: A major recent failure in the commodities market occurred when a nonregulated commodity options firm in California, Goldstein and Samuelson,

collapsed. According to the CEA, customer losses exceeded \$71 million as a result of trading in commodity options which were written "naked." If the firm were regulated under the committee bill, this would not have happened since customer accounts would have been segregated and option trading itself, if allowed, would be strictly regulated by the Commission. Equity Funding and Four Season Nursing Homes were, like all securities and futures, an element of risk for the investor. However, in Goldstein and Samuelson it was not merely the option itself that proved risky, but the actual institution's handling of the investment. This is a risk that no investor, large or small, should be required to assume.

#### Second, Barron's: Multiple delivery points:

For openers, the Commission is to be given authority to determine the location and number of commodities delivery points. This is an immensely complex task, best left to the exchanges. 'Wheat delivered in Chicago is more valuable than wheat delivered in Des Moines,' notes Representative Symms. Thus, in cases where multiple delivery points are specified, there are also provisions for discounts to offset transportation differentials and the like. An inexperienced commission could easily gum up the works. However, with every member of the House Committee on Agriculture bucking for delivery points in his constituency, the issue has irresistible political appeal.

Response: The Committee on Agriculture well recognizes the danger in allowing the Commission to set delivery points in a cavalier fashion. H.R. 13113 provides the Commission can set delivery points only after the contract market itself has failed to respond positively to a request made after investigation of the Commission. Furthermore, there is no evidence whatsoever that "every member of the House Committee on Agriculture—is—bucking for delivery points in his constituency," as the article charges. I certainly was not. If that were so, the committee would have done more to assure that the regulation of the commodity futures trading would have remained in the political sphere; that is, with the Secretary of Agriculture who probably would have been more receptive to individual committee members' desires than the bipartisan independent Commission proposed in H.R. 13113. Additionally, the committee twice rejected amendments to allow congressional approval of such points.

#### Third, Barron's: Broker trading:

The presumption, along the Potomac at any rate, is that commission merchants are robbing the public blind by executing orders to their own advantage rather than the clients. Since all orders for customers and futures commission merchants are dated and time-stamped, it's a simple matter to monitor such activities. In addition, any hobbling of floor brokers would inevitably reduce market liquidity—as investors in securities have learned the hard way. Floor men's in-and-out trades are an important prop. Without them, trading would be dominated by commercial hedgers—with consequently wider price swings.

Response: There is no existing procedure in any regulated exchange that guarantees the accuracy of the time of transaction. Time-stamping of some—

not all—orders is accomplished when first received on the floor and subsequently when the order is returned to the desk where the order was first taken. In a hectic market there is no timing or posting the execution of each and every transaction. Rather, observers above the pit attempt, as best as possible, to identify those prices which appear significant to transmit to the wire.

#### Four, Barron's:

The CFTC also is to be granted sweeping injunctive powers, permitting it to close down anyone who 'has engaged, is engaging, or is about to engage' in any act that would violate the law. Injunctions could be issued whenever a market or an individual was in a position 'to effectuate a squeeze or corner or otherwise restrain trading.' Thus, the mere capacity to do 'wrong' would be enough to bring on the feds—a provision which on the face of it strikes us as unconstitutional.

Response: "About to engage" is statutory language which has stood the test of time. It is identical to powers presently possessed by the SEC. Unlike the SEC, however, the committee provided an additional safeguard to limit the use of the injunctive authority to those situations in which no realistic alternative was available. Therefore, the Commission is required to go through the Justice Department to obtain the injunction. The section also provides, in another break with the authority provided other Federal commissions, a prohibition against ex parte proceedings where there is no opportunity for the defendant to appear and contest the issuance of an injunction by the court.

The bill sets up a procedure wherein there will be at least three separate determinations to obtain an injunction: the CFTC must first decide to seek such an injunction; the Justice Department must implement such a decision; and the court itself, subject to appeal, must make its own separate determination that the injunction was warranted in view of all facts and circumstances surrounding the issuance of the injunction.

#### Five, Barron's:

Another dismaying provision is that all futures markets would have to be licensed.

Response: The majority of all domestic futures markets at present are "licensed"; that is, designated under the Commodity Exchange Act. In addition, some State governments have authority over contract markets. In California, for example, the State government has reportedly just acted against the West Coast Commodities Exchange.

#### Six, Barron's:

This proviso gives the proposed commission immediate justification to control the commodity futures industry. It could, for example, extend the expiration date of contracts, limit trading, alter delivery dates, and even suspend trading.

Response: Both the CEA and attorneys for at least one major board of trade feel that this authority is presently in the law. If not, then new authority is necessary in order to avoid a situation, such as last summer, when the Chicago Board of Trade responded to a request from the CEA that it take action with respect to closing month soybean contracts and was immediately sued for \$200 million by private plaintiffs for its action. The basis



for the suit reportedly was that the board had no authority for its action.

Seven. Barron's:

There are, for example, no compelling reasons for continuing the ban on commodities options trading or extending bureaucracy's reach to such previously unregulated international commodities as cocoa, coffee, copper, silver and sugar. But proposals that go for the jugular of a viable free market are potentially more disruptive."

(a) There are . . . no compelling reasons for continuing the ban on commodities options trading. . . .

Response: Documentation supplied to the committee indicated several compelling reasons to consider continuation of the ban on commodity options trading in some circumstances. At least one prominent futures economist, Roger W. Gray of Stanford University, takes the position that options serve no economic purpose and they should be flatly prohibited. Testimony was received by the committee that options trading should be allowed in the present "nonregulated" commodity futures but no responsible witnesses, even those who advocated such trading, stated that the options trading should be allowed without strong governmental supervision since to do so would appear to be giving the green light to "naked" options trading. It should also be remembered that commodity options were first regulated by State law in 1874 when the State of Illinois passed a statute prohibiting the trading in "privileges" as they were called then:

(b) "... extending bureaucracy's reach to such previously unregulated international commodities as cocoa, coffee, copper, silver, and sugar."

Response: Out of the 60 or more witnesses appearing before the committee or submitting testimony in the 7 months it was studying the futures industry, only one group consistently opposed any regulation of "international" commodities—the international exchanges themselves. The same arguments were made against making grain futures subject to Federal regulation in 1921 and 1922 when Congress first addressed these proposals with legislation. At that time it was stated that such regulation would put the exchanges out of business. Futures trading has prospered continually since then with an ever-expanding market participating in regulated commodities.

Eight. Barron's:

To illustrate, by buying a wheat contract, a baker can guard against a sudden jump in his raw materials costs. Likewise, by selling a contract specifying future delivery of wheat at an agreed-upon price, a farmer can assure himself of a profit even if the cash market declines when he harvests his crop.

