

as under present law or to claim a credit against tax of \$200 for each such exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 13742. A bill to provide that, after January 1, 1974, Memorial Day be observed on May 30 of each year and Veterans' Day be observed on the 11th of November of each year; to the Committee on Judiciary.

H.R. 13743. A bill to eliminate the duty on imports from free world countries of wheat and milled wheat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN (for himself, Mr. MILLER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Ms. BURKE of California, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada):

H.R. 13744. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings which (subject to further increases under the automatic adjustment provisions) is permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder, and to revise the method for determining such amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON (for himself and Mr. LAGOMARSINO):

H.R. 13745. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study of the burden of reporting requirements of Federal regulatory programs on independent business establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 13746. A bill to amend section 4940 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the name of the amount imposed thereby on certain investment income from excise tax to service charge, and to reduce such amount from 4 percent to 1½ percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOWEN (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. SISK, Mr. RARICK, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GINN, Mr. FULTON, Mr. LANDRUM, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. LITTON, Mr. WAMPLER, and Mr. GUNTER):

H.R. 13747. A bill to provide indemnity payments to poultry and egg producers and processors; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 13748. A bill to terminate the Airlines Mutual Aid Agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself and Mr. CONABLE):

H.R. 13749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the capital gain throwback rules applicable to trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 13750. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding and improving the family planning services and population sciences research activities of the Federal Gov-

ernment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. NICHOLS):

H.R. 13751. A bill to insure that recipients of veterans' pension 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; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13752. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13753. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that veterans' pension and compensation will not be reduced as a result of certain increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. PIKE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. ULLMAN, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 13754. A bill to amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the inclusion of certain information on discharge certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MYERS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. ROE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STARK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FORD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. BURKE of California, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 13755. A bill to authorize a national summer youth sports program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEYSER (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. ESCH, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. DIGGS):

H.R. 13756. A bill to authorize a national summer youth sports program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.J. Res. 951. Joint resolution to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide for the designation of the 11th day of November of each year as Veterans' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS (for himself, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. DENT):

H.J. Res. 952. Joint resolution requiring the President to submit to Congress a report concerning importations of minerals which are

critical to the needs of U.S. industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.J. Res. 953. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLBORN (for himself and Mr. WYDLER):

H. Res. 1007. Resolution to authorize an investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to learn who is responsible for the unauthorized release of the report "Expenditures of Federal Funds in Support of Presidential Properties" and to impose penalties against such person or persons; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. MILFORD:

H. Res. 1008. Resolution advocating the use of export controls by the United States, especially with respect to natural resources and agricultural commodities, in order to increase employment opportunities for American workers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRITCHARD (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina):

H. Res. 1011. Resolution to expedite the impeachment inquiry by the House Judiciary Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 13757. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Horace Hill, U.S. Air Force Reserve (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13758. A bill for the relief of Elmer A. Houser, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13759. A bill for the relief of Donald E. Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

413. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Fourth Mariana Islands District Legislature, Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to reimbursement of the legislature for funds expended by it in the presentation to the Micronesian War Claims Commission of the claims of the people of the Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

414. Also, petition of the Republican City Committee of Worcester, Mass., relative to cooperation between the President and the House Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

415. Also, petition of the Democratic Precinct Caucus, Orcas Island, Wash., relative to impeachment proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, an informed electorate is indeed essential

in a democratic society, as a Washington Post editorial last week stated in endorsing the freedom of information amendments passed March 14 by this body.

I submit the editorial so that the readers of these pages may have a concise explanation of the import of this bill (H.R. 12471), and may know of the leadership our colleague—Mr. Moor-

head of Pennsylvania—has taken in enhancing the public's right to know.

The editorial follows:

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Government secrecy has become an unfortunate fact of life in American society, despite the best hopes of this nation's founders. James Madison once declared optimistically: "Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean

to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives." But those lofty ideals of 200 years past have been facing heavy weather for at least a generation, and there is every evidence that reviving such notions in the current climate a government in Washington and elsewhere remains a difficult task. Under the shroud of national security and other devices of secrecy, the bureaucrats go about their business without the knowledge and consent of the governed. This is so despite the fact that Congress provided the press and the people with a weapon—admittedly a blunt one—in the Freedom of Information Act of 1966. It gave the public a right to examine the documents in the possession of government agencies and thus the opportunity to find out what is being done in the name of the governed. But its effective use is much more the exception than the rule.

Thanks to a notable recent exception, we now know that in the 1960s, the late J. Edgar Hoover ordered his agents at the FBI to undertake a "counterintelligence" program against what Mr. Hoover described as "black nationalist hate groups," among others. We know this because Carl Stern of NBC News took the trouble to go into court and win a law suit under the Freedom of Information Act. In theory, at least, FOIA reversed an older law that made disclosure difficult and established a policy that disclosure should be the norm and denial of information the exception. Unfortunately, the act has not worked that way. For one thing, there are a number of frustrating exceptions to the act. Beyond that, its mechanism is so cumbersome that only seven suits have been filed by news organizations since the act was passed.

Some of the blame for FOIA's ineffectiveness to date must rest on the news media. They have taken the view that news is immediate, and if they cannot get what they need for a story, they must move on. Very few journalists have been willing to take the time that the Freedom of Information Act now requires. Mr. Stern, for example, obtained the most recent set of documents on the FBI counterintelligence program 26 months after first seeking them.

The House of Representatives moved decisively this week to reduce the burden on those who wish to make use of the FOIA. It voted 383 to 8 for an amendment to the law proposed by Rep. William Moorhead (D-Pa.). The Moorhead Amendment does several important things to make the FOIA a better law. It reduces the number of days an agency has in which to say if it intends to provide requested information voluntarily. It places in the hands of the courts the question of whether national security is sufficient reason for a given agency to withhold information. It allows plaintiffs to recover their legal expenses if a court rules that an agency withheld material it should have turned over voluntarily. It adds the Office of Management and Budget to the list of agencies now covered by the act, and it requires all agencies to give an account to Congress each year of how it implemented the law.

A similar bill, sponsored by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), has cleared a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and should be ready for floor action shortly. The Nixon administration has made rumblings that could be the forecast of veto action, but that would be a meaningless gesture if the Senate action is as decisive as was that of the House. Attorney Ronald Plessler, who heads the Freedom of Information Clearinghouse and who represented Mr. Stern in his suit against the FBI, has estimated that this new legislation could have reduced the elapsed time of the Stern case from 26 months to six months. That is more in keeping with the needs of justice and the public's right to know what its government is up to. No known substitute for an informed elec-

torate exists in a democratic society, and the Hoover papers make it clear once again how dangerous bureaucratic secrecy can be to the rights of a free people.

EDITOR WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, JR., WARNS THAT UNITED STATES HAS BEEN PLACED ON "PROBATION" BY THE ARABS; NOTES CONGRESS FAILURE TO HEED SENATOR RANDOLPH'S EARLIER PLEAS

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the distinguished William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the widely circulated Hearst newspapers, warned in his "Editor's Report" of Sunday, March 24, 1974, that the United States has been placed on "probation" by the Arab petroleum-producing nations in their lifting of the oil embargo. That warning was the principal theme of his column, in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner and other Hearst newspapers.

Mr. Hearst called the lifting of the oil embargo "good news, to be sure," but he emphasized that:

Even Pollyanna should realize that reopening of the Arab oil tap is no reason to assume an immediate return to business as usual, pleasure as usual, and waste as usual.

And then he declared:

Above all—and this is what really kills any optimism on my part—above all is the fact that ending of the Arab oil embargo is by no means permanent. The tap can again be shut, and very well may be shut, only a few months from now. . . . So what does the oil embargo end really boil down to? It boils down to a respite, a period of uncertainty which overshadows all present good news, and it amounts to a continuing disgrace for these United States of ours. Our country—and no rhetoric can diminish the fact—has stupidly wound up being put on probation by a bunch of superlucky Arabs.

Then editor-in-chief Hearst emphasized this observation which gives credit to our distinguished colleague, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH of West Virginia. He said:

What bugs me about the whole energy situation is that our leadership was so blind to our own weaknesses that the Arab cut-off could damage us in the first place.

We seem to be a country capable of concerted positive action only in a crisis situation. Nobody paid much attention, for example, when Sen. Jennings Randolph (D-W. Va.), as early as 1959 was warning that we would be running out of adequate power supplies and tried unsuccessfully to create a joint committee of Congress to study and act on the problem.

He was proved right, too late, when we lost our power self-sufficiency about five years ago and still did nothing about it. The Arabs and their blackmail oil embargo provided the bitter proof.

And he added succinctly:

So now, today, we find ourselves in the demeaning position of considering it good news that the Arabs have graciously given us a chance to prove to them that we have learned our lesson. . . . And that is not good news.

Mr. Hearst also notes in clear language that:

The whole situation is complicated by the sinister role of the Soviet Union, presumably attempting to further the cooperative spirit of detente but actually doing all it can to torpedo us in the Mideast and just about everywhere else.

Mr. President, the "Editor's Report" is thought-provoking and frank on a subject of acute concern to the United States especially, as well as to other countries. I ask that it be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the "Editor's Report" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Mar. 24, 1974]

EDITOR'S REPORT: UNITED STATES PLACED ON PROBATION

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Since my normal nature is to be optimistic, regular readers of this column might expect to find some rosy comment here today on the week's biggest and best news—lifting of the Arab oil embargo against the United States.

There's no question it was good news. The cause of this winter's gas shortages and cold radiators has been ended. The threat of rationing is over. Announced layoffs of workers are being rescinded. The Nixon-Kissinger Mideast peace efforts have really paid off.

All good news, sure enough, and pleasing indeed. The trouble is that the good news may not last. And even Pollyanna should realize that reopening of the Arab oil tap is no reason to assume an immediate return to business as usual, pleasure as usual, and waste as usual.

The fact is that new Arabian oil will not be reaching our gas station pumps for many weeks. What is being made available all of a sudden are reserves previously stored for summer demand. Prices will remain high. And meanwhile the nation's basic and growing general energy shortage remains.

Above all—and this is what really kills any optimism on my part—above all is the fact that ending of the Arab oil embargo is by no means permanent. The taps can again be shut, and very well may be shut, only a few months from now.

This all-important fact has been minimized in the general relief greeting the embargo's end. Yet the Arabs made it very clear in their announcement at Vienna on Monday. They will reconvene on June 1, they said, to "review" their present decision.

It was not a decision, significantly, which was reached unanimously. To the contrary, both Libya and Syria refused to go along and other of the oil-producing countries did so reluctantly, responding favorably only because such moderate but powerful influences as Egypt and Saudi Arabia urged them to cooperate.

So what does the oil embargo end really boil down to? It boils down to a respite, a period of uncertainty which overshadows all present good news, and it amounts to a continuing disgrace for these United States of ours.

Our country—and no rhetoric can diminish the fact—has stupidity wound up being put on probation by a bunch of super-lucky Arabs.

The painful and muted reality of the Mideast oil picture is as simple as A-B-C. Our important Mideast oil supply was cut off to force us to bring pressure against Israel. It was restored only because some of the Arab nations believe such pressure is being effective. Others remain doubtful.

For the next few months, in effect, the United States has the option of continuing

pressure on its Israeli ally to the satisfaction of the Arabs—or else. Either they get what they want or the oil stops, again.

What bugs me about the whole energy situation is that our leadership was so blind to our own weaknesses that the Arab cut-off could damage us in the first place.

We seem to be a country capable of concerted positive action only in a crisis situation. Nobody paid much attention, for example, when Sen. Jennings Randolph (D.-W. Va.), as early as 1959 was warning that we would be running out of adequate power supplies and tried unsuccessfully to create a joint committee of Congress to study and act on the problem.

He was proved right, too late, when we lost our power self-sufficiency about five years ago and still did nothing about it. The Arabs and their blackmail oil embargo provided the bitter proof.

So now, today, we find ourselves in the demeaning position of considering it good news that the Arabs have graciously given us a chance to prove to them that we have learned our lesson.

And that is not good news.

Complicating the situation is the sinister role of the Soviet Union, presumably attempting to further the cooperative spirit of detente but actually doing all it can to torpedo us in the Mideast and just about everywhere else.

Even before the Yom Kippur War broke out last October, and right up to the time of the Arab embargo announcement, our detente buddies had been urging the Arabs both publicly and privately to cut off the oil. As they well know oil is the very blood on which the industrial free world depends to flourish. Cut it off—even partially—and all hell breaks loose.

What needs stressing here is the utter consistency of Moscow's behavior. As always in the past, treaties and acts and handshakes and smiles are nothing to the Communists but useful instruments toward achieving their never-changing goal—the undermining and collapse of the capitalist system.

Detente hasn't changed that goal one bit. It will never change. Any time it seems to change—and you can draw a heavy red line under this—what you have is not change but a new exercise in deviousness.

President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger, of course, are fully aware both of what the Arabs are doing to us and what the Russians would like to do. Both men, naturally, continue trying to play down the grim facts while emphasizing the hope of progress.

In his Houston appearance, as an example, Mr. Nixon ignored his previous declaration that this country would tolerate no strings to a lifting of the oil embargo. Painfully aware of the strings which actually came with the reopened oil taps, he did what he could in a straitjacket situation by declaring that the U.S. will try for Mideast peace as a friend of both sides.

For his part, Dr. Kissinger departs this week for Moscow in an attempt to cool what he publicly admitted have been recent strains in the detente arrangement. If he can further the possibility of a reasonable compromise in the SALT II talks on atomic weapon cut-backs, he will have achieved the best that can be expected.

My Pollyanna instinct suggests that matters may not be as bleak as suggested in what has been written here. So I will note that the more reasonable voices in the Arab world have prevailed and, hopefully, will continue to do so. Also that Russia has as much to gain in the SALT II talks as we, and may prove cooperative in this vital field at last.

All that, however, amounts to an expression of hope.

The reality is that our great nation remains on a kind of parole which may easily be revoked if we do not please a bunch of Communists and their hot-head sycophants in the Arab world.

SETTLEMENT OF THE DEBT OF THE INDIAN GOVERNMENT

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, in newspapers of March 22, columnist Robert S. Allen wrote an interesting and thorough analysis of the administration's unilateral settlement of the debt of the Indian Government to the United States.

This settlement, negotiated by Ambassador Daniel Moynihan, was approved with no consultation with the Congress—and it settled India's debt at only about a third of the amount owed.

I have sponsored legislation to require congressional approval for any settlement of a foreign debt to the United States in which the agreed-upon repayment is less than the full amount of the debt. Similar action, as Mr. Allen reports, is under consideration in the House of Representatives.

It is essential that Congress review proposals that would write off billions of dollars legitimately owed to the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "House Buzzing Over State Write-Off Of India's Debt," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

HOUSE BUZZING OVER STATE WRITE-OFF OF INDIA'S DEBT

(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON, March 21.—That soft-pedaled \$2.2 billion write-off of a \$3.3 billion debt India has long owed the U.S. is triggering a hornet's nest of vehement congressional condemnation.

So pronounced is the bipartisan outrage that drastic crackdown legislation is virtually assured.

In fact, one forceful restriction already has been approved.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee has amended the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 specifically requiring "congressional surveillance over all currency settlements that come under this act."

Express purpose of this legislation is to prevent a repetition of the huge giveaway to India.

With this measure as a starter, its three influential sponsors—Reps. Lester Wolff, D.-N.Y., Edward Derwinski, R.-Ill., and William Broomfield, R.-Mich.—are pressing another resolution applying the same safeguard to "all similar settlements involving American foreign aid."