Response: While a baker can buy a wheat contract under present law, a baker cannot exceed the specified speculative limits as an anticipatory hedger for wheat. As far as wheat futures go, very few small town bankers will loan a farmer money to maintain margin for such a contract, and there is no contract for flour.

The bill, of course, is the product of compromise. Given a free hand, I would change several provisions. But these issues are minor. On the big ones, the bill is sound: it brings all futures trading

under Government regulation; it establishes a quasi-independent commission to establish and carry out the regulation; it gives the commission enough flexibility to make adjustments in the light of experience.

As one who has occasionally criticized Committee Chairman W. R. POAGE, I seize this opportunity to congratulate him, other committee members and the committee lawyers, John O'Neal, John Rainbolt, and Hyde Murray on a splendid and unique product. Unlike most legislation, this bill was truly developed in committee, not in the executive branch. It is the result of long and diligent research and evaluation. All hearings and business sessions of the committee were open to the public.

My forecast is that a decade from now—assuming the bill clears remaining hurdles and becomes law—Barron's will find occasion to salute it as a worthy landmark in legislative efforts to strengthen futures trading as a servant of the public interest.

Text of Barron's article follows:

#### FUTURES SHOCK—A LEGISLATIVE THREAT LOOMS TO COMMODITIES TRADING

Commodities markets have long served the economic needs of farmers, processors and consumers without the dubious benefit of close government supervision. But Washington has chosen futures trading as an all-purpose scapegoat for soaring food prices. And within the next few days, the powerful House Committee on Agriculture will report out H.R. 11955, a measure that would impose full-scale federal regulation.

With a few honorable exceptions, industry spokesmen testifying against the bill made a deplorably weak case—while objecting to this or that provision, most were willing to accept it in principle as something they could "live with" (shades of Wall Street!). As it happens, the most forceful and effective opponent to emerge is Congressman Steven D. Symms (R., Idaho), who warned flatly: "Unless the industry exerts enormous pressure to halt this legislation, the freedom that made the futures system the remarkable success it is will soon be lost."

By contrast, advocates of H.R. 11955 have mobilized some Senatorial big guns—George McGovern (D., S.D.), Hubert Humphrey (D., Minn.), and Philip Hart (D., Mich.), among others. These worthies admit they have no real evidence of hanky-panky. For example, when Senator McGovern introduced a bill calling for stricter controls on futures trading, he alleged food price increases "were caused at least in part by manipulation and speculation." Subsequently, he backed off, saying: "I've had to eat crow on that one."

Senator Humphrey is equally ambivalent and determined. "I'm not saying there has been any nefarious activity," he says. "Don't get me wrong about that. I'm just saying the market as it is today isn't structured to prevent wrongdoings. It's like a time bomb."

Such "reasoning," if one may call it that, rests on the premise that regulation is an infallible cure-all for the presumed ills of the market. Indeed, some influential legislators are urging establishment of an organization like the Securities & Exchange Commission. The logic of this position is hard to grasp, inasmuch as the self-policing commodities trade during its 100-odd years of existence has suffered no major scandals—surely nothing remotely resembling such disastrous frauds as Equity Funding and Four Season Nursing Homes, both of which the SEC has failed to prevent.

Nonetheless, H.R. 11955 calls for the formation of a five-man Commodity Futures Trad-

ing Commission (CFTC), which would be granted sweeping policy and police powers under the aegis of the Department of Agriculture. For openers, the commission is to be given authority to determine the location and number of commodities delivery points. This is an immensely complex task, best left to the exchanges. "Wheat delivered in Chicago is more valuable than wheat delivered in Des Moines," notes Rep. Symms. Thus, in cases where multiple delivery points are specified, there are also provisions for discounts to offset transportation differentials and the like. An inexperienced commission could easily gum up the works. However, with every member of the House Committee on Agriculture bucking for delivery points in his constituency, the issue has irresistible political appeal.

The question of how much daily trading a floor broker can undertake for his own and a customer's account is also being turned over to the CFTC. The presumption, along the Potomac at any rate, is that commission merchants are robbing the public blind by executing orders to their own advantage rather than the clients. A look at the record, however, discloses extremely few documented instances of such abuse. Moreover, those in the pits are already under strict control by the exchanges. Since all orders for customers and futures commission merchants are dated and time-stamped, it's a simple matter to monitor such activities. In addition, any hobbling floor brokers would inevitably reduce market liquidity—as investors in securities have learned the hard way. Floor men's in-and-out trades are an important prop. Without them, trading would be dominated by commercial hedgers—with consequently wider price swings.

The CFTC also is to be granted sweeping injunctive powers, permitting it to close down anyone who "has engaged, is engaging, or is about to engage" in any act that would violate the law. Injunctions could be issued whenever a market or an individual was in a position "to effectuate a squeeze or corner or otherwise restrain trading." Thus, the mere capacity to do "wrong" would be enough to bring on the feds—a provision which on the face of it strikes us as unconstitutional.

Another dismaying provision is that all futures markets would have to be licensed, a key requirement being to demonstrate that specific contracts serve an economic purpose. Obviously (though perhaps not to lawmakers) the best test is success or failure in the marketplace. To illustrate, advances in refrigeration have greatly increased the trading roster of commodities once considered perishable, whereas an attempt to launch a market in turkey futures a few years back was a dismal flop.

More alarming, H.R. 11955 has a section describing circumstances in which the proposed commission could seize control of the futures industry. To wit: "Whenever it has reason to believe that the amount of deliverable supplies, the number of open contracts, the relative size of individual traders' positions, the amount and direction of price movements in cash and futures markets, the impact of government edicts and regulations . . . or any other such market factor that creates a condition which threatens orderly trading."

In other words, the commission itself, rather than free market forces, would decide when the number of open contracts is correct, when traders' positions are balanced, whether cash and/or futures prices are moving in the right direction. There are, of course, no objective yardsticks for determining these conditions, and the CFTC would have to make subjective judgments as to when it had the right and duty to intervene in trading.

Such a body could also direct markets in so-called "market emergencies." These are defined as: "... Significant intervention of

foreign governments in the futures market, war or other national emergency, price controls, export embargoes, or any other significant disruption of normal commercial processes which can reasonably be deemed to affect future transactions."

This proviso gives the proposed commission immediate justification to control the commodity futures industry. It could, for example, extend the expiration date of contracts, limit trading, alter delivery dates and even suspend trading.

Other features of H.R. 11955 are equally disturbing; there are, for example, no compelling reasons for continuing the ban on commodities options trading or extending bureaucracy's reach to such previously unregulated international commodities as cocoa, coffee, copper, silver and sugar. But proposals that go for the jugular of a visible free market are potentially more disruptive.

Commodities producers, processors and purchasers need to protect their interests in what is rapidly becoming a shortage economy. To illustrate, by buying a wheat contract, a baker can guard against a sudden jump in his raw materials costs. Likewise, by selling a contract specifying future delivery of wheat at an agreed-upon price, a farmer can assure himself of a profit even if the cash market declines when he harvests his crop.