Strikingly indicative of the widespread bipartisan support for the imposition of such a curb on the State Department and other agencies is that it has 56 cosponsors. Foremost among them are:

Reps. John Anderson, R.-Ill.; William Cohen, R.-Maine; James Collins, R.-Tex.; Robert Daniel, R.-Va.; W. C. (Dan) Daniel, D.-Va.; H. R. Gross, R.-Iowa; Craig Hosmer, R.-Calif.; William Hungate, D.-Mo.; Richard Ichord, D.-Mo.; Jack Kemp, R.-N.Y.; James Mann, D.-S.C.; G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery, D.-Miss.; Charles Sandman, R.-N.J.; R. F. Sisk, D.-Calif.; Roy Taylor, D.-N.C.; Larry Winn, R.-Kans.; C. W. (Bill) Young, R.-Fla.

Noting this extensive backing, Rep. Wolff, member of the Foreign Affairs Committee spearheading the drive for this corrective

legislation, declared it graphically underscored the strong opposition in Congress against any more huge cancellations by bureaucratic fiat of foreign debts owed the U.S.

"On the basis of this widespread bipartisan endorsement," said Wolff, "I have every confidence this legislation will be enacted by Congress. It's a long overdue safeguard, and the shocking \$2.2 billion giveaway to India emphatically illustrated the urgent need for it."

"SANTA CLAUSE" MOYNIHAN

The \$2.2 billion Indian writeoff was "negotiated" by Ambassador Daniel Moynihan—without prior notice to Congress or the U.S. public.

It was strictly a unilateral and unpublished decision by the State Department.

It is now clear the principal mission of the former Harvard professor, when he took up his post in New Delhi last year, was to arrange this huge giveaway—despite the undisguised animus toward the U.S. by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and her Soviet-leaning regime.

Last month, Moynihan, following an unannounced arrival in Washington, spent several weeks lobbying Congress about the multibillion-dollar writeoff deal.

As reported at the time in this column, he ran into a storm of irate censure at a Foreign Affairs subcommittee meeting—where Rep. Wolff served notice he was sponsoring a "sense of Congress" resolution urging President Nixon to reject the huge write-off.

Subsequently, Wolff and Reps. Derwinski and Broomfield sponsored the bill designed to give Congress a direct voice in such transactions. It is this measure that now has 56 bipartisan cosponsors.

In offering it, Wolff pointed out it is Congress that "votes to loan taxpayers' money to foreign countries, and Congress must retain the right to any change in the repayment or write-off of those funds." This is particularly essential, he stressed, because:

"There still remain vast amounts of foreign currencies, by conservative estimates running into the billions, owed by foreign nations. At a time when our domestic economy is under such tremendous strains, the executive branch must not be allowed to engage in giant giveaways involving these debts without answering first to Congress.

"Our bill represents a long overdue move by Congress to establish a role in the making of executive agreements, which have become a major instrument of foreign policy completely circumventing the congressional role in implementing important international policies. The purpose of this bill is to assure congressional control over settlements, cancellations, renegotiations and rescheduling of debts of foreign countries to the United States."

Foreign Affairs chairman Thomas Morgan, D.-Pa., has assured Wolff of full consideration of his landmark bill. Says Wolff:

"I haven't any doubt that it will be overwhelmingly approved by the committee and subsequently by the full House. That is clearly indicated by colleagues from all sections of the country and both parties joining in cosponsoring this measure."

BITING THE HAND

For Ambassador Moynihan there has been an ironic aftermath to his successful labors in arranging the \$2.2 billion write-off of India's debt.

In recent days, the tall envoy has been the target of caustic Indian blasts.

In an anonymous, prominently featured article in the National Herald, leading organ of the Congress Party headed by Prime Minister Gandhi, Moynihan was carpingly berated for, of all things, endeavoring to improve the long-strained relations between the U.S. and India.

Particularly he was rebuked for indulging

in "platitudes" about closer ties between the two countries.

This startling and unexpected attack was followed a few days later by a testy reproof by Foreign Minister Swaran Singh—whose ire was stirred by remarks made by Moynihan at an off-the-record meeting with India newsmen about U.S. plans to establish a naval and air base on the island of Diego Garcia, more than 1,000 miles south of the tip of India.

Purpose of this military installation is to offset the rapidly growing armed strength of Russia in the Indian Ocean.

India, under unmistakable Moscow prodding, has been fulminating against the U.S. project. In engaging in this anti-U.S. carping, the Gandhi regime has been completely silent about the Soviets' expanding military might in the Indian Ocean. Foreign Minister Singh said nothing about that in criticizing Moynihan's private comments.

Also, it goes without saying that neither the Indian official nor the National Herald made the slightest reference to the \$2.2 billion debt cancellation that Moynihan "negotiated."

Under the rule of peevish and carping Madame Gandhi, India has never been noted for evincing any appreciation of the billions in loans, food and other aid lavishly extended by the U.S. In the past 15 years, that aid, which has repeatedly saved tens of millions of Indians from starvation, totals more than \$10 billion.

Virtually all the U.S. has gotten in return has been incessant whining and complaining about our foreign policy—with never a word of disapproval of anything Moscow does, which has largely armed India for cash on the barrelhead.

For Ambassador Moynihan the surprising Indian attacks must be doubly galling because in the past several weeks top officials of the Gandhi regime have been secretly talking to him about possible new U.S. aid.

Privately, they've got the tin cup out again while publicly they are kicking his shins.

One thing is certain—if Congress has anything to say about it, it's very unlikely India will get any more large-scale foreign aid.

DAN GERBER

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, Michigan lost one of its most outstanding citizens and business leaders when Daniel F. Gerber died last week.

For many years, Mr. Gerber headed the Gerber Products Co., the leading producer of baby foods throughout the world today. However, his success in life is not measured in business terms alone, but also by his monumental contributions toward the betterment of his community, his country and mankind.

Some indication of the deep respect and affection earned by Dan Gerber during the period of his remarkable life was registered last Wednesday in Fremont, Mich., when a community memorial service was held to honor his memory. Warm tributes came from neighbors and townspeople who knew him best for his leadership in community service as well as from those who knew him in business.

Mrs. Griffin joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Gerber

and the fine family of this distinguished son of Michigan.

I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD reflect the remarks delivered on that occasion by Ted Johnson, who spoke for the Boy Scouts of America; Richard Bell, who represented the Fremont Area Foundation; Fred Billerbeck, mayor of Fremont; and by John Suerth and Art Frens, who are officers of the Gerber Co.

In addition, I ask that a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Gerber's life and career be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF TED JOHNSON

Dan Gerber was a friend of young people everywhere. He demonstrated that through his activities in business, his family, his interests, and values. Dan was a friend of the Boy Scouts. He was a friend of mine.

I can't presume to speak for millions of others, both young and old, whose lives he influenced. But I can attempt to express, in some small way, the influence his presence exerted on all of us.

A friend has gone. We console ourselves by reflection on good times, good days, bright thoughts, and memories.

Camp Gerber, a scout camp dedicated to citizenship, character-building, physical and mental fitness, developed through Dan's generosity. Dan, in turn, influenced his father to help in the development of this extension of the Boy Scout program—a woods and water area for boys and girls to develop memories, ideals, and a sense of worth—a belonging to this earth and the society of which they are a part. Over 600 acres, two lakes, and many dreams.

This initial gift, made over 20 years ago, has inspired others—buildings have been donated, a trust fund established for maintaining and preserving this ideal camp location—because Dan believed in helping others to help themselves. More than 1,000 boys and girls every year are able to see the majesty of a starlit sky, hear the message of a noisy stream—all to inspire the spiritual petition, "Be still and know that I am God."

Dan's contribution of time and inspiration to the ideals of the Boy Scouts of America was a continuing one. He has given an annual luncheon for business leaders in the Timber Trails Council during which the scouting story was told, a council progress report made, talent recruited, and funds raised. The spring luncheon was scheduled for April of this year.

Dan saw, in the Boy Scouts of America, the opportunity for men and women to live forever in the lives of boys and girls, and to guarantee the right of those boys and girls to know and to appreciate, and to be influenced, and to be guided by nature's power and beauty, and freedom of spirit that he acknowledged to be common to all ages and a part of the heritage which he passed along.

Because of him, we can offer these children, our children, the woodlands, the streams, the lakes, the stars—a bridge on the steep, always-remembered road to character, good citizenship, and morality.

Dan accepted the opportunity, the challenge, and responsibility to help build bridges so that generations to follow will have these bridges to cross.

Showing his love for the youth of America, he shared his time, talent, and treasure with Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4-H Youth, and other youth oriented organizations. If we would all give, as Dan gave, an example of character to our youth, our world would be safe from any threat from within or without. We need, as never before, prayer, dedication, and example of such men of character and morality as Dan.

Dan was a warm human being, quiet, self-effacing, talented in business and human relations, a friend to those who needed friendship, an inspiration to those in need of support, a man who knew his God.

Henry Adams once said, "A teacher affects eternity, he can never tell where his influence stops." By example of his life, sharing his talents, his gifts, his love for the benefit of others, Dan was such a teacher.

We will miss our friend.

REMARKS OF RICHARD BELL

For all of his life, Dan Gerber was interested in others, and shared most generously not only his financial support, but also his considerable talents and business skills. It would be literally impossible to list all of the organizations which have benefited from the generosity of this man. In the first place, the broad range of his interests meant that there were literally hundreds of civic, charitable and educational organizations within his philanthropic portfolio. Secondly, and perhaps more significant, is the fact that untold thousands of his acts of generosity were made quietly and in many cases the recipient never knew who his benefactor was. Dan never sought personal credit, finding satisfaction in the giving, and in the benefits for others his gifts so often produced.

Several years ago, recognizing the need for continuity in his giving program, Dan conceived the idea of, and was largely responsible for, the development of The Fremont Area Foundation. It was his thought that by combining a number of charitable trusts and funds within the community, a significant resource of wisely given financial support could be established. Furthermore, such a fund could accept smaller individual bequests, which would in turn be an effective part of the total foundation. The Fremont Area Foundation today consists of twelve separate funds, from which total contributions of about \$300,000 are made annually.

The Newaygo County Community Services is the largest single beneficiary currently. With funds from The Fremont Area Foundation, plus some donated directly, Newaygo County Community Services provides a wide variety of services to people of all ages throughout the County.

The schools certainly have shared in the programs made possible by The Foundation. The library, the hospital, indeed nearly every facet of the community which he loved so deeply, have benefited and will continue to benefit from his thoughtful foresight and resourcefulness.

Just two years ago, initial steps were taken toward the realization of a lifelong dream, when Dan made funds available for the planning of the Fremont Civic Center. It was his hope that we may some day develop a multi-purpose Civic Center and Auditorium, offering a whole new range of opportunities for the people of this area. At this point, preliminary plans are well under way, some land has been acquired, and a Civic Center Commission has been established. Some day, and we hope soon, we will have a Civic Center of which he, and all of us, may be very proud.

There are a great many other areas I could mention, for his recognition of the needs of others was immediate, and his feeling of responsibility for them was a deep one. Yet, he could not seek, yes, he would even shun, credit or recognition for his efforts to meet those needs.

The Fremont Area Foundation—a living, growing extension of Dan Gerber's personal awareness of the needs of others—exists, in itself as a memorial to a mighty man.

REMARKS OF MAYOR FRED BILLERBECK

The fabric of this community owes a great deal to the man, Daniel F. Gerber. For his underlying contribution can be likened to the "warp" or foundation base on a loom upon

which the "woof" is weaved to form the final woven material. Today the City of Fremont is a vital, pulsing, modern community which is greatly envied by far larger communities because of the stimulus this gentleman's enterprise has transmitted, both direct and indirect. We recognize his direct impact as we enter this community by any of the main arteries—for the state highway signs proclaim the City of Fremont as the "Baby Food Capital!" This status has meant economic prosperity and stability to the citizens of this city. His acumen as an entrepreneur has brought worldwide recognition to the firm as well as to the city. We of the city administration are mindful of his constant concern and love for this community. His impact on the community has always stressed self-reliance of its citizens rather than a paternalistic approach which has regrettably characterized many other communities. The strength of our local autonomy owes much to Mr. Gerber's strong sense of values. Those who had occasion to know him were always struck by his most modest, unassuming and pragmatic approach to problems which he faced. Just last year as President of the Fremont Rotary Club, I was made more fully aware of this man's qualities of reserve. The Club arranged a special dinner meeting so as to award him the coveted "Service Above Self" award. It was questionable if Mr. Gerber would actually come largely because of his self-effacing nature. When invited to attend to receive the award, his response was: "I would rather be boiled in oil"—but to my very great relief, he did attend! This small incident captures the character of the man.

His philanthropic efforts have been keyed to this same low profile approach. Development of the Fremont municipal airport was spurred by his early and continuing interest in aviation. Our community's excellent library, Fremont Area Foundation, Gerber Memorial Hospital, natatorium all have been recipients of his supportive interest. Most recently, it was his initiative that made it possible to create a building authority for the proposed Fremont Civic Center. Characteristically, he did so by providing the seed money for the project but at the same time challenged those of the community to participation so that a proper wide respect for the project would be realized. The Boy Scouts and the First Church of Christ Scientists have found his support and have been better for it. The scope of his active interest and participation reach far beyond local confines. Undoubtedly, he has been inspirational to many people, young and old, who have been associated with him either as an employee, recipient of a scholarship, as an acquaintance, or just simply because of his good works.

Mr. Gerber's passing is accepted with very deep regret by the City of Fremont administration. It is always sad to lose a good and loyal friend. We do, however, draw inspiration from his life's work and his stature among the great industrialists and benefactors of this age. The finest compliment is to consider his example as worthy of emulation.

REMARKS OF JOHN SUERTH

Dan Gerber's life spanned an interesting era, a time of fascinating technological, scientific, and social growth. His enthusiastic interest in the world and its people never wavered, he welcomed change and challenge and progress. Because of this attitude, Dan was able to lead this company into its present status among the world's major business enterprises. Because of this attitude, he held a lifelong compassionate concern interest in the goals and dreams of his fellow man.

His ideas, his wise counsel, and his years of experience leave a lasting imprint on the company. We shall miss him, of course, but consider invaluable the opportunity to have shared so much with him.

REMARKS OF ART FRENS

In many ways, far better than any words of mine, the company that bears his name stands as a memorial to Dan Gerber. Under his leadership and those he chose to carry on after him, Gerber Products Company stands today among the ranks of the leaders in the world of business.

Yet "bigness" as such was never very much of a concern with Dan, unless it had to do with "thinking big" in terms of service to others, or enthusiasm for a new idea or a new project. Dan enjoyed, and took pride in the growth of the company—but only because it represented further service to others, and increasing opportunities for those who shared in that company growth.

Success to Dan was a journey, never a destination. Even in later years, long after he had earned the right to sit back and let others bear the burden of decision, he participated actively and effectively in the affairs of the company. His quick grasp of the essential features in any problem, his vast experience of some 60 years in the business, and above all his instinctive feel for the human touch in every situation have served as valued guidelines in making Gerber Products Company what it is today.

Dan always seemed to have time—time for listening to others; time for shared laughter; time for a quiet kindness; time for those who asked for his patient counsel. And yet he could be firm and decisive when the situation called for decision. Dan always expected the best of others, and never gave less than the best of himself.

We have heard today from a representative few of the broad range of activities and interests which were part of Dan Gerber's life. There were so many more, for here was a man who gave not only generously, but also conscientiously of his considerable time and talents in many, many areas. But in reviewing that list, and in reviewing the accomplishments that mark the many milestones in his life, one factor remains constant—the humanness of the man. The deep, genuine, shared concern for his fellow man. Even the very basis of Gerber Products Company—baby foods and baby need items—reflects his desire to fulfill a need where it exists, with products which can be depended upon for that most precious commodity—a baby human being.

Much has been said in the past few days, and here today, about this man and our memories of him. There is little more I can add to that tribute.

Dan Gerber's memorial exists, as he would want it to exist, in the people around you; in the Scouts; his church, the school; the community, and in the company which bears the unmistakable imprint of a man who cared.

Dan Gerber—it was a privilege to share your lifetime.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Daniel F. Gerber, chairman of the executive committee of Gerber Products Company, passed away Saturday evening, March 16, following a brief illness. He was 75 years of age. His wife, Dorothy, five children, and eighteen grandchildren survive him.

A native of Fremont, Mr. Gerber joined his father in the Fremont Canning Company in 1912. The company introduced Gerber strained baby foods in 1928, and in succeeding years the company became the leading producer of baby foods and baby need items known throughout the world.

Mr. Gerber was named president of the company in 1945, and in 1964 became chairman of the board. Three years ago, at his own request, he relinquished the chairmanship but agreed to serve as chairman of the executive committee and as a director of the firm. He also served as chairman of the board of the Old State Bank of Fremont.

Widely known throughout the food in-

dustry, Mr. Gerber gave freely of his time and talents to a variety of trade and professional associations and to a great many civic organizations in which he had an enthusiastic interest. A generous philanthropist, he was especially concerned with the community and its schools, his church, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Fremont Public Library. A project of current interest within the community was the establishment of a civic center, initial funds for which were donated by the Gerber family within the last two years. In addition to his many local interests, Mr. Gerber served on the board of the United Negro College Fund, The Greater Michigan Foundation, the Nutrition Foundation, and many other organizations. A graduate of St. John's Military Academy and Babson Institute, Mr. Gerber has maintained a life-long interest in the affairs of those schools.

Private family memorial services were held Monday afternoon, March 18. The family has asked that those who wish to offer a lasting memorial to Mr. Gerber may consider the Timber Trails Council Boy Scouts of America, the Fremont Public Library, Gerber Memorial Hospital, the First Church of Christ, Scientist, the Fremont Civic Center, or the Foster Parents Plan, Inc., of New York City.

A community memorial service was held Wednesday afternoon in the Fremont High School.

CONSERVATION AND ALLOCATION OF ENERGY

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, in carrying out the shortrun programs for conservation and allocation of energy, it is vital that officials of the Government keep in mind the enormous impact their actions will have on the economy.

I think that preservation of jobs, and keeping the economy healthy, are top priorities in the energy program.

One industry that is absolutely dependent on the energy program, as it relates to allocations of gasoline and rules for its distribution, is tourism. This is a major industry in this country. In Virginia alone it generates about \$1 billion a year.

Recently the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments adopted a resolution emphasizing the importance of tourism in the region of the Nation's Capital, Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia are affected in a major way by tourism in this area, and I hope that the council's resolution will be given every consideration by the appropriate administration officials.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RESOLUTION REQUESTING INCREASED GASOLINE ALLOCATIONS TO THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AREA

Whereas, the millions of tourists, foreign and national, who will be or are visiting the Washington Metropolitan Area every month

of this year require food, lodging, transportation, public health and safety services; and

Whereas, the economy of the Washington Metropolitan Area is dependent in great measure upon the continued delivery of tourism-related services; and

Whereas, the headquarters of the Federal Government and other public buildings located in the Maryland and Virginia suburbs of Washington, D.C., attract thousands of American citizens to transact essential business; and

Whereas, the failure to support essential private sector tourism-related services would result in the serious deterioration of local employment and affect the well-being of thousands of local citizens,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments that:

1. The Administrator of the Federal Energy Office is urged to take into consideration the needs of and impacts of tourists and other citizens visiting the Washington Metropolitan Area in determining gasoline allocations to Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia;

2. The Governors of Maryland and Virginia be requested to provide increased allocations of gasoline for distribution by officials of the jurisdictions which are members of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments;

3. Copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Administrator of the Federal Energy Office, to members of Congress who represent the Metropolitan Washington Area, and to the Governors of Maryland and Virginia.

FARM LABOR REVIEW

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know there is a farm labor problem in California which is unsettling and cries for congressional action. There are a number of legislative proposals before the House Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Farm Labor, and I am one of the sponsors of one remedy—placement of agriculture labor under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

At this time I would like to share the reporting ability of Rev. Richard Humphrys, pastor of Our Lady of Soledad Catholic Church in Coachella, who has been involved with the problem for the past 4 years. His reporting ability was printed in the Riverside Daily Enterprise on February 12, 1974.

The article follows.

PRIEST SAYS HIS GROUP'S STUDY TAKES IMPARTIAL LOOK AT FARM LABOR UNIONS

(By Neil Parse)

COACHELLA.—While two rival unions battle over who will represent laborers in Coachella Valley vineyards, a small group of Catholic priests has been quietly conducting an investigation.

Most pronouncements by clergymen in connection with the grape dispute have been on the side of the Cesar Chavez-led United Farm Workers of America, but this group is making its own study, according to the Rev. Richard Humphrys, pastor of Our Lady of Soledad Catholic Church here.

The group—the Mexican-American Commission of the Diocese of San Diego—in-

cludes about 20 priests from Riverside, San Bernardino, Imperial and San Diego counties.

Father Humphrys, one of the members, explains that each priest has been asked to conduct his own research so he can make up his own mind instead of just listening to someone's recommendations.

One thing is certain—the study will not result in 100 per cent support for the United Farm Workers. Father Humphrys already has presented his four-page report which holds that most workers did want to join the Western Conference of Teamsters.

That report was presented at the Mexican-American Commission's meeting here last week. It was the latest in a series of commission meetings on that topic, but the group's study has not been publicized.

Coachella Mayor Anthony Garcia, who was invited to sit in on last week's meeting, told news media about it afterward.

Father Humphrys said the commission will continue to meet about twice a month.

One of his basic conclusions, Father Humphrys said, is that "to come out in favor of either union is a tremendous mistake" unless there is conclusive evidence that one union is not doing the job for its members.

He noted in his report that "a small number of Catholic bishops have come out in favor of the Chavez union." There are "many priests," he said, who think the church should be impartial and that the bishop's statement attributed too many of the farm workers' problems to growers.

"My research," Father Humphrys wrote, "does not mean that I am taking sides between the unions. I am only a reporter of what I have been able to find out in the four years I have been close to the issues."

The majority of those four years were in the Palo Verde Valley. He said he went there with "a very open mind" concerning the United Farm Workers, and was surprised to find widespread opposition to Chavez among Mexican-Americans.

He became pastor of the Couchella church last July.

To try to determine whether the workers really wanted to be represented by the Teamsters, or did so because they had no choice, Father Humphrys said he talked with growers familiar with Teamster petitions which workers had signed.

He said he saw a petition taken at the Bagdasarian Ranch near Mecca and signed by 452 workers who did not want to be represented by the Chavez union.

At Mel-Pak, near Thermal, he learned that 90 per cent of the workers on hand at the time of the petitioning had signed.

"Considering that a worker might sincerely be afraid to sign such a petition for fear of reprisals," he said, "it would seem that this great number of signatures would indicate that the workers sincerely wanted the Teamsters Union."

He said he "found that similar petitions had been taken by all the other ranches."

There have been charges, Father Humphrys observed, that the Teamsters agreed to a "sweetheart contracts" (labor agreements which provide little for the worker) to help persuade growers to sign with the Teamsters instead of the United Farm Workers.

An examination of the contracts, however, indicates that the worker earns more than \$3 and in some cases more than \$3.50 an hour, including fringe benefits.

That, he said, discredits the "sweetheart contracts" theory.

Father Humphrys said he interviewed workers on their feelings about the United Farm Workers and found these grievances:

The union split families when it dispatched them to fields, and families in many cases could not continue to work at vineyards where they had worked for years and knew the grower.

Union "harassers" visited fields, asked to see union cards, demanded that workers take

part in union picketing if they wanted to continue to work.

When one type of work (such as pruning) was concluded, the worker had to drive back to the union office and wait to be dispatched to the next type of work (such as thinning), even if it was at the same vineyard.

Back dues had to be paid before a worker was dispatched to a job, even if he did not have any money. After last season this "abuse" was corrected, he noted, but dues were increased.

Failure to attend a union meeting resulted in a \$25 fine.

"Many workers I have talked to over the past few years," Father Humphrys said, "thought that Cesar Chavez was a fair person, but they bitterly complained of the treatment they received from officials of the union."

He also said in his report that growers are not "getting rich" as some critics contend.

Most growers, he said, are making far less than they could earn by selling their property and "investing their money at 7 per cent (interest) with no risk and no work."

The "middle men" make at least double the profits of the grower, he said.

Father Humphrys added that it is "terribly unfair not to give the growers credit for the wages they are paying." It compares favorably, he said, with the pay for many other types of common labor.

He concluded that farm labor should be placed under the National Labor Relations Board so that free elections could be conducted among workers without question of bias, and that "until it can be proved that all virtue and right is on the side of one union... we should be fair and impartial to both unions."

RHODESIAN CHROME

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, Anthony Harrigan, columnist and executive vice president of the United States Industrial Council, wrote a perceptive analysis of the Rhodesian embargo issue for newspapers of March 14.

Mr. Harrigan pointed out the inconsistency of the Senate's voting to reimpose sanctions on importing strategic materials from Rhodesia while at the same time protesting the Arab oil embargo.

He also notes that resuming the embargo on chrome, the principal strategic commodity from Rhodesia, would increase our dependence for chrome on Russia. Surely Russia is neither a reliable source of supply nor a more democratic regime than is Rhodesia.

I ask unanimous consent that the column, "Chrome-Plated Hypocrisy," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHROME-PLATED HYPOCRISY

(By Anthony Harrigan)

As the Washington *Star-News* said in a recent editorial, the U. S. Senate engaged in an orgy of hypocrisy when a majority of that body voted to resume the United Nations-sponsored embargo on imports of chrome from Rhodesia. The 54 senators who favored the ban have a double standard on boycotts.

These same senators are among the loudest critics of the oil boycott the Arab nations directed against the United States.

Moreover, those who say the U. S. has a moral obligation to help bring down the government of Rhodesia seem not at all interested in helping liberate captive peoples under Soviet rule. Indeed the liberal foes of Rhodesia are among the most ardent advocates of stepped-up trade with the Soviet Union whose tyrannical rule has been exposed again by the great Russian writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

Fair-minded citizens, mindful of the U.S. economic and security interest in continued purchases of Rhodesian chrome, can only hope that the House of Representatives will not be ruled by the same hypocritical standards that prevailed in the Senate.

It is very important that the U. S. public receive accurate information about the Rhodesian chrome situation. Members of the anti-Rhodesia lobby such as Reps. John H. Buchanan Jr. of Alabama and Donald Fraser of Minnesota are working hard to reimpose the embargo that was lifted by the Byrd Amendment in 1971.

The Youngstown, Ohio, *Vindicator*, published in the heart of the steel producing area, has printed considerable information on the hurtful effects of a renewed boycott. Recently, it quoted a steel executive as saying: "So again we've got to buy the poorer quality Russian chrome ore at higher prices and Russia then uses our money to buy the higher quality Rhodesian chrome for use in her own steel mills. Guess who is the goat?"

This is what will happen if the House of Representatives goes along with the boycott voted by the Senate.

Consider these facts about chrome:

There is no substitute for chrome in stainless steel and other super alloys. The most important uses for metallurgical grade chrome and ferrochrome are power generation equipment, environmental controls, food processing machinery, aircraft, and chemical and petroleum production.

No chrome ore has been mined in the U. S. since 1961. Rhodesia has 67 per cent of the world's supply of chrome ore—top quality at low prices. Sen. Edward Kennedy and other advocates of the boycott of Rhodesian chrome make much of the U. S. defense stockpile. But this stockpile has declined 43 per cent since 1962 and is currently at the lowest level in 15 years.

Rhodesia supplies 46 per cent of American high carbon ferrochrome. As other countries develop their ferrochrome industry, the U. S. will find it increasingly difficult to obtain chrome ore at any price. During the period when the boycott was in effect (1966-1971), chrome ore from the Soviet Union doubled in price.

Finally, U. S. demand for ferrochrome has more than doubled since 1971. If the boycott against Rhodesia is reimposed, severe unemployment will result in the specialty steel industry.

These facts are understood not only by the specialty steel industry but by union members working in this industry. Locals of the United States Steelworkers of America in the stainless steel industry are no record as opposing the boycott of Rhodesian chrome.

If the House votes for the boycott and the President signs the bill, Rhodesia won't be hurt. Japan and other industrial countries are eager to contract for Rhodesian chrome, especially in view of the coming global metals shortage which may be even more severe than the oil shortage. But American companies and working men would suffer from a renewed boycott. The Soviet Union, of course, would be able to hike its chrome prices and make stainless steel more expensive for American consumers.

CXX—524—Part 6

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BLANKET AMNESTY

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we have had much ado in the press because of the hearings on amnesty by a House subcommittee. I believe unconditional amnesty would be a travesty and an insult to every young man who fought in Vietnam, and especially to those who never came back.

Certainly at the proper time we can impose rigid conditions on granting restored status to those who ran away during our troubles in Vietnam.

I include as a portion of my remarks the article "Blanket Amnesty Is Unjust" from the San Diego Union:

BLANKET AMNESTY IS UNJUST

The problem of whether and how to forgive those men who evaded compulsory military service or deserted from the armed forces during a time of war never has been an easy one for people of the United States of America to resolve.

According to the Library of Congress, citizens have debated the question on 37 separate occasions since the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794. Over those years the lines of argument have become clear-cut.

Those who favor unconditional, blanket amnesty often make no distinction between draft dodgers, who have never taken an oath to serve their country, and the deserters who have. They say, as they do today, that forgiveness is necessary if national wounds are to heal—that magnanimity toward those who have erred is essential to project the image of a strong, self-confident nation.

In assessing the problem, we would dismiss at the outset those who insist that draft dodgers and deserters should not be punished because they saw the "error" of Vietnam long before the nation's statesmen did. The United States would dissolve into anarchy if individual decisions superseded the national will—and Vietnam was the national will until Congress and the President agreed otherwise. Nor do we believe that the debate over whether Congress or the President should grant amnesty to be more than a distraction under the present circumstances. Historically, that role always has been performed by the President.

What is clear at the outset is that granting of amnesty would not enhance the national unity. Polls consistently show that the majority of Americans are opposed to leniency. Moreover, if those who ran away from serving the United States really believe that they are morally right, they would resent conditional amnesty—which certainly is the most that could be offered if history is a guide.

More than history and tradition oppose unconditional or blanket amnesty for the simple draft dodgers. Blanket amnesty would be an injustice of the first order to those who have made sacrifices for their country, a slap at those who serve in the armed forces, and it would weaken the fabric of law and order in the United States. Deserters, moreover, should be considered separately because they did violate an oath as well as the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

While the United States may not be at war today, the wounds from Vietnam have not healed. It is, we believe, far too early to begin offering amnesty. If and when that time is reached, amnesty should not be unconditional or universal, but a case by case evaluation.

JOSEPH E. LEE ANNIVERSARY NOTED

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens for Community Action District 6, Inc., of Jacksonville, Fla., have been operating a community center in Jacksonville named for the late Joseph E. Lee, who died 54 years ago on March 25, 1920. Mr. Joseph J. Benekin, president of the organization, has asked me to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following account of this very distinguished Floridian, which I am glad to do:

JOSEPH E. LEE—1849-1920

One of Jacksonville's and Florida's most distinguished adopted sons was Joseph E. Lee. In the 47 years that he lived in this city and state, Lee established himself as a brilliant lawyer, an outstanding theologian, a captivating orator, a masterful politician, an illustrious statesman, and a social, civic, religious and fraternal leader.

Joseph E. Lee was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on September 15, 1849. He attended that city's public schools as well as the famous "Institute for Bold Youth." He obtained his law degree from Howard University School in 1873, where he was a student of the brilliant John M. Lanston, Dean of the Law School.

His legal career was commended in April, 1873, when he was admitted to practice before the Florida Supreme Court on the motion of Attorney General William A. Cocke. He was the first black lawyer in Jacksonville and the third one in the entire state. Lee was also one of the first, if not the first, lawyer in Florida to have a law degree. His clientele was state wide and included some of Florida's wealthiest citizens. Lee had a brilliant legal practice that lasted for 47 years and ended on March 25, 1920, when he died in his law office at 23 E. Beaver Street.