Farm commodities traditionally have dominated futures markets. But virtually anything subject to volatile price swings can become a candidate for trading. No contract would be viable, however, without participation of individuals whose willingness to speculate on future price trends gives commodities markets liquidity.

On the whole, participants get a far fairer shake than in securities markets. Inside information is rare. Most projections on supply and demand are issued by federal agencies, and all players have access to the same scoreboards.

It is tempting for harried Congressmen to subscribe to the theory that sinister forces are engaged in widespread manipulation. The fact is, however, the price gyrations of last summer and beyond were largely attributable to shortages caused by ill-conceived government programs.

The very size of the business has made it an inviting target. In the fiscal year ended last June 30, some 47 million contracts, worth \$399 billion, were bought and sold on the nation's 13 exchanges. Five years earlier, the totals were 20 million contracts worth \$81 billion.

Clearly, the public has considerable confidence in the integrity of the current system, which was subject to self-policing 50 years before the Commodity Exchange Authority came into existence. Rep. Symms says it's possible the proposed measure will turn out to be one the industry can live with. But he has doubts. "If this bill is passed," he warns, "we will have yet another example of Congress throwing reason out the window, along with the liberty and economic survival of the American people."

#### SEPARATION PROGRAM DESIGNATOR

#### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. KOCH, and I have recently received from the Department of Defense a breakdown of the more than 35,000 GI's discharged under honorable conditions in fiscal 1973

who were branded with a separation program designator—SPD or SPN—for unsuitability. The list shows the reasons for unsuitability that were entered in coded form on discharge papers without hearing and frequently without the explanation of possible consequences to the individuals concerned. But while the 35,000 enlisted men and women may have been unaware of what their SPD means, employers have known all along and have denied jobs to many of them.

SPD's are clearly lifelong nonjudicial punishment imposed by the Defense Department on thousands of young men and women who have served their Nation with honor, but who fell short of the military's standards. In no case were they guilty of an offense under civil or military law, but they received an SPD with punitive consequences nevertheless.

Although the list shows but 35,000 with the good discharge/bad SPD combination, in the past 5 years alone more than 180,000 were similarly punished.

NUMBER OF HONORABLE AND GENERAL (UNDER HONORABLE CONDITIONS) DISCHARGES FOR UNSUITABILITY, FISCAL YEAR 1973

Reason for unsuitability	Number of honorable discharges	Number of general discharges	Total
Alcoholism.....	34	192	226
Apathy, defective attitude.....	3,092	6,921	10,103
Character and behavior disorders.....	10,909	10,330	21,239
Enuresis.....	291	41	332
Financial irresponsibility.....	94	96	190
Homosexual tendencies.....	263	109	372
Other aberrant tendencies.....	28	9	37
Inaptitude.....	2,391	542	2,933
Multiple reasons (USA only).....	94	204	298
Total.....	17,196	18,444	35,640

Source: Department of Defense.

#### PROABORTION RULING "BAD LAW"

#### HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, in discussing landmark decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, lawyers often quote the old saw "hard cases make bad law."

That maxim, in my opinion, applies to the Supreme Court's ruling in favor of legalized abortions.

As Mr. Justice White noted in his powerful dissent, the court's judgment was "an improvident and extravagant exercise of the power of judicial review that the Constitution extend to this court."

The abortion issue, in Mr. Justice White's view, "should be left with the people and to the political processes the people have devised to govern their affairs."

In furtherance of this philosophy, several of my colleagues and I have proposed various constitutional amendments that would have the effect of overturning the Court's decision. These amendments were introduced soon after the Supreme Court's proabortion deci-

sion of January 22, 1973. Now, 14 months later, we are still waiting for the Judiciary Committee to accede to our request for hearings.

The other body has been somewhat more responsive. The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments began hearings on the various anti-abortion amendments on March 6, 1974. I submitted the following statement in support of my proposals:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE  
GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

Mr. Chairman, we are here today to, hopefully, commence serious Congressional consideration of amendments to the Constitution which are urgently needed to nullify the January 22, 1973 U.S. Supreme Court abortion decisions in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 and *Doe v. Bolton*, 410 U.S. 179. I have stated on prior occasions, and repeat here, that these decisions, which strip the states of the power to prohibit abortions in approximately the first six months of pregnancy, are bad law. The decisions have been variously denounced by legal scholars as "unfortunate", "replete with error and fraught with dangerous implications",<sup>1</sup> lacking "constitutional foundation",<sup>2</sup> and lacking "colorable support in the constitutional text, history, or any other appropriate source of constitutional doctrine."<sup>3</sup> On reading the decisions, one is struck by the Court's reliance on decisions concerning the right to receive contraceptives as justification for sustaining an abortion right, the fundamental distinction being the difference between prevention of conception and the destruction of human life; by the Court's utter disregard for numerous lower court decisions clearly establishing the legal personhood of the unborn in various areas of the law; by the Court's disinclination to factually determine when human life begins, yet its willingness to read the unborn out of the protection afforded by the Fourteenth Amendment, without so much as a reference to the intent of the Framers; and by the Court's arbitrary selection of fetal viability as the time in pregnancy at and after which states may conditionally prohibit abortions.

As a result of such faulty legal analysis, the seven majority justices in *Wade* and *Bolton* have visited on 210 million Americans a legal system that permits hundreds of thousands of legal abortions a year. That the Law, in all its Majesty, stoops to permit such behavior wounds me as a lawyer and as a human being.

The Congress must take the lead in ensuring that human life, at all stages of development, receives the protection of the laws of this country. While it is true that *Wade* and *Bolton* allow the states certain regulatory authority over abortions, both decisions make clear that such regulation must not unduly inhibit the exercise of the abortion right. Simply put, the states are now helpless to stem the pro-abortion tide. Clearly, Congress must assume the leadership role. It is to this end, hopefully, that we are gathered here today.

A Constitutional amendment is needed to restore the right to life to the unborn. This conclusion is compelled from the fact that, as a result of the *Wade* decision, the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution must now be read to (1) insulate the abortion de-

<sup>1</sup> Loewy, *Abortive Reasons and Obscene Standards: A Comment on the Abortion and Obscenity Cases*, 52 N.C.L. Rev. 223 (1973)

<sup>2</sup> Byrn, *An American Tragedy: The Supreme Court on Abortion*, 41 Fordham L. Rev. 807, 809 (1973)

<sup>3</sup> *Supreme Court Review 1973—Abortion*, 64 Jour.Crim.L. and Criminology, 393, 399 (1973)

<sup>4</sup> Ely, *The Wages of Crying Wolf: A Comment on Roe v. Wade*, 82 Yale L.J. 920, 943 (1973)



cision with a right of privacy that precludes the prohibition of abortions in the early months of pregnancy and (2) deny to the unborn the protections of that Amendment.

This Committee has before it two proposed Constitutional amendments, S.J. Res. 119, the so-called "Buckley Amendment" and S.J. Res. 130, introduced by Senator Helms, either of which would correct the immoral and legally illogical *Wade* and *Bolton* decisions and ensure constitutional protection for the unborn. I personally favor S.J. Res. 130 which is identical to H.J. Res. 631, a proposed Constitutional Amendment which I have introduced in the House. S.J. Res. 119, unfortunately, embodies an exception to the general prohibition on abortion; an exception which I fear may be subsequently interpreted in the courts in such a manner as to render the general prohibition meaningless. I urge this Committee, however to give its prompt attention to weighing the virtues and vices of both measures so that action may be completed at the earliest possible date.

Before closing, I would assert that it is possible that Congress would be reluctant to vote for a Constitutional amendment which would effect a nation-wide abortion ban. In addition to proposed amendments such as S.J. Res. 119 and S.J. Res. 130, which would have such an effect, I therefore urge alternative consideration of an amendment which would, at least, return to the states the plenary power to regulate or limit abortion practices. I have co-sponsored such a measure, H.J. Res. 537, in the House. The substantive language of this amendment reads:

"Nothing in this Constitution shall bar any State, or the Congress with regard to any area over which it is granted the power to exercise exclusive legislation, from enacting laws respecting the life of an unborn child from the time of conception."

Rather than prohibit abortions in every state, an amendment such as H.J. Res. 537 would empower each state to regulate abortion as it saw fit. Such an amendment would restore that notion of Federalism which was destroyed in *Wade*. As Mr. Justice White noted in dissent, the result of *Wade* is that "the people and the legislatures of the 50 states are constitutionally disoriented" to decide the abortion question. White continued:

"As an exercise of raw judicial power, the Court perhaps has the authority to do what it does today; but in my view its judgment is an improvident and extravagant exercise of the power of judicial review that the Constitution extends to this Court."

"[The abortion] issue, for the most part, should be left with the people and to the political processes the people have devised to govern their affairs."

Indeed, given the opportunity to offer direct expression on the question of abortion, voters in two referenda, one in North Dakota and one in Michigan, on November 7, 1972, resoundingly defeated efforts to liberalize the availability of abortions in those states. However, the Supreme Court—or rather seven Justices—has decreed that states may no longer decide for themselves; that abortions must be available in all the states. This usurpation of a traditional state power is another shocking result of the *Wade* decision. The Court of Appeals for Kentucky, the highest appellate court in that state, recently invalidated the Kentucky abortion statute, under the constitutional compulsion of the principles enunciated in *Wade*. Mr. Justice Osborne of that court, in concurring in the decision, remarked on the usurpation of state power effected by *Wade*:

"I concur in the actions of the court in this matter simply because I feel I have no alternative. By doing so I do not want it to be interpreted that I agree to any part of the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*. . . . I believe that court, in this instance and in many others, has and is usurping the rights of the several states in this Union to determine for themselves

what constitutes a crime and to enforce their own criminal laws. This inference has now reached the point of the ridiculous. The citizens of the several states are forced, more and more, to look to the seat of our National Government for guidance, regulation and control and when they look they are perceiving more and more of nothing but confusion and incompetence.

"The federalist government which our ancestors established in this land has, at this time and point, been obliterated. This has been accomplished by all three branches of our Federal Government with no reason or purpose but to seize for themselves power. Now that they have seized the power, it daily becomes apparent that they totally lack the qualifications to properly exercise it."

"If the court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* is a barometer of what is about to befall us, we should all turn our heads to heaven for mercy for there is nothing left."

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, this Committee must act immediately on measures to ensure the right to life to the unborn. Congress must present to the states such a measure at the earliest possible occasion. At the very minimum, we must permit the individual states to decide the abortion question for themselves. And we must never lose sight of our purpose—to preserve the sanctity of human life. My personal views, and I would hope the views of most people here today, find expression in the eloquence of the distinguished French philosopher, Francois Mauriac, when he wrote:

"I believe as I did as a child, that life has meaning, a direction, a value; that no suffering is lost, that every tear counts, and each drop of blood, and the secret of living in today's troubled world is found in the simple phrase of St. John, 'Deus caritas est.'"

#### POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, most Members are aware of the organization, Amnesty International, which has won worldwide respect for its impartial work on behalf of all "prisoners of conscience" in jails throughout the world.

This week, officers of the organization find themselves outraged by denials of the existence of political prisoners in South Vietnam. As more and more facts on the situation come to light, the Nixon-Thieu forces combine to denounce criticism and discredit critics.

It may be difficult, however, for administration spokesmen to dismiss such questions as those raised by James Harrison of Amnesty International. I insert in the RECORD his letter which appeared in the New York Times on March 19:

SAIGON: DOLLARS FOR JAILS

To the Editor:

If there are "only 35,139 prisoners of all types" in South Vietnam, as reported by former U.S. Ambassador to Saigon Elbridge Durbrow and others after their recent tour, why does the U.S. still find it necessary to budget an estimated \$20 million a year for Saigon's police system, four times the amount it gives for hospitals in South Vietnam? And why are there some 120,000 security personnel and over 600 detention centers in a country the size of an average U.S. state?

As for the "ulterior motives" and "foreign" connections of those who allege that up to 200,000 political prisoners have been detained in the South—which the Ambassador's group, the American Security Council, suggested should be investigated—they are "foreign" only to the kind of thinking which believes it rational to contribute to the decimation of the population, the maiming of millions, the arrest of countless thousands for trying to improve the situation, the uprooting of one third of the population and the destruction of much of the landscape for up to a century, all lest a relatively small country become Communist at exactly the same time that our country is making basic compromises to get along with Communist Russia and China.

Amnesty International, with its headquarters in London, is proud to be "foreign" in that sense. Together with many other organizations with reliable sources in Vietnam, we believe that many tens of thousands will remain in jail even if the latest efforts to exchange a few thousand civilian detainees as called for over a year ago are completed, an insurmountable obstacle to real peace and a mockery of American policy in Vietnam.

Meanwhile, the State Department replies to letters of inquiry about specific cases among some 2,500 individual "prisoners of conscience" worked for by Amnesty International with the statement, "It would not be appropriate for the U.S. Government to interject itself into individual prisoner cases involving either Vietnamese side."

If so, we must also end with a question: Why has the United States spent well over \$100 billion in the name of protecting "free choice" in Vietnam, when Saigon arrests anyone who tries to assert basic freedoms?

#### FOURTH DISTRICT CENTURY CLUB

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my custom to make public financial matters involving my congressional office which may be of consequence to my constituency. Accordingly, I am submitting a brief report on the activities of the Congressman CONLAN's Century Club, an organization founded last year.