In November of 1874 Lee was elected to the Lower House of the Florida Legislature. He was a member of that body for the next eight years. In 1880 he was elected to the State Senate, where he served until 1882. Lee was a very active legislator, and he served on the following legislative committees: Judiciary, Privileged and Election, Engrossed Bill, and Education.

Lee's federal appointments were as impressive as his elected record. Throughout the 70's and 80's he was either the Deputy Collector of Customs of the Port of St. John or the Deputy Collector of Internal Revenue of Jacksonville. He was the Collector of Customs of the Port of St. John from 1890 to 1894 and from 1897 to 1898. The last federal appointment that he held was the Collector of Internal Revenue of Jacksonville from 1898 to 1913.

In 1884 he was nominated by his political party to be a delegate to the constitutional convention of 1885 which had to rewrite the Florida Constitution as its duty.

The achievements of Joseph E. Lee as a religious leader matched his other accomplishments. He was a member of Mt. Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church where he served as the superintendent of its Sunday School. He later became a minister in his denomination and was the pastor of three of Jacksonville's most famous churches, Mt. Zion, Mt. Olive and Grant Memorial. A charter member of the East Florida Conference of the A.M.C. Church, he later served as a presiding elder.

On April 3, 1888 Lee was elected Municipal Judge of Jacksonville over two white candi-

dates. He was the only black man to ever hold a judgeship in the history of Jacksonville.

As a political leader and statesman his brilliant abilities were known and respected on the local, county and congressional levels. Joseph E. Lee was a major force in the Republican Party of Florida for almost fifty years. He was both the Chairman of the Duval County Republican and Secretary of the State Republican Parties for almost forty years. At the time of his death in 1920 he was still holding these positions and delegate to the national Republican convention of that year.

Lee's contribution as an educator was made at Edward Waters College where he was a trustee of that institution for over thirty years. In this position he played a major roll in the development of that institution of higher learning.

The fraternal and civic activities of this "man of all seasons" were as exciting as his other careers. Lee was the Worshipful Master of Harmony Lodge No. 1 and the Grand Messenger of the Grand Lodge of the State of Florida. He was also the Grand Worthy Chief Templar of Florida's Order of Good Templars as well as the recording secretary of the Union Benevolent Association which provides aid to the poor, aged and the infirm.

Perhaps Lee's greatest contribution was to the youth of his days. They idolized him, not only did he both inspire and influence them during his lifetime, he also wrote his name in their minds forever. When James Weldon Johnson wrote his autobiography, *Along This Way*, in 1933, he remembered the Joseph E. Lee from his youth. He wrote, "I was in my teens when the city government was reorganized and Joseph E. Lee, a negro and a very able man and astute politician, was made judge of the Municipal Court."

In December 1972 A. Phillip Randolph told a reporter for the *New Yorker*, who was writing an article on the Dean of the Civil Rights Movement, of how his father looked up to Lee and tried to influence his children to do like him. It is of interest to note that the statement by Mr. Randolph was made 52 years after the death of Joseph E. Lee.

Joseph E. Lee was truly a man of all seasons who wrote his name forever in the history of Jacksonville and Florida.

NJPA AWARD TO LOUISE SAUL

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest writers I have ever known, Louise Saul, recently won a prize for feature writing—one of many she has received during a productive and gratifying career.

Besides being a talented writer, Louise Saul is a refined lady, so it is with special pride and happiness that I insert the story of her recent achievement at the New Jersey Press Association's annual Best Newspaper Contest. The award was not Ms. Saul's first, and I know it will not be her last.

The article follows:

NJPA AWARD TO LOUISE SAUL

Sentinel Newspapers Associate Editor Louise Saul won a third prize for feature writing at the New Jersey Press Association's annual Best Newspaper Contest last week.

The award-winning entry was a story published last summer, entitled "To make a mid-winter commercial in midsummer, you need

actors, a director, and lots of snow." It appeared in the *Sentinel*.

This is Ms. Saul's eighth award for writing since joining the *Sentinel* staff 12 years ago. Five of the awards came from the NJPA—three for her weekly column (including best women's column in the state) and two for feature articles. She also received East Brunswick's first brotherhood award for "outstanding human relations in journalism" for her writings in the field of civil rights. The Jewish War Veterans and the Amvets gave her an award for "fearless and honest reporting", for a series on anti-semitism in the suburbs. She also received an award from the Association for Brain-Injured Children for articles on behalf of children.

A former teacher, Ms. Saul has a BA degree from Wagner College and an MA from Columbia. She and her husband, Edwin, are parents of two girls—Amy, an EBHS sophomore, and April, a student at Tufts University.

In 1973, her byline appeared in *Ms Magazine*, *The Wall Street Journal* and the *New York Times*. Her column regularly appears in the *Somerset Spectator* and *Manhattan East*, as well as the *Sentinel Newspapers*.

TOUGH TO KEEP ABREAST OF TAXES AND INFLATION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, we Members of Congress, because of our salary increase, have not been called upon to bear the brunt of increasing taxes and inflation as have most of our constituents.

Gordon E. Duenow, editor of the *St. Cloud Daily Times*, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, recently wrote an editorial on this matter which I would like to share with my colleagues by inserting it in the *RECORD*:

TOUGH TO KEEP AHEAD OF TAXES AND INFLATION

Have you wondered at times why there just doesn't seem to be enough money around to make ends meet? There probably is a good reason if you have managed to get only a 50 per cent boost in pay in the past eight years.

According to new figures released by the Tax Foundation, if you have received only a 50 per cent pay increase in the past eight years you still have less than you started with, thanks to higher taxes and inflation.

Figures used by the Tax Foundation show that a person earning \$5,000 a year in 1966 and receiving a 50 per cent hike in pay to \$7,500 in 1974 still is \$11 worse off than he was eight years ago. The situation gets worse as the income level rises.

For instance, a person earning \$10,000 in 1966 and receiving a 50 per cent boost in pay to \$15,000 in 1974 would find himself \$159 worse off than before. And for those on a fixed income, they fare even worse.

If you received more than a 50 per cent pay increase during these eight years, you come out ahead. According to the Tax Foundation, only federal civilian employees and private construction workers are in this group as these groups of workers received nearly a 75 per cent increase in the eight-year period.

"Here's how the evil combination of taxes and inflation works," the Foundation points out:

"Take a family of four with one earner and \$10,000 income in 1966. Start where the taxes

start, with the amounts withheld from a year's paychecks. The federal income tax came to \$1,013. Despite some reductions in the tax, its bite on a salary of \$15,000 in 1974 is \$1,685, with the Social Security tax raised from \$177 to \$772.

"State income taxes which amounted to less than eight per cent of federal income tax collections in 1966, now take more than 15 per cent. Thus the average \$78 state income tax on \$10,000 in 1966 has risen to \$257 on \$15,000 in 1974.

"While taxes have reduced that \$5,000 pay increase to \$3,645, look at what inflation has done to the remaining take home pay. In the past eight years the dollar has lost nearly 45 per cent of its purchasing power. In terms of 1966 dollars, today's take home pay of \$12,286 equals only \$8,473 or \$159 less than the take home pay of \$8,632 in 1966."

And these figures do not include many other taxes, such as the sales tax, paid from after-tax take home pay. Now you may have some idea why the paycheck just doesn't seem to go as far as it used to. G.E.D.

PEACE RESOLUTION FOR THE NORTH OF IRELAND

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of Northern Ireland is well known to us. Yet as Americans with a deep concern for world peace in a century of international economic and military activity, we seem oblivious and unresolved with regard to Ireland in her agony.

Although our Government's official attitude is that the matter is one internal to the United Kingdom, we must, in conscience express our concern, indeed as we have with regard to repression of human rights in the U.S.S.R.

My country's legislature has passed a resolution memorializing Congress in this matter and I am pleased to submit it for the *RECORD*:

RESOLUTION

(Resolution No. 232 1974, urging the U.S. Congress to take affirmative action to persuade all concerned parties and the world community of nations to a speedy solution to the dangerous situation in the north of Ireland)

Whereas, the many contributions of men and women of Irish blood to the County of Suffolk, the State of New York, the building of our Nation, and to the Cause of Freedom everywhere since the earliest times; and

Whereas, the fact that Ireland is artificially partitioned against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people; and Whereas, that Irish people in the six-county area of Ireland known as "northern Ireland" are denied basic civil and human rights, and are unable to obtain either adequate protection or equal justice under law; and

Whereas, the explosive situation in "northern Ireland" is an unreasonable threat to the Peace and is, therefore, the legitimate concern of all men; and

Whereas, it is in the best interests of the United States that there be a just and equitable solution to this problem in order that peace, order, justice and well-being might be restored to that part of the world; and

Whereas, for humanitarian reasons, as well as out of respect for the principles of freedom, liberty, natural law, justice and history,

we hereby take notice of the dangerous and deplorable state of affairs in Ireland; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Suffolk County Legislature respectfully, yet firmly, urges memorializes and petitions the Congress of the United States to manifest our country's traditional position as guardian of freedom and republican-democracy, the dignity of all mankind, freedom of conscience, and mankind's universal natural rights, by taking such affirmative action as will tend to persuade all concerned parties, and the world community of nations, through diplomatic channels to seek a speedy, just and equitable solution to the dangerous situation in the "North" of Ireland, and to formally express the moral opinion that:

"The Irish people ought to be permitted to exercise the Right of National Self-Determination, thus returning the disputed six counties of northeast Ireland to the Irish Republic, unless a clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free and open plebiscite, determine to the contrary"; and be it further

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR EASTERN SHORE RAILROAD SERVICE

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, the unfairness of proposed cutbacks in rail service suggested in the Department of Transportation's plan for the reorganized northeastern railways is painfully apparent to those of us who live on Maryland's Eastern Shore. The DOT plan would cut back our rail service by 65 percent and do serious damage to the shore's economy.

But one does not have to live on the Eastern Shore and be directly affected by the plan to see that it is unfair, and that the Transportation Department is doing a disservice by its suggestion that such a drastic cutback be ordered. In an editorial broadcast on March 20 and 21, WTOP radio here in Washington argued that the service cutbacks suggested for the shore would be a "monumental mistake."

I include in the RECORD the text of the WTOP editorial, which was read by Editorial Director Ray White:

EASTERN SHORE RAIL SERVICE SHOULD BE RETAINED

(Editorial by WTOP Radio, Washington, D.C.)

The federal government will be making a monumental mistake if it goes ahead with plans to eliminate most railroad service on the Eastern Shore.

Federal legislation has been passed calling for the reorganization of seven bankrupt roads in the Northeast and Midwest United States.

Part of that legislation is a plan for consolidation prepared by the Department of Transportation.

And it's that plan that proposed in part the shutdown of two to three hundred miles of track on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, Delaware and Virginia.

This track represents nearly all of Maryland's Eastern Shore freight service, and all of Virginia's shore service.

The rationale behind the plan is to eliminate wasteful, unprofitable rail transport, so that the reorganized rail company will begin on a sound financial footing.

Fair enough, as economics go . . . except that much of the waste and unprofitability is the fault of the rail carriers themselves. Besides, more than "economics" and "profitability" are involved here.

A rational transportation system for Maryland, Virginia and the nation must include more—not less—railroad service than we have at present.

From practically any standpoint—energy use, environmental impact, transportation cost—railroads make more sense than highways.

The Department of Transportation seems afraid that continuing rail service to places like the Eastern Shore will ultimately force government subsidy of railroads.

We point this out: that the nation already has subsidized the trucking industry with thousands of miles of interstate highway—an action that has given the truckers a big advantage over trains in the last 25 years.

There may be a few places in the nation where continuing rail service doesn't make sense. The Eastern Shore is not one of them, and we hope the Congressional delegations of Maryland and Virginia will become the champions of more train service in this area, not less.

TAX EQUALIZER

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today cosponsoring legislation to give individual taxpayers the option of taking a \$200 credit instead of a \$750 deduction for each personal exemption claimed on the Federal income tax return.

I feel this is a plan which has the virtue of being readily understandable and also is tailored to help those most in need—families in the low- and moderate-income brackets.

Our present method, on the other hand, discriminates against persons of relatively modest means.

For example, an individual in the minimum 14-percent tax bracket stands to realize only \$105 in actual savings for each \$750 personal exemption, while someone in the 50 percent bracket would net \$375.

The \$200 credit would thus serve as an equalizer of sorts, by concentrating its benefits on the less affluent taxpayer. It is possible that the Ways and Means Committee may decide to make the credit mandatory, in which case everybody would get the flat \$200 regardless of his or her income bracket.

I am less impressed by the recent Senate action in voting to raise the personal exemption from \$750 to \$850. Everyone would benefit to some extent from an increase in the personal exemption, but those in the highest brackets would benefit the most.

The \$200 credit is basically more equitable in that it would apply with equal force at all income levels, but the degree

of relief would be greater for those of modest means.

I specifically reject the argument that we cannot afford to offer this relief. If anything, the opposite is true: It is quite possible we cannot afford to hold back on this aid. I am convinced that if this proposal is enacted, it will actually have a rejuvenating effect, as consumers will have more money to spend.

By focusing 90 percent of the tax relief on people making less than \$15,000, the plan not only helps those most in need, but also would provide a needed shot in the arm to the economy.

The bill I am offering today is the same as H.R. 13197 introduced March 4 by Mrs. GRIFFITHS, a knowledgeable member of the Ways and Means Committee. I hope the committee will be able to take early action on these and similar reform proposals.

LEGAL SERVICES: PATTERNS OF LEFT-LIBERAL ACTIVITY

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, opposition to legal services is nationwide. It is also widespread. Individuals in New Hampshire object to legal services there because it spends so much of its time bringing actions against various governmental agencies, in pursuit of law reform. Editorials in Indiana complain about Indianapolis Legal Services Organization because it spends so much time on impact and law reform litigation. We have all seen and read, probably many of us from our own districts, complaints and objections to legal services projects in the respective areas, generally complaints grounded on the fact that the attorneys spend so much time on law reform projects.

There are plenty of poor people who don't like busing, prison agitation, or suits in behalf of middle-class kids producing "underground" papers, but the ideological loading of the (legal services projects) is strictly on the left liberal side of things.

That is the succinct criticism offered by the Indianapolis News, and it contains more than appears on the surface.

The ideological loading of legal services attorneys, and therefore of their projects, is on the left-liberal side of things. While restrictions may be put on their activities; namely, that certain things they simply cannot do because of punitive measures—which I might add would also have to be written into the bill with great care—that ideological disposition will remain left-liberal, will remain opposed to what the majority of our citizens love about America and consider her great qualities: free enterprise, individualism, self-reliance, limited government. I do not know how the problem is going to be solved at all if we insist on clinging to the idea of an independent legal services corporation. It seems to me that programs providing in one way or another for legal aid to the poor channeled through the existing professional

organizations and mechanism is far more desirable than any independent, politically active, left-wing federally funded bureaucracy could be.

IT'S A PATTERN

Dispute over the Indianapolis Legal Services Organization has frequently been portrayed by LSO supporters as a battle between those who want to "help the poor" and those who don't.

As noted here in previous comment, this characterization is absurd, since the real issue at stake in continued LSO funding is whether taxpayers should put up dollars for so-called "impact" or "law reform" agitation aimed at remoulding U.S. institutions to suit the viewpoints of the liberal-left. There are plenty of poor people who don't like busing, prison agitation, or suits in behalf of middle-class kids producing "underground" papers, but the ideological loading of the LSO is strictly on the left liberal side of things.

That this latter is the real issue in legal services programs across the country is indicated by data unearthed in debate over the concept in Washington, and by reports on abuses in many states and localities. A good example is provided by a recent analysis compiled in the office of Gov. Meldrim Thomson of New Hampshire, which documents the outlook and practices of legal services agents in that state. While the particulars differ, the general themes emerging from the Thomson report are similar to those which have surfaced here.