The club is nonpolitical in nature. Its main function is to facilitate dissemination of information to residents of my congressional district and create direct communication between the membership and myself at periodic breakfasts, lunches or dinners.

Membership dues are \$100 a year. The funds thus collected are used to defray expenses incurred in the production of newsletters and other informational costs such as travel expenses of my mobile office. The trustees of the club and its funds, over which I have no personal control, are businessman H. G. Miller and CPA William Thrall, former deputy auditor general of the State of Arizona.

In 1973 the club collected \$1,300 from friends in my district, all of which was expended for the purposes mentioned above. In addition, I received \$1,292.50 in donations from 93 constituents to assist in publication costs of my periodic newsletter.

# IRAN'S PROPOSALS FOR THE WORLD ECONOMY

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the Shah of Iran in late February that his nation was willing to make a tangible contribution toward easing the severe worldwide effect of skyrocketing oil prices was a welcome idea to oil hungry nations around the globe.

Although the details are still quite flexible, I understand that our Government looks with favor upon the Shah's initiative and feel that his three-point program is a responsible action on the part of one of the world's oil giants to ease the severe economic hardships resulting from the international energy crisis.

The following editorial which appeared in the March 1, Washington Post, is a thoughtful analysis of the Shah's overtures, and I include this editorial at the conclusion of my remarks:

## IRAN'S PROPOSALS FOR THE WORLD ECONOMY

Iran has made a far-reaching proposal to cope with some of the acute dislocations caused in the world economy by the oil cartel's quadrupling of prices two months ago. To help poor countries hit by the increases to maintain the momentum of development, Iran would have 12 oil exporters and 12 industrialized countries put up \$150 million each a year (a total of \$3 billion) in a new soft-loan fund, to be run by donors and recipients on "non-political" lines and to be serviced by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. To help oil importers absorb the severe balance-of-payments impact of the new prices, Iran will lend perhaps \$700 million (at commercial rates) to the IMF, to be recycled to importers. Iran also will buy (at commercial rates) some \$200 million in ordinary World Bank bonds. The Shah has committed his country to put up \$1 billion for these three uses this year. He hopes his initiative will be joined and supported by other states.

The Shah's proposal is, first, a major political move reflecting an Iranian bid for global political stature. It goes well beyond the bilateral oil arrangements which the Shah is quietly and simultaneously making with countries of his region. It makes Iran the first member of OPEC, the oil cartel, to offer a comprehensive adjustment plan for the world economy. It puts Iran in the prestigious position of using the great international financial institutions, the World Bank and IMF, as instruments of Iranian policy to a considerable extent. Indeed, these institutions, by accepting the Shah's initiative, have in effect endorsed his grand strategy of reshaping the world economy to pay the new high prices of the oil cartel; it is the American grand strategy, of course, to lower the prices. And no matter what comes of the proposed new soft-loan fund, the Shah will make a good return on funds invested in the IMF and the World Bank's hard-loan branch.

The soft-loan fund idea is especially interesting because of the poor countries' desperation. The oil exporters have sound moral and political reason to come to the aid of their price-stricken third-world brothers. To be candid, however, \$150 million a year per donor is not much; for Iran, it's only one per cent of the increment of its oil revenues. Then, there are differences between Iran's

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

aid proposal and the evident aid proclivities of OPEC's Arab members. Iran and Saudi Arabia are political rivals; whether the Saudis will wish to support an Iranian proposal, one which they were not invited to help shape, remains to be seen. Iran wants aid to be nonpolitical but the Arabs avowedly want to use oil as a political weapon. The Arabs may not be as ready as Iran to use the services of the World Bank and IMF. So far only Venezuela, another non-Arab OPEC member, has indicated support for the Iranian proposal. There is always the prospect, however, that if the Arabs do not choose to join Iran on this fund, they will create their own separate and larger one. The need is there.

The \$700 million which Iran plans to loan to the IMF will help it serve better the swollen liquidity requirements of the oil-importing nations. There is no particular political reason why the Arabs in OPEC should not follow suit, and there is good economic reason why they should: the IMF is a good safe place to invest some of their surplus funds. Recycling oil revenues to consumers should quiet their nerves, at least in the short run. Just how consumers are to earn the money to pay back the IMF, and their other creditors, is necessarily a longer-term problem running beyond the writ of the IMF.

Needless to say, the Shah's initiative is not the last word, or perhaps even his last word. But he has put into circulation serious proposals to deal with some of the basic new conditions of the world economy. Moreover, he is treating the world economy as the integrated interdependent entity which it is. If there is a tight strand of Iranian self-interest in what the Shah of Iran suggests, then the rest of us should not be put off. We should test his ideas to see which of them may work.

## JAMES BRIAN RAYMOND RECEIVING A CERTIFICATE OF MERITORIOUS SERVICE

**HON. DAN KUYKENDALL**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that James Brian Raymond, of 4220 Burgundy Road in Memphis, Tenn., will today be receiving a certificate of meritorious service as an international volunteer for the International Red Cross. The accomplishments of this young man should serve as an excellent example for the youth of this country.

Jim was a member of the Friendship Africa team of 1973. This was a team of 12 youths and one leader who served as international student volunteers during the summer of 1973 in a work-service program conducted jointly by the American National Red Cross and Red Cross National Societies in Liberia and Malawi.

While in Africa, Jim taught first aid, health, and safety in the schools of Liberia. He developed a course in basic health relevant to Liberia, using materials from Homemaking Handbook, published by USAID; a guide to Health and Good Food for the Family, Cornelia Van Schelvan, Malawi; and the American Red Cross Home Nursing Manual. This course is now being taught in the public schools in Liberia.

March 21, 1974

Also while in Liberia, Jim saved two boys—8 and 10 years old—from drowning.

For these meritorious activities, Jim is to receive a certificate and pin as an international volunteer presented by the American National Red Cross and signed by George Elsey, national president of the American Red Cross. Jim has also been given a citation and awarded the certificate of merit for life saving by the National Red Cross.

## MR. NIXON IS THE ISSUE—NOT THE PRESIDENCY

**HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during his question-and-answer session in Houston last Tuesday, President Nixon suggested that the House Judiciary Committee's request for additional documentary information to carry out its impeachment investigation amounted to "dragging out Watergate" and thus "dragging down America." The President asserted that the committee already had all the information it needed for its investigation, thanks to magnanimous generosity on his own part in turning over materials which had already been given to the Special Prosecutor. By cooperating, he said, he had already seriously compromised the Office of the Presidency—and he warned that he would tolerate no further assaults on that Office.

Mr. Speaker, the President does not seem to understand: It is not the Office of the Presidency which is under investigation. It is rather the current incumbent of that Office—the manner in which Mr. Nixon has or has not exercised the responsibilities of that Office under the Constitution. The Constitution does, indeed, insure separation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, just as Mr. Nixon says, but it also provides a safeguard to protect the Nation from abuses of power by the incumbent in the Presidential Office.

The constitutional safeguard, Mr. Speaker, is the impeachment responsibility which it assigns to the Congress. In its present effort to carry out that burdensome responsibility, the Congress is not presuming to breach the constitutional separation of powers nor attack the Office of the Presidency. And, as the following editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin so eloquently demonstrates, Mr. Nixon has no right to hide behind his Presidential seal in order to avoid cooperating with the constitutional process of impeachment. The editorial reads as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Mar. 20, 1974]

## PRESIDENT NIXON AND THE PRESIDENCY

Throughout his question-and-answer session with the National Association of Broadcasters last night President Nixon appeared determined not only to limit the scope of the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment inquiry, but also to impede the inquiry.



Mr. Nixon acted as though it were not he, but the office he holds—the Presidency—that is under searching and critical scrutiny by a committee of the House of Representatives acting under a direct mandate by an overwhelming and bipartisan majority of that chamber. It is this stance on the part of President Nixon, and not the House committee's determination to do the job assigned to it, that could "drag out Watergate" and possibly "drag down America."

As he has in his recent and frequent public appearances, President Nixon seemed to be appealing directly to the American people to weaken what has been the obvious determination of the Judiciary Committee to assert its constitutional rights and demand from the White House all of the information it deems relevant to its inquiry. For the committee to yield to public or any kind of pressure now would be to give way to intimidation and a very apparent effort by the White House to cloud the entire issue in even greater confusion.

Mr. Nixon acts as though the House Judiciary Committee is engaged upon some massive, political fishing expedition with the sinister intention of driving him from office and weakening all future presidents. The facts simply do not support such a charge.

The process of impeachment is designed to preserve the Presidency from abuse by an incumbent. And in seeking to determine whether or not President Nixon should be impeached—that is, subjected to trial by the United States Senate—the House Judiciary Committee is also fulfilling its constitutional mandate to preserve the Presidency.

It is not the Presidency that is the subject of the committee's inquiry, it is President Nixon. Yet, President Nixon's whole effort is designed to convince the public that this is not so. The committee's reasoned requests for tape recordings and for documents beyond those given the Watergate grand jury are treated as conspiratorial incursions against the office itself. Yet, even the senior Republican member of the Judiciary Committee has termed the committee's requests "reasonable."

President Nixon has, of course, every right to use whatever legal means are available to buttress the position he now takes. But the House of Representatives, acting as it is as a grand jury for the American people, also has the right and the duty to press for the information it regards as vital to its inquiry.

It would be far better for the White House to cooperate fully with the House committee instead of trying to scatter legal dust in the eyes of the public. The committee has given no indication at all that it wants to "paw" over or "haul" material from the White House. It is unfair and unfitting for the Presidency to suggest that it has.

President Nixon said last night that he is trying to find a way to cooperate with the House Judiciary Committee. Only the President can do this, and he can do it by providing the material that has been requested. Such cooperation with the House committee in its awesome task would be precisely the kind of strong and right decision that President Nixon said last night is essential to preserving the Presidency.

MRS. DOROTHY BUSSARD

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my pleasure to meet with Dorothy Bussard, affectionately nicknamed Mrs.

"Middletown America." Mrs. Bussard is national president of AMVETS Auxiliary and is a resident of Middletown, Md., in my congressional district.

I met with Mrs. Bussard after she attended a hearing of the Veterans Legislative Committee to support the testimony being given by Berge Avadanian, national commander of AMVETS, the veterans' organization born out of World War II and continuing its concern with membership of Korean and Vietnam veterans.

Mrs. "Middletown America" Bussard represents the average woman in America today—a woman who devotes herself to service to mankind while fulfilling her role as a member of the working force, an outstanding mother and wife of a veteran who unselfishly fought for our country.

I salute all Mrs. "Middletown Americas" through the personification of Dorothy Bussard.

#### BENIGN NEGLECT WOULD BE EASIER ON EVERYBODY'S NERVES

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times published an article by Don Cook on February 24 entitled, "Nixon's Foreign Policy: How Foreigners React," which may be of interest to my colleagues. It covers the subject of Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy primarily as that policy has affected our relations with the Western European countries.

We are all familiar with the President's statement proclaiming this the year of Europe wherein the efforts of the United States will be directed toward a redefinition of the U.S.-European relationship, and supposedly a more mutually satisfying alliance. As the article points out, however, the results of efforts in this direction so far have been less than encouraging, and to our European allies they have begun to appear mildly threatening. "Détente" with the Soviet Union has caused considerable uneasiness about the future of our defensive alliance with Western Europe, and the Washington oil conference, which took place just a few weeks ago may have caused more diplomatic problems than it was convened to solve.

It seems to me that despite the initial successes of the highly personalized style of diplomacy displayed by Mr. Kissinger, there are serious drawbacks casting doubt on the efficacy of such a style when applied to more routine relations between traditional allies. The style was perhaps appropriate for the tough negotiating required to get us out of our full-scale military involvement in Vietnam. It also appears to have been useful in establishing new contacts with China, and improving those with the Soviet Union. The Arabs have expressed their admiration for the ability of our Secretary of State to bring the belliger-

ents together on efforts toward an agreement in the Middle East. However, the Latin American nations, traditionally among our closest allies, have found Mr. Kissinger's approach less than adequate, as have the Europeans.

The tactics used seem to be a major problem. When approaching the Foreign Ministers' conference in Mexico City, in a series of brilliant diplomatic moves, Mr. Kissinger managed to take the wind out of expected criticism of United States-Panama and United States-Peru relations by concluding a new agreement with the Panamanians on the controversial Canal Zone, and by reaching a decision with the Peruvians on the longstanding dispute over compensation of several large corporations expropriated in 1968 and subsequent years. These moves, however, were intended to stifle Latin American complaints about their client relationship with the United States, of which Panama and Peru provided two examples. The Foreign Ministers then became publicly irritated when Kissinger stressed the advantages of a hemisphere "community" which to them amounted to a reassertion of U.S. dominance.

Similarly, the tactics used by Kissinger on approaching the European nations have aroused criticism, particularly from France. In preparing for the Washington oil conference, the Secretary had agreed to a French proposal to include oil producing nations in the dialog to be conducted in Washington, as well as oil consuming nations. In the end, however, he reverted to his original intention of including only the oil consumers and, in fact, even failed to invite some of them, leaving out four of the Common Market countries. His tactics in Europe have led to diplomatic difficulties, as have his tactics in Latin America.

The article I insert below explains further the origins of the problems we are now having with Europe, problems that have received considerable news coverage of late, focusing primarily on the statements of one of our most vocal critics, French Foreign Minister Michel Jobert. In my opinion, the article is of significant value in that it contains an excellent analysis of the "why" of European criticism, and I hope it will be read by each of my colleagues.