The New Hampshire document reports that legal services representatives there spend a great deal of time bringing actions against various levels of government, many on a so-called "law reform" basis. One statement from the New Hampshire legal service guidelines has it that "law reform is to be considered, if not the primary purpose of legal services, certainly a major purpose." In pursuit of this goal, the New Hampshire agency has brought suit against the state welfare department, the employment security agency, the surplus food distribution system, local housing authorities, zoning officials, and so on.

One especially glaring fact noted by Thomson is the frequency with which New Hampshire legal service types speak in their various reports of seeking out or developing cases to suit the theories of the lawyers in question. One such statement has it that a lawyer "awaits a case in which to try out a new tort theory on creditors harassment." Another that "we should propose legislation and, if necessary, develop lawsuits to rectify the state's archaic registration and voting laws."

Such statements follow quite naturally from the whole "law reform" concept of litigation, since it is seldom an indigent plaintiff who has ideas about sweeping changes in the legal system. Notions of this type must be supplied by the lawyers, and the alleged "reforms" will reflect the predispositions of the attorneys seeking them.

These ideas have little to do with impartial help for the indigent, a great deal to do with imposing liberal-left notions on the American nation through legal agitation. The accumulating record makes it plain that national legal services as presently conducted should be abolished.

COMMUNIST MASSACRE OF SOUTH VIETNAMESE SCHOOLCHILDREN

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1974, at 2:55 p.m. Communist gunners

fired an 82 millimeter shell that landed on the primary school of the Cai-Lay district town of Dinh Tuong province. When the debris had been cleared away, 24 schoolchildren lay dead, 64 others were wounded, including one teacher and two other civilians.

This is just one more example of a gross violation of Paris Agreements of last year and a continuation of the selective terrorism practiced by the Communists in Vietnam for years—a specialty of Communists everywhere. Since the Paris Agreement was signed on January 27, 1973, there have been more than 12,000 South Vietnamese village and hamlet chiefs, policemen, schoolteachers, and civil servants murdered, wounded, or kidnapped by Communist terror teams. In my view, the Congress needs to keep these facts in mind when considering questions affecting the situation in Southeast Asia.

TRUTH IN CONGRESS

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, if there is one place on Earth where credibility and integrity should be taken seriously, it is in these Halls of Congress. Yet, time and again, a few among us have decided that the credibility and integrity of Congress can be sacrificed in favor of headline grabbing.

I believe this is wrong. I believe the majority of the Members of the House view this as wrong. And I believe we now must take steps to assure that our rules and our code of conduct have meaning; that they are not mere words to be applied as we individually see fit.

The most recent incident making our action imperative is the unauthorized release last week of the report, not yet approved by the House Committee on Government Operations, "Expenditures of Federal Funds in Support of Presidential Properties." It is the second time in as many years that a member of this committee, or one of its staff, has decided that committee approval is frivolous, that making the news is more important than the integrity of Congress.

In this particular instance, I will admit, the report had the blessing of a subcommittee—the Subcommittee on Government Activities, chaired by the gentleman from Texas. The report was, however, clearly stamped on each page with a legend reading: "Hold Until Release Date Approved by full Committee on Government Operations." Additionally, I am told that after the subcommittee had approved the report March 21 the chairman reiterated the point that the report must remain confidential.

In spite of these admonitions, in spite of the House rules, and in spite of our Code of Official Conduct, a story headlined "Hill Panel Hits Nixon Homes' Costs" appeared on page 2 of the March 22 issue of the Washington Post.

And the public, once more has been misled.

Just about 2 years ago, I addressed myself on this floor to a similar incident involving the same committee. What I said then is true today.

Clearly, we have again witnessed a breach of committee rules and the spirit, if not the letter, of the House rules. Thus, we have once again cast doubt upon the integrity of this body. At very least, we have contributed to the public's diminishing faith in Government, and in Congress.

The issue is not whether a Member wishes to be associated or disassociated with the report—and I am professing neither with regard to the report in question. Rather, the issue is one of principle: Should some Members of this House or their employees be allowed to foist upon the public a report seen by only a handful of Members and not acted upon by the responsible committee?

Integrity, like charity, begins at home. The Government Operations Committee, obviously, is incapable of protecting the integrity of its work, and so it is up to the House to find out who is responsible for the premature and unauthorized release of this report and then to reprimand that person or persons.

This is the only way we can hope to prevent a recurrence, and the only way we can assure the American people that we in Congress practice what we preach.

To this end, I am introducing the following resolution, together with my colleague, Mr. WYDLER of New York, on the Government Operations Committee:

RESOLUTION

Whereas clause 27(d)(3) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives stipulates that any report of any committee shall be printed in a single volume which shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report; and

Whereas all Members and staff of the Committee on Government Operations have a responsibility, pursuant to a memorandum from their Chairman to Subcommittee Chairmen dated December 14, 1971, and entitled, "Guidelines for Drafting Investigative Reports," to maintain the confidentiality of reports before approval and release by the full Committee; and

Whereas a proposed report based on a study by the Government Activities Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, entitled, "Expenditures of Federal Funds in Support of Presidential Properties," was released to the public on or before March 21, 1974, without opportunity for submission of supplemental, minority, or additional views, and in advance of Committee consideration of such report, in violation of clause 27(d)(3) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives and Guidelines of the Committee on Government Operations; and

Whereas the first provision of the Code of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives states, "A Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall conduct himself at all times in a manner which shall reflect creditably on the House of Representatives;" and

Whereas all measures relating to the Code of Official Conduct shall be referred, under clause 19 of Rule XI of the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct investigate the release of this proposed report, with the objec-

tive of learning which person(s) are responsible for the release; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives censure those person(s) whom the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct find to be so responsible, and, if the responsible person(s) be found to be staff member(s) of the Committee on Government Operations, that the Chairman of that Committee be instructed to impose administrative penalties, including, at his discretion, discharge from employment, against such staff member(s).

SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES DECISIONS AFFECTING AN ORDERLY TREATMENT OF TEMPORARY MARINE MAMMALS PROBLEMS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1974, I inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the Select Committee's incorrect decision to transfer the existing jurisdiction of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee over Panama and interoceanic canals to the Foreign Affairs Committee. This was followed by comments, on March 25, 1974, relating to the Select Committee's fragmentation of the existing unified Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee's oceanography jurisdiction. Today, I would like to make some remarks with respect to the adverse effect of the Select Committee on Committees' decisions on the rational treatment of marine mammals.

The protection of marine mammals has been consistently considered by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and we have proposed comprehensive legislation to establish an integrated system for their protection and regulation—Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, Public Law 92-522. It is enlightening to examine the fate of marine mammals under the Select Committee on Committees' reform proposals. I ask the Members to remember the tremendous public interest and concern for seals, whales, and porpoises that resulted in the passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, followed shortly by passage of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Let us also remember that a prime focus of these laws dealt with the health and stability of the ecosystem and dealt not only with the economic benefits of the remarkable animals in question but also their values to recreation and esthetics. Just what does the proposed reorganization scheme do to marine mammals?

Let us examine the knotty problem of the Pribilof fur seals. Here we have a species that has been well managed, and through the careful attention of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee a full spectrum of talent involving fisheries scientists and oceanographers have been turned loose to unravel the mysteries of this splendid marine mammal. In recent years the populations of seals have failed to increase in numbers as might be expected from the management practices.

Two prime causes for this failure are hypothesized: First, the rapidly growing Soviet and Japanese trawl fishery in the Bering Sea, a fishery that may be in direct competition with the seals, and, second, the possible degradation of the ocean environment by the intrusion of DDT, DDE, and other chlorinated hydrocarbons, an increase which may in effect be reducing the birth rate of the seals. Investigations are now underway by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to solve this critical question. Under the select committee's decision, this work would be reported to three separate committees of the House, a fact which may result in our limited scientific manpower utilizing their time primarily for the preparation and offering of testimony rather than being employed in the field gathering necessary data.

The same unfortunate result occurs when we consider the development of solutions to the problem of inadvertent porpoise mortality in the fishery for yellowfin tuna. Solutions here, depend on a knowledge of all the key factors: the tuna fish, the porpoises, the fishermen and the ocean itself—again the jurisdiction will be spread over three committees. This seems a most inefficient way to organize the Congress and be responsive to critical national needs. It is in reality negative reform—retrogression in the face of a clear environmental mandate to the contrary.

If we are to move forward, to act both responsibly and most effectively to understand the dynamics of the oceans and the life they contain, we can only do so by a highly integrated approach—the highly integrated approach taken by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with respect to these problems over the years. The select committee members' stated objectives are laudatory, but their perceptions of the means of accomplishment of these objectives in the real world are incredible.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people proclaimed their national independence and regained their freedom which was lost to Czarist Russia at the end of the 18th century. On that day, the all Byelorussian Congress, meeting in the city of Minsk, proclaimed the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. A provisional constitution was then adopted which called for direct and secret ballot open to all; freedom of speech, press and assembly; national and cultural autonomy of all minorities; an 8-hour work day and the right to strike; all guarantees of human rights, advanced for their day.

The independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was accorded de jure recognition by over a dozen states, and Byelorussian legations and consulates were set up in some foreign capitals. Unfortunately, the new state was unable to enjoy its sovereignty for long. The Russian Communists consolidated their forces, and the Red Army invaded Byelorussia. The Byelorussian territory was turned into a battlefield, and the nation soon found itself in Russian captivity again.

In an attempt to pacify the national aspirations of the Byelorussian people, the Soviet Government in Moscow created the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic—BSSR—which was to replace the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. However, this regime was nothing more than a new form of subjugation. By this time, the national consciousness of the Byelorussian people was strongly aroused and led to several armed insurgencies, the most notable being the Slutsk uprisings in 1920, and others from 1922 to 1926 in the districts of Vializ, Homiel, Cervien, and Barysau.

The German occupation during World War II provided a period of relative calm which resulted in a spontaneous revival of Byelorussian national institutions, counter to Eastern European policy by the Nazis. In 1944, in Minsk, the Second All-Byelorussian Congress was convened and reaffirmed the desire of the Byelorussian people for complete political independence.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic of today is not an independent state; it only possesses some external trappings of independence, such as its membership in the United Nations. Such normal functions of a sovereign state as relations with other states are not only strictly controlled by Moscow, but on the diplomatic level do not exist.

The present relations of Moscow to Byelorussia are strictly colonial in nature and have two distinct aims. One is to exploit the Byelorussian natural resources for the benefit of Russian imperial expansion; and the other is to eradicate Byelorussian nationalism in the hope of fostering a homogeneous Soviet empire. In pursuit of these policies, Moscow has implemented the following measures: Only Russians are permitted to occupy the key positions in the BSSR; the industrial development in the BSSR is primarily channeled for the express purpose of developing the Russian empire in Siberia and Central Asia; the Byelorussian language has been almost completely eliminated from administrative use, from institutions of higher learning, and from secondary schools. Still, the ceaseless attacks by the Communist press and radio on "Byelorussian Bourgeois Nationalism" prove that these policies are failing, and that Soviet Russia will never succeed in stifling the desire of the Byelorussian people for their national freedom, just as Czarist Russia failed in the same endeavor.

On March 25, 1918, the highest aspirations of the Byelorussian people for a free and independent life were fulfilled. Today, March 25 is a symbol of a dynamic spiritual force for Byelorussian

sian independence which unites all Byelorussians wherever they may be. The fight for Byelorussian independence is also a fight for the emergency of all captive nations, which is a necessary prerequisite for the establishment of a lasting peace in the world.

PRICE CONTROLS, A FRAUD

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, there is broad agreement across our land that price controls have failed and my hope is that they will be allowed to expire. In this rare instance, both management and labor agree that controls have been a failure. As evidence of this, I call the attention of my colleagues to the editorial that recently appeared in the *Machinist* of October 4, 1973—the organ of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers. The editorial follows:

AN INDEPENDENT FINDING: PRICE CONTROLS, A FRAUD

One of the nation's most productive think tanks, the Rand Corporation of Santa Monica, Calif., has turned out another paper that may cause the government almost as much trouble as the famous Pentagon Papers—an earlier Rand product.

This one isn't classified Top Secret, but President Nixon may wish it had been if ever it gets the attention it deserves. The paper is entitled "The Effectiveness of Phase II Price Controls."

The four Rand economists who worked on it have effectively debunked for all time the official folklore about the usefulness of price controls. Here is a typical excerpt:

"When price trends are examined on an industry-by-industry basis, the evidence appears to show that in most industries there was hardly any relationship between Price Commission ruling and price trends."

The Rand team examined price changes in 117 industries during Phase II, then picked those which had price increases in excess of 5% and compared the average price increase to the average increase granted by the Price Commission. Here's the chart that resulted.

[In percent]

Wholesale Price Index during phase II... 12.1
Price increases granted during phase II... 2.4

Said the Rand paper:

"In industries which caused the most trouble during phase II, prices went up five times as much as the average increase allowed by the Price Commission. This makes it very difficult to maintain that the prices set by the Price Commission had any restraining impact in those industries."

On the other hand, the Rand researchers found that in several industries, where the Price Commission granted increases, prices actually declined during Phase II.

According to this paper, "The data show, when all 117 industries are included, there is essentially a zero correlation," between the decisions of the Price Commission and prices charged by the large manufacturers in a particular industry. The paper carries the documentation.

The only justification for Phase II price controls these researchers could find was reported gingerly this way:

"Data pointing to the ineffectiveness of

Phase II price controls should be seriously considered in contemplating any future control program. Since Phase II controls were the most extensive that the United States has undertaken in peacetime, and since most other price control programs were also unsuccessful, one is led to the general conclusion that peacetime price controls should be avoided and that the U.S. should rely instead on more traditional methods of fighting inflation.

"One problem with this position is that price controls can be useful even if they do not control prices. During Phase II, for example, the existence of price controls provided an excuse for maintaining wage controls, and many businessmen supported the control program because they felt that the nuisance of price controls was more than offset by the benefits of restraining unions through wage controls.

"However, the use of price controls as a facade for maintaining restraints on unions becomes impossible when price controls are clearly proven to be ineffective and the public becomes aware of it. Besides, there are methods other than price controls that will ensure wage earners that they do not bear the entire burden of fighting inflation. Such methods include an increase in corporation income taxes or more progressive personal income taxes."

IAM President Floyd Smith called the Nixon Stabilization Program "a hoax" last December. Few in Congress would listen. Perhaps Senator Proxmire (D) of Wis., chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, will be more impressed by this Rand paper.

Union members deserve something better from their friends in Congress than a fraudulent stabilization program made possible by the blank check authority which the Democrats voted to President Nixon.

A BILL TO AMEND THE CLAYTON ACT

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Clayton Act to encourage competition in the oil industry by prohibiting an oil company, which is engaged in the production and refining of petroleum products, from engaging in the marketing of such products.

Right now we are in the throws of a fuel shortage. What has caused this shortage? When we examine the structure of oil production and distribution, we find substantial barriers to free competition. These carriers are designed to keep competitors out of the lucrative oil business, thus limiting the supply of oil and creating monopoly profits for the major oil companies.

Barriers to entry into the oil industry are set up in many ways, but the most important method is vertical integration. Major oil companies are involved in all five phases of the petroleum industry operations: First, crude oil production, second, crude oil transportation, third, refining, fourth, product transportation, and fifth, the marketing of refined petroleum products. Involvement and control of all five of these operations by the ma-

for oil companies has led to artificially high prices for the consumer.

The method of control that leads to monopoly profits is complex. The major oil companies own most of the known petroleum resources. The oil depletion allowance allows a 22-percent tax deduction for profits made on production of crude oil. Profits, mind you, not the amount of production. The higher the price of crude oil, the higher the profits and the greater the tax deduction. Thus, by monopoly control the oil companies are maintaining artificially high prices for crude to get astronomical tax deductions. But how does the oil industry maintain this artificial level of prices. Well, they own the refineries. It is a simple bookkeeping process to shift the profits from the refinery level to the production level.

The refineries are not concerned about profit and are willing to pay the artificially high prices for crude. With joint ownership of the crude production and refineries, the profits all go into the same pocket, except now they can go to the Government for larger tax deductions. Because there is almost no profit at the refinery level, the oil companies have prevented the entrance of any competitors.