The text follows:

NIXON'S FOREIGN POLICY: HOW FOREIGNERS REACT; EUROPEANS SOURD BY U.S. PROPOSALS, TACTICS

(By Don Cook)

PARIS.—The Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy probably has been least successful in Europe, where America's ties are older and deeper than elsewhere and where U.S. security is most directly involved.

This is all the more depressing, if not alarming, because President Nixon and Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger have generally moved toward Europe with what they believe to be generous motives and the best of goodwill—only to be rebuffed by the Europeans.

Europe and America now seem increasingly to be getting on each other's nerves. Kissinger blows off steam in private about the craven, weak-kneed unreliability of his NATO allies, and the Europeans in turn grumble about some Bismarckian power-complex with which Kissinger tries to order the world.

"I wonder," a British ambassador mused

recently, "if there isn't some subliminal resentment in Kissinger against Europeans—you know, the emigrant who left Europe behind and then made it to the top in the world's most competitive intellectual society, now making decisions which affect our lives."

The breakdown of communication and lack of understanding are apparent in European reaction to three major Nixon-Kissinger initiatives toward Europe in the past year:

The Year-of-Europe speech of April, 1973; Nobody in Europe was advised or consulted in advance. Kissinger, calling for a new Atlantic declaration, did not specify or had not thought through where, how and by whom this was to be drafted. Ireland is a member of the Common Market but not of NATO; vice versa for Norway, Greece, Turkey and Portugal.

Kissinger asked that Japan be linked in new global arrangements without asking either the Europeans or the Japanese if they would go along.

And he asserted that this whole operation "should not be left to experts," but should be dealt with at the top level by a small number of senior personal advisers to presidents and heads of state like himself. But this totally ignored how European governments operate—both in cabinet responsibility and the fact that no government in Europe would dream of bypassing its foreign minister the way Kissinger, in his White House days, bypassed the State Department. Thus, on technical, strategic and tactical grounds the Year-of-Europe speech drew a skeptical if not openly sour European reaction from which it has never fully recovered.

The Brezhnev-Nixon San Clemente declaration of June, 1973: Without any prior consultation or warning to the NATO allies, President Nixon and Kissinger produced an agreement with the Russians on political cooperation and avoidance of nuclear war. This raised questions in Europe about which comes first with Kissinger and Mr. Nixon—the NATO Treaty or their new coziness with the Soviet Union.

Moreover, it was a declaration which, at least by implication, minimized the nuclear deterrence on which NATO security ultimately has to rest.

The Washington oil conference: Kissinger hastily tried this on with the British, French, Dutch and West Germans when he went to Europe for the December NATO meeting, and then produced his proposal in a London dinner speech. At French insistence, he included oil producers as well as consumers in his plan for an energy action group. But when he got back to Washington he made two mistakes. He reverted to "consumers only" for the initial conference, and he invited only five of the nine Common Market countries. Instantly he was up to his neck in diplomatic problems with the French and the Common Market.

Moreover, instead of high-level consultations, the invitees simply received an American proposed agenda only 10 days before the Washington meeting.

The point in each of these major foreign policy moves is not that Kissinger was wrong and the Europeans were right—but rather that Kissinger's tactics have been self-defeating and have caused more resentment than understanding.

He could have launched the Year-of-Europe idea with some careful exploratory talks in NATO and in various capitals, looking toward NATO's 25th birthday in April. President Nixon could have listened to Brezhnev's ideas about a declaration of co-operation and told him to wait until their next meeting while he thought it over and consulted his allies. The oil conference could have been convened under the framework of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris, a larger and more clumsy gathering but one to which the French could not have objected.

Kissinger's irritation with the slower processes of diplomacy is well known, and

probably is reinforced by his spectacular successes when unencumbered by the Europeans he has dealt bilaterally with the Egyptians, Israelis, Chinese, North Vietnamese or Russians.

Two self-inflicted handicaps also hamper U.S. diplomacy. The first is the decline of U.S. embassies in Europe. Manned at the top by mediocre Nixon political appointees, bypassed and ignored by Washington, and now increasingly drained of able senior career men who have quit in frustration, the American embassies abroad have simply dried up as functioning instruments of Kissinger-Nixon foreign policy.

The second handicap is Watergate. Suspicion that a major motivation of Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy is to offset Watergate is reinforced by the urgency and haste with which Kissinger acts. He has seemed to be on a frenetic search for successful results. There is the danger that Kissinger and Mr. Nixon, frustrated by Europe's sour response, may turn to Moscow for success, and buy it at a price that mortgages everybody's future.

"I wish that Kissinger would simply do nothing about Europe for a long while now—let's just have a long fallow period in which we allow realities to focus and ideas and common interests to converge," said a senior, pro-American foreign ministry official. "Often in diplomacy it takes as much courage to wait as it does to act, certainly as much wisdom. But I am afraid that Henry is an activist and Nixon wants action and results."

What this diplomat advocates in essence—benign neglect—would be easier on everybody's nerves.

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, over the years the various veterans organizations have solidly backed law enforcement agencies, especially the FBI, and the work of the congressional investigative committees. It was no surprise, then, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States oppose the abolition of the House Committee on Internal Security and the transferral of its function to the House Committee on Government Operations.

The Chicago Tribune of March 4, ran an article by Ronald Koziol, one of the Trib's veteran investigative reporters, calling to public attention the report on the Symbionese Liberation Army just recently released. The SLA, of course, is the group which kidnapped Patricia Hearst, whose whereabouts are still unknown. Copies of the report can be obtained from the committee, free for the asking, while the supply lasts.

The SLA report of the committee is but one of the many reports and hearings made available for public use over the years by HCIS. It makes sense then for responsible and concerned organizations like the Legion and VFW to support efforts directed at keeping American citizens informed on issues of high priority.

I insert at this point the Chicago Tribune article, "Kidnapers Well-Funded, U.S. Reports" by Mr. Koziol, along with the two national resolutions of the American Legion and the VFW which are still

in force and which speak for several million veterans in their support of the work of the House Committee on Internal Security:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 4, 1974]

KIDNAPERS WELL-FUNDED, UNITED STATES REPORTS

(By Ronald Koziol)

The Symbionese Liberation Army, which claims responsibility for the kidnapping of Patricia Hearst, 20-year-old publishing heiress, is well-funded and capable of improvising under pressure, a Congressional investigation has discovered.

The findings are contained in a special report compiled on the S.L.A. by investigators for the House Internal Security Committee on orders of its chairman, U.S. Rep. Richard H. Ichord [D., Mo.].

Altho little was known of the S.L.A. and its activities before the Feb. 4 kidnapping of Miss Hearst in California, the committee was able to piece together a series of incidents indicating that the revolutionary group had no financial problems.