But the monopoly does not stop here. The major oil companies also dominate the retail markets. Through heavy reliance on advertising and other forms of nonprice competition—that is, credit cards—the oil companies have segmented the market for retail gasoline into two markets, one for branded gasoline and another for nonbranded gasoline. The oil companies determine who supplies their retail outlets with gasoline, and have restricted this opportunity to their own refineries and cooperating independent refineries. This means that a large portion of the market for refined petroleum products is insulated from the competitive pressures of the truly independent section. Again, barriers are set up that prevent an increase in the supply of gasoline. Because of this marketing procedure, there is a reduction in refinery capacity, both for independents and for the entire industry, from the level which prevail if all refiners, actual and potential, were not prevented from competing for the right to supply the entire demand for gasoline. Another barrier in retail marketing is that the major oil companies have often refused to sell motor gasoline to independent marketers. These independent marketers are the primary source of price competition in the retail market for gasoline and represents a threat both to the oil companies style of marketing, which avoids price competition, and to the stability of their share of the market. It is at these levels where the public really feels the pinch. Here, the oil companies' power is translated into higher profits by charging higher prices to the consumers. It is time to break up this monopoly power to allow competition in the petroleum industry that will bring about greater supplies and lower prices. The public is fed up and wants action now. I agree and hope that Congress will favorably consider this legislation in this session.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
H.R. 69

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time during the consideration of amendments to H.R. 69, I intend to offer the following amendment to title II:

Page 59, line 24, strike all of subsection "(c)" of "Sec. 801" as added by Sec. 201(a), and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) No funds are authorized to be appropriated in the first bill or resolution proposing to make an appropriation under subsections (a) and (b) unless the aggregate amount which would be so appropriated is at least equal to the aggregate amount appropriated for obligation by the Commissioner during the preceding fiscal year for programs authorized by Title II, III and V of Sections 807 and 808 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and Title III (except for Section 305 thereof) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

NEED TO REFORM OCCUPATIONAL
SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1970

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, the Select Labor Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee held hearings March 19 and 20, on the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. This marks the beginning of an extensive review of the act's implementation and general applicability toward the achievements of the purposes and policy of assuring every working man and woman safe and healthful working conditions.

Next month will mark the act's third year of implementation. There are many concerns to be brought to light regarding various aspects of the operations and enforcement procedures of OSHA. As a participant in the proceedings of providing testimony on the need to reform the act, I indicated that we need to change provisions starting from the manner in which standards are set all the way through the inspections process and into the review and appeal rights afforded the cited individuals. Appearing with me were representatives of the farming and small business community of South Dakota where OSHA's application and operation has greatly impinged upon the rights of individual employers without necessarily enhancing greater safety and healthful working conditions.

I would at this time like to include here the testimony of Mr. Gary Enright of the South Dakota Farm Bureau and Mr. Art Kroetch, president of Little Scotchman's Industries of Philip, S. Dak.:

TESTIMONY OF MR. GARY J. ENRIGHT, ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR, SOUTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU

I am Gary Enright, administrative director of South Dakota Farm Bureau, Huron, South Dakota.

I wish to thank the members of this committee for allowing testimony from individuals and organizations regarding corrections and amendments to the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

I appeared before this committee about two years ago after my organization had conducted a series of information gathering meetings across the state of South Dakota to determine the opinion of citizens of that state on what is now commonly called OSHA. At that time we asked that the committee exempt agriculture from the broad coverage of the Act.

The exemption has taken a lot of pressure off agriculture. Many agricultural and small business employers, however, still express fear that stringent regulations covering the safety of their employees would literally drive them out of business.

We have experienced an increasing awareness toward safety in working conditions in many areas, not because of the severe regulations or threat of fine, but because employers and employees are increasingly aware of the need for safe working conditions.

We appear today to ask this committee to consider some recommendations as to how to improve OSHA as it applies to agriculture such as we have in South Dakota in the area of small businesses and manufacturing firms.

The members of Farm Bureau in South Dakota have directed their attention to this matter and have the following recommendations:

1. Safety standards and regulations governing business, manufacturers, and agricultural operations employing 15 or fewer persons should be exempt from the type of regulations which govern firms or operations which are above 15 employees.

A. We are not asking for total exemption from all safety standards, but are asking that standards be reasonable and suitable for the type of operations they govern.

B. These standards should be written with the assistance of representatives of the owners or operators of the businesses and the employees of those businesses.

C. We recommend that standards for agricultural employers be written only after representatives of various types of agricultural and small business operations and their employees work with department officials in promulgating regulations and that they not be enforced until proper public hearing processes are conducted.

2. We recommend that safety regulations and standards which are promulgated under the above system be voluntary for at least three years from the time of enforcement. This is being requested so that ample time will be allowed for an educational process.

3. It is the recommendation of the organization I represent that farm and small business safety procedures and standards be the subject of an educational program to be conducted through existing educational organizations such as the National Safety Council, Extension, Vocational Education, and farm organizations, and that these programs be financed through grants from the federal government.

4. We recommend that employees be liable under the Act so that they also have responsibility in the area of conducting safe working practices on the job. Employers should not be subject to fine or imprisonment because an employee refused to observe safety standards under conditions in which the employer provided a reasonably safe place in which to work.

5. A program directed toward on-site consultation for small businesses and agriculture to assist them in developing safe working conditions.

6. We concur with Representative Abdnor's recommendation that an economic impact study be made on the effect of all regulations promulgated and that this study be considered when the regulations are finally developed.

7. And finally, we ask that this Committee establish a study of the present Occupational Safety and Health Act and the regulations promulgated under the act and determine whether American businesses, manufacturers, and agriculture can continue to operate at a non-inflationary level. The costs of complying with OSHA regulations should not be prohibitive and generally cannot be borne entirely by the companies involved.

There is no doubt but that OSHA has caused a great deal of concern throughout the nation. There are many, many areas which directly affect agriculture because agriculture depends upon almost every industry in the nation for its machinery, supplies, chemicals, processing, transportation, and retailing of its products. OSHA affects agriculture when regulations are imposed on even the largest manufacturing firms because the increased cost of implementing safety measures at these plants is passed along to the consumer of their products. Strict safety regulations covering small manufacturers supplying the large firms with parts have caused extreme hardships because some of these firms have gone out of business rather than attempt to meet the OSHA regulations and now we are faced with shortages in the supply of machinery and tractors.

There are impacts far greater than the mere lack of supply of some parts or the shortage of farm machinery. We must also take into consideration the impact of unemployment in the communities where these small plants are located. We must face the possible impact of loss of purchasing power of agriculture, or even a shortage of food products because farmers are unable to get the needed equipment in quantity to raise the food which is demanded by the American consumer. We must consider that agriculture cannot add the increased cost of conforming to safety regulations to the consumer price of food.

There is another economic impact to consider. This is the impact of the loss of employment for persons working in small plants in low population areas, or the loss of employment for persons working in agriculture, because their employers are unable to meet the costs of compliance with OSHA regulations. This puts a serious economic burden on small communities.

We are in hopes that the members of this committee and the Congress itself will take back some of the power it has given to agencies of government and that you will impose some restrictions on the regulatory bodies under OSHA in the area of promulgation, education, and enforcement of safety regulations and standards.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our opinions.

TESTIMONY OF MR. ART KROETCH, LITTLE SCOTCHMAN'S INDUSTRIES, PHILIP, S. DAK.

I am appearing before you at the request of Representative Abdnor of South Dakota, and I wish to thank you for your consideration.

I am the major stockholder and the man who started the business known as Little Scotchman Industries of Philip, South Dakota. Our firm does business in every state in the United States, except one, that being Hawaii due to location.

I am quite familiar with O.S.H.A., having served on the B11-5 committee, writing standards for iron workers which is in our field, as we manufacture the Dvorak iron worker. It is a hydraulic operated machine of small to medium size and sold to plants of the largest size and the smallest.

My experience also has been wearing many hats, as we are a small company with 40 full-time employees. One of my jobs is being safety man, and we were only cited on one citation and had a total of six violations from O.S.H.A. with a fine of only \$75 on 3 violations of \$25 each. When you consider that we have in use daily more than 40 industrial machines of various sizes and types for our products,

and with only \$75 fine, I consider it coming out quite well.

However, I am quite opposed to O.S.H.A. in several respects. One reason being the inspector can demand entry to any business at any time he chooses, regardless if management or owner is present or not, as you will note in one of the references, and that being Petersen Company of Pierre, South Dakota.

Many small businessmen are very much afraid of O.S.H.A. because they don't have the expertise to be able to understand what is needed to comply simply because the Federal Register is not clear on what is needed.

I believe if you follow Article Four of the Preamble of the Constitution of the United States that you will find the O.S.H.A. to be unconstitutional.

Article Four: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

I believe it is unconstitutional for an inspector to be allowed entry into any business without first giving notice in advance to the management when he plans to make his inspection, especially when he can cite violations against the business and cause the business to be fined without recourse.

I believe that any other law enforcement organizations, with the exception of a few other federal bureaus, do not have the privilege of conducting business in this manner for reasons stated in Article Four. My reason tells me that OSHA should not have this power either.

Also, I am told by IRS that any fine levied by OSHA is not tax deductible from federal income tax, which I feel is wrong. I know that fines such as traffic and other fines are not deductible; and I think that is right because they are willfully committed. But OSHA is different in the respect that management does not commit a willful crime by not meeting all standards, because it is nearly impossible to meet these standards. I am sure you must agree that an OSHA fine is a business expense and should be deductible from income tax.

I believe that employees should be held responsible for OSHA in this respect, in the care and maintenance of the machinery they operate. The OSHA law releases employees of all responsibility, or at least the way I read the law, it does.

The employer can do everything to meet OSHA, and an employee can tear it down as fast as the employer builds it up; but the employer pays. If an employee refuses to use safety equipment provided by the employer and is caught by the OSHA inspector, who pays? The employer, and not the employee who is responsible for the so-called crime. OSHA calls it a crime or at least fines for it. Call it what you like.

I believe that the court system should be changed for these reasons. As I understand the law, the judge and jury are three men located in one city of a given area or district of the United States. In my case, it is Billings, Montana, which is 500 miles away. I am afraid it would have to be a heavy fine before it would be worthwhile to fight a case even if I knew I was right. I believe this is wrong. No business should be asked to travel 500 miles to be tried in court, in my estimation.

Another thing that I believe is wrong is that one of the first questions the inspector asked me was, "Are your employees represented by a union?" I cannot see any reason for this question to be on the questionnaire unless it would be so that the information could be passed on so that it would be easier for the unions to organize non-union companies. It is true that if the company is union, the inspector wants a union man to

accompany him on the inspection, which I will buy; but he does not need to have this question on the sheet to find if it is a union shop.

I am told by OSHA that if I am cited for a violation and fined for it, I have X many days to comply. But if it is a gray area, of which there are many, and I fix the wrong and comply, or think I do, and a re-inspection does not suit the inspector, the company can be liable for a fine of X many dollars a day from the date of the first inspection until it is fixed to suit the compliance officer. He does not need to tell you how to do it, unless he chooses to do so. Another thing that is grossly wrong is that there are amazing differences of opinion from one compliance officer to another, and in many cases it is run by opinion alone.

For the reasons I have mentioned, I believe that OSHA should be repealed in lieu of some workable safety law if it is needed. It would seem to me that the workman's compensation, fire insurance, and liability would be deterrent enough to make any company be as safe as possible. Our little company paid \$5,000.00 in 1973. Incidentally, I have had men on workman's compensation for a total of 25 years, ranging in number from 1 to 40 men and have had only two claims that were paid for being off work for more than 8 days.

If we are to have this law, then let's get together and make it fair to all employers, employees, OSHA and any other parties interested.

I have stated the reasons I think the law should be repealed; and if it is not repealed, then all of the things I mentioned should be changed.

Also, I have more things that need attention. One is training the inspectors so they are knowledgeable about their job. The inspector we had was quite deplorable to say the least, as far as knowledge was concerned, and I will relate them to you in person. I am sure that the Department of Labor could find many sources of training for compliance officers in trade associations, etc. It is my belief that the Machine Tool Builders Association has offered to train inspectors in the machine tool line so that they would be knowledgeable at least to recognize a specific machine when they see it, if not know the exact guarding necessary for it, as was the case of the compliance officer that made our inspection.

Another thing that I believe must be changed is that the compliance officer and management sit down after an inspection and decide what was found wrong and decide what must be done to correct the problem. The company should be given X many days to comply without fine. Then if it is not done upon re-inspection, the company should be fined for non-compliance, but absolutely not on the first trip around. I am told that this is the way the Bureau of Mines does, except they don't fine. They simply shut the company down until the correction is made, and this is done on re-inspection.

Members of the Committee, I am going to wander just a bit from OSHA now and relate as best I can the plight of the small businessman. Between getting your federal taxes paid on the third banking day after payday, fighting with wage and hour men, collecting debts which have been made harder by federal legislation, fighting some insurance company on a product liability case that was not his responsibility that was more than likely caused by a no-fault insurance law passed in some governmental agency, trying to read up on consumer protection bills which are about to slap many of us in the face, it looks like a harder fight than OSHA. We are worrying about land use bills that will affect about every acre of land in the United States sooner or later, battling environmental protection laws that affect many of us, and maybe fighting a labor dispute all at the same time.

It may be that some of the politicians will get their wishes sooner than they expect, and that is to nationalize everything. I can tell you from experience that we as businessmen cannot last very long amongst the octopus that has a strangle hold such as the federal government has on us now.

The following are excerpts of letters I have received from other concerned South Dakotans regarding their feelings on the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970:

From Mr. Ray Godfrey, Godfrey Brake Service and Supply Company, 118 Omaha Street, Rapid City, South Dakota: "I can't see why a small business has to be subject to such an unfair regulation and be fined every time one of the inspectors drops in to our places. We have been inspected one time and fined \$25.00."

It seems to me that when a building is built and meets all city and state building codes, one should not have to be forced to spend large sums of money to fit the OSHA code."

From Mr. G. Homer Harding, State Senator, Pierre, South Dakota: "It is my opinion that a determination of the true purpose of the Act should be arrived at first. Is it designed to safeguard the health and well being of the worker; or is it a revenue measure? If it is the first, then I recommend that the inspectors give warnings and if the deficiency is corrected in 30 days, there be no fine. With this type of assistance there would be more understanding and cooperation between government and the private sector; and isn't this what it's all about? Government is supposedly designed to help the citizenry, not harass and badger the normal flow of activity. If it is the second reason, then I say the whole act is a fraud and should be scrapped."

"As a further recommendation, I feel the record system should be modified in cases where there are fewer than 100 employees. For starters, eliminate all posting and forms other than a file of loss time accidents, only. Other records are nothing more than harassment and serve no useful purpose whatever."

"I, also, became concerned when each year in the legislature we are faced with STATE OSHA regulations and department formation by the statement, 'If we don't do this, the Fed's will really get tough in S. Dak.' Now, I say this type of justification is ridiculous. Why two levels of bureaucracy when the Federal can handle it now with the least expense to the taxpayer. If the state of S. Dak. must establish an OSHA Department, then there is absolutely no need for a Federal Agency. Duplication must stop."

"Art, I know this is general philosophy more than specific points of the law. However, to be specific in all areas would be an impossible task. It is my hope that sincere thinking men will prevail and the Act be modified to be helpful and practical without jeopardizing its avowed purpose, that is, the health and safety of the working people of this country."

From Larry M. Owen, Vice President, Marketing and Development, Black Hills Power and Light Company, P.O. Box 1951, Rapid City, South Dakota: "One of the primary concerns of many people is the inspection procedure wherein the business or industry is found to be in violation of a regulation and immediately faces a citation and/or fine. Certainly it would be much better to discuss violations with the inspector and at least attempt to resolve the problem to the satisfaction of both parties. Some reasonable time period should be allowed for compliance after citations are issued and prior to assessing any fine."

"Owners and managers of business and industry, in most cases, intend to provide a safe working environment for all employees and expect to comply with OSHA regulations. However, in many inspections, violations are minimal and can be corrected expediently if

the parties involved are reasonable in their attitude toward each other.

"I would much prefer an attitude by OSHA of assisting business and industry in the reduction of occupational injuries, in the improvement of working conditions and in the general improvement of the working environment. Many companies, Black Hills Power and Light Company included, have actively promoted safety for many years, both in their own industry and in the communities in which they do business and are willing to cooperate with federal agencies. I feel that a spirit of cooperation would be more valuable than the present system of inspection, citation and fine. The citations and fines could be used where there is an obvious or serious disregard for the safety and health of employees."

From Grace Petersen, Petersen Motors, Inc., 422 South Fort Street, Pierre, South Dakota: "As for the inspection of Petersen Motors, Inc. by OSHA, both Mr. Petersen and I were absent the day of the inspection. We therefore have no first hand knowledge of how the inspector conducted himself or what the procedure was. According to our employees, the man merely said he was with the government and that this was just routine inspection. To my knowledge he did not present any credentials. Our salesman offered to call me so I could find the records he asked about; however, the inspector said they were unimportant and it was not necessary for him to see them."

"I'm sure it is the practice in other businesses as in ours that only a limited number of people have access to business records. In our business, which is family oriented, only myself and Mr. Petersen have complete access to business records."

"It was the considered opinion of our employees that the inspector had little, if any, knowledge of the garage business. The alleged violations tend to confirm this opinion."

"You can see by the material enclosed that we only contested the record keeping alleged violation. While the fine of \$350.00 and the work needed to correct alleged violations was near \$2,000.00, we consider this a large amount of money but felt it would be more costly to contest the rest of them when you consider the amount of money and time that could be consumed by running to hearings and hiring attorneys. Being a small family type business, any time away from the business is costly in business loss."

"We believe that the OSHA law should be repealed in its entirety. If this is not possible, then it should exclude small business with under 25 employees. Small businesses are safety conscious for the simple reason that it is too costly to have employees injured. Our record speaks for itself, more than twenty years in business with only a few minor injuries requiring first aid and no serious injuries."

OPERATION INDEPENDENCE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we can now look forward to running our automobiles on water. This exciting possibility of using one of our most plentiful elements—hydrogen—as a fuel source is fascinating. It is the main ingredient of water—H₂O—and it offers a pollution-free abundance of energy that would eliminate the need for drilling for oil and gas, mining of coal, or grinding up of oil

shale. Hydrogen is a safe, convenient fuel that shows great promise for the future. Experiments at UCLA give us a glimpse of what may become a major breakthrough. President Nixon's "Operation Independence" must proceed immediately to apply ample research funds in this area.

I include as a portion of my remarks a brilliant article on this subject by Herb Lawrence, the environment writer for the San Diego Evening Tribune.

"ELEMENTAL" REPLACEMENT FOR OIL FOUND
(By Herb Lawrence)

Research at UCLA shows that hydrogen, a very light element which is plentiful in water, packs the ability to replace oil as our major fuel by the middle of the 1980s.

UCLA scientists believe this gas, the simplest and lightest of all elements, could permanently free this country from dependency on the whims and blackmail of oil sources.

Hydrogen could fuel all cars, buses and trucks in the United States and do a host of other chores such as producing electricity by fueling turbines and fuel cells.

There are still some problems with hydrogen, an odorless and colorless gas, but nothing that can't be overcome relatively quickly with sufficient development money.

William Van Vorst, associate professor of engineering and applied science at UCLA, says the research of his group shows that:

Cars can operate just as efficiently on hydrogen as they do on gasoline.

Engines need less maintenance when using hydrogen because the element doesn't contain the particles that gasoline does. This cuts maintenance costs and makes the engines last longer.

Cars operating on hydrogen put out practically no pollutants. They don't need the normal smog control devices. Tests done by Van Vorst's laboratory show a hydrogen-powered car that easily meets the tough 1976 federal emission standards. It puts out no hydrocarbons or carbon monoxide. There is a slight trace of nitrogen oxides.

When operating on hydrogen the car emits mostly water vapor. Van Vorst said it's "fog instead of smog that comes out."

Problems encountered with hydrogen:

There occasionally is some back-firing during car operations. But Van Vorst is working on it and thinks he has it solved with exhaust gas recirculation.

The storage area needed for hydrogen in a car is too large now. It's larger than for a gasoline tank. But he said he thinks it can be reduced without too many problems.

Van Vorst and his five other researchers have been asked by the federal government to generally determine if hydrogen could do the job of replacing gasoline.

Specifically, the \$60,000 grant from the Department of Transportation is to evaluate the engine performance with hydrogen and to develop a way in which hydrogen will take up less storage space in a car.

"Engine performance has been good in our tests," he said in a telephone interview. "And we think we can store hydrogen in a smaller area by using the hydride method. In this system, you store the hydrogen in powdered metals."

In the hydride, the hydrogen would be kept in a combination of powdered metals under pressure until needed. The hydrogen would then be extracted so it could fuel the car.

Van Vorst said much less space would be needed to carry a hydride tank.

He said that UCLA is using a 1972 American Motors Gremlin for its research work. "We use gaseous hydrogen to power the car," he said. "It's also possible now to use liquefied hydrogen. But then you have to keep it at 400 degrees below zero and that complicates the whole process."

The gas hydrogen tanks are stored where the car's rear seat would normally be.

Maximum range of the car without a refill is 60 miles.

"That's a limiting factor," he said. "But we are sure that using the hydride method would expand the range by a lot and make it comparable to the gasoline driven car."

The 150-horsepower engine in the test car is a normal internal combustion engine except for some minor modifications to suit the gaseous hydrogen.

It has operated on hydrogen for more than 1,000 miles.

Van Vorst said that within 10 years "we would be fueling a lot of our cars and trucks with hydrogen. It would take a commitment of money because you would have to have service stations available to pump hydrogen and a system to get it out of water."

The technique of getting hydrogen out of water by using electricity already is well known.

"Some slight engine modifications would be needed for cars," he said. "But that wouldn't be much. We could have buses running on hydrogen in 5 years and other vehicles in 10 years."

There's been concern over the volatility of hydrogen. Some people feel that it could ignite too easily.

"That not true," Van Vorst said. "Our research shows that it isn't any more likely to go up than gasoline."

Cost of the hydrogen also has been held up as a problem. But Van Vorst said that with mass production the cost would be cut to low levels.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S SPECIAL MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS PROPOSING A NATIONWIDE WAR ON THE SOURCES OF POVERTY, MARCH 16, 1964

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, on March 16, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson declared war on poverty. In proposing the establishment of a Federal poverty program, President Johnson defined the war on poverty as not simply a struggle to support people, but a struggle to give people a chance.

In the 10 years since this declaration of war, millions of Americans have been given a chance; millions have been lifted out of poverty; millions have had a voice in the decisions which affected their lives, and millions have risen from a sense of helplessness and despair to positions of leadership in their communities and in the Nation. These millions are a living testament to the rightness of the objectives President Johnson set forth in March 1964, and a testament to the crucial need for these efforts to continue.

On the 10th anniversary of this declaration we should be strengthening the Federal poverty program; instead, we are in another war, a fight for survival. On June 30 of this year, the funding authority for the Economic Opportunity Act will expire. The administration has proposed that the Office of Economic Opportunity be dismantled and that Federal funding for poverty programs, most

March 26, 1974

notably the community action program, be discontinued. I have introduced legislation, along with Congressmen CARL PERKINS and ALPHONZO BELL (H.R. 12464) which would extend the Economic Opportunity Act which established the Office of Economic Opportunity for 3 additional years. My Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities has conducted hearings around the country and in Washington on the future of the OEO programs, and I anticipate that the subcommittee will act within the next few weeks to report an extension of the Economic Opportunity Act.

I think it is appropriate to take another look at the initial declaration of the war on poverty. It is important to note that it did not seek, nor has it achieved, miracles. In President Johnson's words:

We are fully aware that this program will not eliminate all the poverty in America in a few months or a few years . . . But this program will show the way to new opportunities for millions of our fellow citizens . . . This program is much more than a beginning. Rather it is a commitment. It is a total commitment by this President, and this Congress, and this nation, to pursue victory over the most ancient of mankind's enemies.

In referring this historic declaration to the attention of my colleagues, I would like to express my own deep sense of concern that it is the very commitment which President Johnson articulated which is in the gravest danger of extinction:

LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S SPECIAL MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS PROPOSING A NATIONWIDE WAR ON THE SOURCES OF POVERTY, MARCH 16, 1964

To the Congress of the United States:

We are citizens of the richest and most fortunate nation in the history of the world. One hundred and eighty years ago we were a small country struggling for survival on the margin of a hostile land.

Today we have established a civilization of free men which spans an entire continent.

With the growth of our country has come opportunity for our people—opportunity to educate our children, to use our energies in productive work, to increase our leisure—opportunity for almost every American to hope that through work and talent he could create a better life for himself and his family.

The path forward has not been an easy one. But we have never lost sight of our goal: an America in which every citizen shares all the opportunities of his society, in which every man has a chance to advance his welfare to the limit of his capacities.

We have come a long way toward this goal.

We still have a long way to go.

The distance which remains is the measure of the great unfinished work of our society.

To finish that work I have called for a national war on poverty. Our objective: total victory.

There are millions of Americans—one fifth of our people—who have not shared in the abundance which has been granted to most of us, and on whom the gates of opportunity have been closed.

What does this poverty mean to those who endure it?

It means a daily struggle to secure the necessities for even a meager existence. It means that the abundance, the comforts, the opportunities they see all around them are beyond their grasp.

Worst of all, it means hopelessness for the young.

The young man or woman who grows up without a decent education, in a broken home, in a hostile and squalid environment, in ill health or in the face of racial injustice—that young man or woman is often trapped in a life of poverty.

He does not have the skills demanded by a complex society. He does not know how to acquire those skills. He faces a mounting sense of despair which drains initiative and ambition and energy.

Our tax cut will create millions of new jobs—new exits from poverty.

But we must also strike down all the barriers which keep many from using those exits.

The war on poverty is not a struggle simply to support people, to make them dependent on the generosity of others.

It is a struggle to give people a chance.

It is an effort to allow them to develop and use their capacities, as we have been allowed to develop and use ours, so that they can share, as others share, in the promise of this nation.

We do this, first of all, because it is right that we should.

From the establishment of public education and land grant colleges through agricultural extension and encouragement to industry, we have pursued the goal of a nation with full and increasing opportunities for all its citizens.

The war on poverty is a further step in that pursuit.

We do it also because helping some will increase the prosperity of all.

Our fight against poverty will be an investment in the most valuable of our resources—the skills and strength of our people.

And in the future, as in the past, this investment will return its cost many fold to our entire economy.

If we can raise the annual earnings of 10 million among the poor by only \$1,000 we will have added 14 billion dollars a year to our national output. In addition we can make important reductions in public assistance payments which now cost us 4 billion dollars a year, and in the large costs of fighting crime and delinquency, disease and hunger.

This is only part of the story.

Our history has proved that each time we broaden the base of abundance, giving more people the chance to produce and consume, we create new industry, higher production, increased earnings and better income for all.

Giving new opportunity to those who have little will enrich the lives of all the rest.

Because it is right, because it is wise, and because, for the first time in our history, it is possible to conquer poverty, I submit, for the consideration of the Congress and the country, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The Act does not merely expand old programs or improve what is already being done. It charts a new course.

It strikes at the causes, not just the consequences of poverty.

It can be a milestone in our one-hundred eighty year search for a better life for our people.

This Act provides five basic opportunities. It will give almost half a million underprivileged young Americans the opportunity to develop skills, continue education, and find useful work.

It will give every American community the opportunity to develop a comprehensive plan to fight its own poverty—and help them to carry out their plans.

It will give dedicated Americans the opportunity to enlist as volunteers in the war against poverty.

It will give many workers and farmers the opportunity to break through particular barriers which bar their escape from poverty.

It will give the entire nation the opportunity for a concerted attack on poverty

through the establishment, under my direction, of the Office of Economic Opportunity, a national headquarters for the war against poverty.

This is how we propose to create these opportunities.

First we will give high priority to helping young Americans who lack skills, who have not completed their education or who cannot complete it because they are too poor.

The years of high school and college age are the most critical stage of a young person's life. If they are not helped then, many will be condemned to a life of poverty which they, in turn, will pass on to their children.

I therefore recommend the creation of a Job Corps, a Work-Training Program, and a Work Study Program.

A new national Job Corps will build toward an enlistment of 100,000 young men. They will be drawn from those whose background, health and education make them least fit for useful work.

Those who volunteer will enter more than 10 Camps and Centers around the country.

Half of these young men will work, in the first year, on special conservation projects to give them education, useful work experience and to enrich the natural resources of the country.

Half of these young men will receive, in the first year, a blend of training, basic education and work experience in Job Training Centers.

These are not simply camps for the underprivileged. They are new educational institutions, comparable in innovation to the land grant colleges. Those who enter them will emerge better qualified to play a productive role in American society.

A new national Work-Training Program operated by the Department of Labor will provide work and training for 200,000 American men and women between the ages of 16 and 21. This will be developed through state and local governments and non-profit agencies.

Hundreds of thousands of young Americans badly need the experience, the income, and the sense of purpose which useful full or part-time work can bring. For them such work may mean the difference between finishing school or dropping out. Vital community activities from hospitals and playgrounds to libraries and settlement houses are suffering because there are not enough people to staff them.

We are simply bringing these needs together.

A new national Work-Study Program operated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will provide federal funds for part-time jobs for 140,000 young Americans who do not go to college because they cannot afford it.

There is no more senseless waste than the waste of the brainpower and skill of those who are kept from college by economic circumstance. Under this program, they will, in a great American tradition, be able to work their way through school.

They and the country will be richer for it.

Second, through a new Community Action program we intend to strike at poverty at its source—in the streets of our cities and on the farms of our countryside among the very young and the impoverished old.

This program asks men and women throughout the country to prepare long-range plans for the attack on poverty in their own local communities.

These are not plans prepared in Washington and imposed upon hundreds of different situations.

They are based on the fact that local citizens best understand their own problems, and know best how to deal with those problems.

These plans will be local plans striking at the many unfilled needs which underlie poverty in each community, not just one or

two. Their components and emphasis will differ as needs differ.

These plans will be local plans calling upon all the resources available to the community—federal and state, local and private, human and material.

And when these plans are approved by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the federal government will finance up to 90% of the additional cost for the first two years.

The most enduring strength of our nation is the huge reservoir of talent, initiative and leadership which exists at every level of our society.

Through the Community Action Program we call upon this, our greatest strength, to overcome our greatest weakness.

Third, I ask for the authority to recruit and train skilled volunteers for the war against poverty.

Thousands of Americans have volunteered to serve the needs of other lands.

Thousands more want the chance to serve the needs of their own land.

They should have that chance.

Among older people who have retired, as well as among the young, among women as well as men, there are many Americans who are ready to enlist in our war against poverty.

They have skills and dedication. They are badly needed.

If the State requests them, if the community needs and will use them, we will recruit and train them and give them the chance to serve.

Fourth, we intend to create new opportunities for certain hard-hit groups to break out of the pattern of poverty.

Through a new program of loans and guarantees we can provide incentives to those who will employ the unemployed.

Through programs of work and retraining for unemployed fathers and mothers we can help them support their families in dignity while preparing themselves for new work.

Through funds to purchase needed land, organize cooperatives, and create new and adequate family farms we can help those whose life on the land has been a struggle without hope.

Fifth, I do not intend that the war against poverty become a series of uncoordinated and unrelated efforts—that it perish for lack of leadership and direction.

Therefore this bill creates, in the Executive Office of the President, a new Office of Economic Opportunity. Its Director will be my personal Chief of Staff for the War against poverty. I intend to appoint Sargent Shriver to this post.