One such incident attesting to this fact was the rent payments made by members of the S.L.A. on a home in Concord, 20 miles northeast of Oakland. The home was described by police as the headquarters of the terrorist group.

Investigators discovered the house was rented by Nancy Ling Perry, a fugitive and an admitted S.L.A. member. Miss Perry paid a security deposit of \$100 and a month's rent of \$500 when the house was first rented last August.

In paying the initial rent, Miss Perry used money orders drawn on a New York City bank. Subsequent rental payments were made up to Jan. 2, either by money orders or cash.

Other evidence found indicated that the S.L.A. was planning to finance itself thru a series of well-organized burglaries. Investigators believe several burglaries of homes of wealthy San Francisco Bay residents were committed by the group.

Miss Perry's financial independence also was evident on the last known job she had. She was employed as a waitress at the Fruity Rudy juice stand in Berkeley from February to August, 1973. The operator of the stand told investigators that Miss Perry earned \$140 a week and gave \$130 of it to prison inmates at California's Vacaville prison during her weekly visits there.

One other source, not connected with the House committee, has told The Tribune that it is believed one of the 10 known members of the S.L.A. inherited a large sum of money last year. The time period of the inheritance coincides with purchases of expensive walkie-talkies, guns and ammunition by the group.

The committee report suggests that the S.L.A. is a small, close-knit group of at least six, with a probable maximum under 10 persons.

"From the associates of the S.L.A., it must be presumed that some members and former members of the Venceremos Organization know the S.L.A. and are willing to support its terrorist acts," the report notes.

The Venceremos Organization was considered one of the most violent revolutionary groups operating in the United States from 1971 until its almost complete disintegration last August. Here again, investigators believe the split in the Venceremos group led to the birth of the S.L.A. and the renting of the Concord home was an initial step.

RESOLUTION No. 405 OF THE AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORT THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY AND THE SENATE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

Whereas, The House Committee on Internal Security and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have clearly proved their worth to the Nation and its security by ex-



posing, through their investigations, the working of the Communist conspiracy within the United States; and

Whereas, The current expansion of activities on the part of the Communist Party, USA, recent revelations by the Director of the FBI, and the decisions of the Supreme Court, which emasculated the internal security legislation of the United States, have made even more clear the necessity for continued action on the part of these Congressional Committees; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Chicago, Illinois, August 22, 23, 24, 1972, that The American Legion again express its confidence in the work of the House Committee on Internal Security and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as important instruments for the exposure and eradication of the Communist menace within our borders; and, be it further

Resolved, That this organization does urge the said committees to continue vigorously in the work which they have so well undertaken in the years past; and, be it further

Resolved, That The American Legion petition the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to enable these committees to extend and expand their activities.

#### RESOLUTION NO. 102 OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

##### THE DOMESTIC THREAT

Whereas, there exists in these United States multiple groups of either a permanent or *ad hoc* character ranging from the Communist Party, USA (CPUSA), with the clear and avowed mission of overthrowing our free institutions, to groupings of a more fleeting, single-issue-oriented nature which seek to embarrass and discredit the United States; and

Whereas, far too many persons in the communications media have failed to report violent dissidence and treason "as it is," but have extended inordinately respectful coverage to those who have consistently displayed hatred and contempt for our country, our flag and institutions; and

Whereas, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; now, therefore be it

Resolved, by the 74th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that

(a) The Federal Bureau of Investigation continue and intensify its program of surveillance and reporting upon parties, groups, and individuals whose actions are inimicable to the domestic tranquility of the United States; and

(b) Since the Subversive Activities Control Board (SACB) was not fully used by the Attorney General and has been permitted to decay and perish, full support must now be extended to H.R. 6241 (Constitutional Oath Support Act) which revises and strengthens America's Federal Civilian Employee Loyalty-Security Program; and

(c) Subversive elements attacking the Armed Forces from within or without be identified and prosecuted with energy and dedication; and

(d) All of those so-called groups and peace activists who by their actions undermined our war effort in Southeast Asia and contributed to their deterioration of the peace agreements which were established with the communists, be publicly spotlighted for what they are and subjected to vigorous legal prosecution as they seek to disappear into the wide American Society in the post-Vietnam era; and

(e) Our Commander-in-Chief commends the painstaking efforts of the great majority of the House Committee on Internal Security (the Ichord Committee) for its fair-minded and comprehensive efforts to enhance our internal security without any valid "witch hunting" charges being brought against them.

## SENATE—Friday, March 22, 1974

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God of this new day, as the dawn has grown into the fullness of the morning, so let Thy light banish all doubt and fear that we may find and follow Thy purpose throughout this day. Help us to use its precious hours in a manner Thou canst bless and hallow with Thy presence. May we be strong to do things worth doing and strong in turning away from the unworthy, the base, and the trivial. In these times requiring greatness, may our dedication to Thee be complete. And, finally, in our work give us the joy of those who are workers together with Thee for a world redeemed and made ready for Thy coming kingdom.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 21, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume the consideration of the unfinished business S. 1541, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. 1541, to provide for the reform of congressional procedures with respect to the enactment of fiscal measures; to provide ceilings on Federal expenditures and the national debt; to create a budget committee in each House; to create a congressional office of the budget, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the Nelson-Mondale amendment No. 1046 which the clerk will state.

The second assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 107, on line 6, beginning with the word "The", strike everything through the word "completed." on line 19, and insert the following: "Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"8. (a) The Committee on the Budget shall consist of fifteen members.

"(b) For purposes of paragraph 6, service of a Senator as a member of the Committee on the Budget shall not be taken into account.

"(c) (1) Membership on the Committee on the Budget shall be divided into three classes with five seats in each class. The members first elected to the committee shall, by lot, determine the class to which their seats are assigned. Thereafter, members elected to the committee shall be elected to a seat in one of the three classes.

"(2) A member serving on the committee in a seat of the first class during the Ninety-fifth Congress, or during any third Congress following the Ninety-fifth Congress, shall not be eligible to serve on the committee during

the Congress following such Ninety-fifth Congress or following any such third Congress, as the case may be.

"(3) A member serving on the committee in a seat of the second class during the Ninety-sixth Congress, or during any third Congress following the Ninety-sixth Congress, shall not be eligible to serve on the committee during the Congress following such Ninety-sixth Congress or following any such third Congress, as the case may be.

"(4) A member serving on the committee in a seat of the third class during the Ninety-seventh Congress, or during any third Congress following the Ninety-seventh Congress, shall not be eligible to serve on the committee during the Congress following such Ninety-seventh Congress or following any such third Congress, as the case may be."

#### ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, separate and apart from the unanimous-consent agreement, there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. For how long a period?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I said a brief period. Fifteen minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. Is there any morning business?

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.