He will be directly responsible for these new programs. He will work with and through existing agencies of the government.

This program—the Economic Opportunity Act—is the foundation of our war against poverty. But it does not stand alone.

For the past three years this government has advanced a number of new proposals which strike at important areas of need and distress.

I ask the Congress to extend those which are already in action, and to establish those which have already been proposed.

There are programs to help badly distressed areas such as the Area Redevelopment Act, and the legislation now being prepared to help Appalachia.

There are programs to help those without training find a place in today's complex society—such as the Manpower Development Training Act and the Vocational Education Act for youth.

There are programs to protect those who are specially vulnerable to the ravages of poverty—hospital insurance for the elderly, protection for migrant farm workers, a food stamp program for the needy, coverage for millions not now protected by a minimum wage, new and expanded unemployment benefits for men out of work, a Housing and

Community Development bill for those seeking decent homes.

Finally there are programs which help the entire country, such as aid to education which, by raising the quality of schooling available to every American child, will give a new chance for knowledge to the children of the poor.

I ask immediate action on all these programs.

What you are being asked to consider is not a simple or an easy program. But poverty is not a simple or an easy enemy.

It cannot be driven from the land by a single attack on a single front. Were this so we would have conquered poverty long ago.

Nor can it be conquered by government alone.

For decades American labor and American business, private institutions and private individuals have been engaged in strengthening our economy and offering new opportunity to those in need.

We need their help, their support, and their full participation.

Through this program we offer new incentives and new opportunities for cooperation, so that all the energy of our nation, not merely the efforts of government, can be brought to bear on our common enemy.

Today, for the first time in our history, we have the power to strike away the barriers to full participation in our society. Having the power, we have the duty.

The Congress is charged by the Constitution to "provide . . . for the general welfare of the United States." Our present abundance is a measure of its success in fulfilling that duty. Now Congress is being asked to extend that welfare to all our people.

The President of the United States is President of all the people in every section of the country. But this office also holds a special responsibility to the distressed and disinherited, the hungry and the hopeless of this abundant nation.

It is in pursuit of that special responsibility that I submit this Message to you today.

The new program I propose is within our means. Its cost of 970 million dollars is 1 percent of our national budget—and every dollar I am requesting for this program is already included in the budget I sent to Congress in January.

But we cannot measure its importance by its cost.

For it charts an entirely new course of hope for our people.

We are fully aware that this program will not eliminate all the poverty in America in a few months or a few years. Poverty is deeply rooted and its causes are many.

But this program will show the way to new opportunities for millions of our fellow citizens.

It will provide a lever with which we can begin to open the door to our prosperity for those who have been kept outside.

It will also give us the chance to test our weapons, to try our energy and ideas and imagination for the many battles yet to come. As conditions change, and as experience illuminates our difficulties, we will be prepared to modify our strategy.

And this program is much more than a beginning.

Rather it is a commitment. It is a total commitment by this President, and this Congress, and this nation, to pursue victory over the most ancient of mankind's enemies.

On many historic occasions the President has requested from Congress the authority to move against forces which were endangering the well-being of our country.

This is such an occasion.

On similar occasions in the past we have often been called upon to wage war against foreign enemies which threatened our freedom. Today we are asked to declare war

on a domestic enemy which threatens the strength of our nation and the welfare of our people.

If we now move forward against this enemy—if we can bring to the challenges of peace the same determination and strength which has brought us victory in war—then this day and this Congress will have won a secure and honorable place in the history of the nation, and the enduring gratitude of generations of Americans yet to come.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

(NOTE.—The draft bill and a section by section analysis were released with the President's message. They are printed in House Document 243 (88th Cong., 2d sess.).

(For the President's remarks upon signing the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, see Item 528.)

EULOGY OF HON. HAROLD DUNBAR COOLEY

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year it was my sad duty to announce the passing of one of the 20th century leaders of this House—the Honorable Harold Dunbar Cooley of Nashville, N.C.

Harold Cooley, who served with great distinction as a Representative in the Congress of the United States of America for more than 32 years, occupied a post of vast importance—the chairmanship of the House Agriculture Committee—for many years and provided vital leadership in the formulation of national agricultural policy during a crucial period in American history.

The eulogy at the funeral, which was conducted on January 17, 1974, at the Nashville United Methodist Church in Nashville, N.C., was delivered by the Reverend Dr. Samuel Tilden Habel, who is now professor of sociology at Marshall University, Huntington, W. Va.

Dr. Habel, who received his B.A. from the University of Richmond in 1927, his Th. M. from Southern Seminary in 1930, his Ph. D. from the University of Edinburgh in 1945, and who also studied at the University of Paris and the University of North Carolina, served as Pastor of the Nashville Baptist Church from 1930-34.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the warm words of Dr. Habel's eulogy:

A EULOGY OF HON. HAROLD DUNBAR COOLEY
U.S. Congressman from North Carolina for many years. A devoted public servant. An international statesman. (Delivered at his funeral at Nashville, North Carolina, January 17, 1974, by Dr. Samuel Tilden Habel.)

I have come this afternoon not to bury Harold Cooley but to praise him. There is an old Latin saying which is appropriate. "Let nothing but good be said about the dead." I wish to speak of the good which was in this man.

Time has cut him down but he will grow again, tall and straight as a giant Redwood tree. He will flourish again as the Biblical green bay tree; and his branches will run over the wall. The vital spark which now seems quenched will elsewhere burst into flame once more. His voice which now is stilled will speak again in a resonant tone,

strong and clear. Age caught up with him only for a time. He will run again as a strong young man runs a race. His heart which rests for a moment will beat again, for hearts of love are never stopped for long. *This I believe.*

One of our American writers once said, "I can never be resigned to the shutting away of loving hearts in the cold, ground." Neither can I. Men assure us of the conservation of matter, but I am assured of the conservation of mind and spirit. Nothing in all of God's great universe is lost or destroyed; it only changes its form and appears again. *This I believe.*

On the *Via Dolorosa*, the road to his own death, Jesus said to the weeping people who lined the way, "Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves." Harold Cooley now says that to all of us here this afternoon. The dead do not need tears. It is the living who need tears; the dead need naught but inspiring remembrances.

Harold Cooley epitomized in his life the best of the old American tradition. As a boy he was a bright lad who by his pluck and industry emerged from the crowds; forged to the front and attained at last the pinnacle of achievement and fame. Compared to the great urban areas of the world Nashville is a very small place. As was once asked of Nazareth so some have asked of Nashville, "Can any good thing come out of it?" This man's life is the answer. A young boy orphaned at an early age and left to fend for himself, save for the help of sisters and brothers, lifts himself by his own bootstraps, secures an education and becomes a lawyer. As a young lawyer his fame reaches beyond Nash County; into neighboring counties; then across the nation and eventually across the oceans.

Harold Cooley stirred up the gift of God within him. This young lad from a small North Carolina town would grow into an able man who would sit in the Halls of Congress and in the Councils of the nations. He would visit with the leaders of foreign lands. He would have as personal friends the heads of state around the world and they would cherish and honor him with innumerable decorations. But with it all no insufferable conceit would mark this man. "He walked with kings but kept the common touch." The folks back home would always know him simply as "Harold."

Harold Cooley epitomized friendship. Anyone who ever needed help knew they had a friend in this man. He was a friend to all—the foe, the friendless. Much of his energy and time and life went into good works. Nameless and numberless are the hundreds of people whose personal problems he wrestled with as with his own. "If everyone for whom he had done a loving service were to bring a blossom to his grave he would sleep tonight beneath a wilderness of flowers." You could count on this man to give his life. "Greater love hath no man than this; that a man lay down his life for his friends." This loving father, husband, friend died when the shadows of evening were slowly falling toward the west but the glow of a useful energetic life still lingers in the sky and men facing the dark know that the streak of brightness in the heavens signifies the coming of a new tomorrow.

Harold Cooley epitomized religion. Not the religion of a crystallized institution but the religion of the spirit. At its heart religion is unselfishness. All the great religions of the world have been dedicated to producing unselfish men and women. Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, and Christianity urge men to be unselfish. "Treat every man you meet," said Confucius "as if he were an honored guest in your own home". "Love thy neighbor as thyself," said the Torah. "Do unto others as you would that they should do to you," said Christ. Recently I put together a definition of religion. To me

religion consists of those processes, procedures and techniques which enable men individually and collectively to reduce their egocentricity to a bearable degree. Harold Cooley was unselfish through and through.

I remember a bitter cold night in Nashville many years ago. The temperature had fallen far below the normal mark for this area of the world. Two young people living in the parsonage, just beginning their lives together, with very little of the world's goods to call their own, were shivering in their beds in a chilled house. About two o'clock in the morning there was a knock on the parsonage door and when it was opened there stood Harold Cooley with an armful of wool blankets. He had been worried about the couple in the parsonage and had left his warm home and made his journey in the night that they, too, might be warm. I testify for countless others that this was an unselfish man.

To those who may not have known Harold Cooley I would say to you, "Do not think that he was perfect." There is only one who is perfect; that is God. Harold Cooley had his faults as all of us have our faults. But one recalls an unhappy person surrounded by accusers who were hurling vile epithets, when Jesus turned on them and said, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone." And then the Master stooped and wrote with his finger in the sand. When he looked up all the accusers were gone, "for all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God."

I would remind you that "Divine justice weighs the sins of the warm-hearted and the cold-blooded in different scales." This man was a warm human being who loved his fellow human beings.

It is always sad to perform the last rites for the dead. But there is a thought that heartens us: The good in a man never dies. Shakespeare had one of his characters say, "The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones." I do not believe this. I believe no stroke for good is ever lost; that every stroke for good tells on ages; tells for God. "Out of sight sinks the stone in the deep sea of time, but the circles sweep on and on and on."

I would speak now a word of comfort to his loved ones whom he leaves behind. To his faithful, devoted, loyal wife who stood by him through all the years, I say, Be beautiful and strong and brave as you have always been. To his loving daughter and son, and to their families, I say, Cherish the memory of your distinguished father and honor him by the quality of your own lives. To his devoted sisters, and to their families, I say, Take comfort in the knowledge that the one you loved gave a good account of himself and made a creative contribution to mankind. And, to all the others present here, I say, in the words of Paul, "Thank God and take courage", and I would add, Carry on! "I said to the man who stood at the gate of the New Year, 'Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown.' He said to me, 'Go out into the darkness and place your hand in the hand of God. That is better than a light and safer than a known way'."

Harold left a request that two poems be read at his funeral. One was his father's favorite poem by James Whitcomb Riley; the other was one written by Harold's own mother and is entitled "Be Content." I shall read the first one now and the other at the graveside.

KISSING THE ROD

O heart of mine, we shouldn't worry so!
What we've missed of calm we couldn't have,
you know!
What we've met of stormy pain,
And of sorrow's driving rain,
We can better meet again, if it blow!
We have erred in that dark hour we have
known,
When our tears fell with the shower all
alone!—

Were not shine and shower blent
As the gracious Master meant?—
Let us temper our content with His own.
For, we know, not every morrow can be sad;
So, forgetting all the sorrow we have had,
Let us fold away our fears,
And put by our foolish tears,
And through all the coming years just be
glad.

This is no moment or time for unbelief.
It is the hour for faith. The world of science
is a closed, narrow and limited world. We
are just now beginning to learn that man's
hope lies in his faith in that larger universe:
the universe of the Spirit—the universe of
God.

"Yet in the maddening maze of things
And tossed by storm and flood,
To one fixed trust my spirit clings,
I know that God is good.
I know not where the islands lift
Their fronded palms in air,
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond His love and care".

Addendum: This poem by Harold's mother
was read at his grave.

BE CONTENT

(By Hattie Davis Cooley)

If we always had the sunshine,
And we never had the rain,
If life held naught but pleasure
And we never knew a pain;
If our hearts were always happy,
Ever joyous, ever bright,
If we always had the daytime,
And we never had the night,
Why our eyes would soon get weary
And our limbs would tired grow
And the sunshine look as dreary
As the winter frost, and snow.
Why, it is the brightest sunlight,
That the deepest shadows cast,
And the greatest of all trials,
Are as trifles when they're past;
It is pain that makes us helpless,
Makes us turn to God above,
'Tis not joy but grief and anguish
Binds our hearts in perfect love.
Let us then always remember
That the storms of life are few;
That the loveliest, sweetest flowers,
Are the flowers wet with dew.

LANDMARK COURT DECISION EXCORIATES POLICE FOR DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICE IN PROSECUTION CASES

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1974, Judge David L. Norman, an eminent jurist of the District of Columbia Superior Court, issued an opinion which in crystal-clear language excoriates the blatantly discriminatory practice of the District of Columbia Police in arresting and charging only women, but not men, in prostitution cases, even though the statute (22 D.C. Code 2701) which prohibits solicitation for purposes of prostitution applies to "any person."

Judge Norman pointed out that the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department arrested 550 women, but no men, under this provision in 1973, and that in each case "the complaining witness—that is, the person allegedly solicited—was a male police officer put on

the street" specifically "to make themselves available to be approached and 'solicited' by females."

Judge Norman said:

This case represents a classic case of our historic double standard under which one set of standards is applied to females and another set of standards to males. Under police policy, what warrants criminal prosecution for a female does not warrant criminal prosecution for a male. The Constitution does not condone this result.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Norman is a highly respected and able jurist who formerly served as an Assistant Attorney General in the Justice Department, after extensive experience as an attorney in its Civil Rights Division. His opinion should help to stem the sex-discriminatory application of prostitution laws in the District of Columbia. The arguments and precedents assembled in his opinion will also be of considerable interest to Members of Congress and others who desire to end the widely prevalent sex-biased administration of criminal laws in many other cities and towns. Therefore, I insert the full text of Judge Norman's opinion at this point in the RECORD:

[Superior Court of the District of Columbia, Criminal Division]

OPINION AND ORDER

United States of America v. Arminta C. Wilson, Criminal No. 69760-73.

United States of America v. Regina A. Wiley, Criminal No. 74784-73.

The question in these cases, on motions to dismiss, is whether the policy and practice of the Metropolitan Police Department in the enforcement of § 22-2701 of the D.C. Code unconstitutionally discriminates against females. After hearing the evidence, this Court holds that it does. Therefore these cases are dismissed with prejudice.

Defendants Arminta C. Wilson and Regina A. Wiley were charged with violating § 22-2701 of the District of Columbia Code in cases 69760-73 and 74784-73, respectively. These cases have been consolidated solely for purposes of these motions.

Title 22 of the District of Columbia Code, § 2701 provides in pertinent part:

"It shall not be lawful for any person to invite, entice, persuade, or to address for the purpose of inviting, enticing, or persuading, any person or persons 16 years of age or over in the District of Columbia, for the purpose of prostitution. . . ."

Criminal penalties are provided for violations of this statute. The defendants in these cases are charged by information with violating that portion of the statute quoted above.¹

The government concedes that this statute on its face is sexually neutral, and that the term "any person" applies equally to males and females. Thus, the government concedes that from the plain meaning of the words of this statute the statute would be violated if (1) a female approached a male and invited him to engage in a specific sexual act at a specific price; or (2) a male approached a female and invited her to perform a specific sexual act at a specific price. The Court is persuaded that a sexually neutral interpretation of this statute is the only appropriate and constitutional interpretation.²

¹ The same statute makes unlawful solicitation for "lewd and immoral purposes." However, that portion of the statute—which is applied only to solicitation for sodomy—is not involved in this case.

² This interpretation has also been followed by Judge Halleck of this Court in *United States v. Moses, et al.*, 41 U.S.L.W., 2298 (Nov. 3, 1972), appeal docketed, No. 7042 D.C.C.A., Jan. 8, 1973.

The evidence adduced at the hearing demonstrates beyond any doubt that the quoted portion of § 22-2701 is enforced exclusively against females. Lt. Charles D. Hersey, who is in charge of that branch of the Metropolitan Police Department which enforces this statute, testified as to the procedure followed in the enforcement of this statute. Male undercover police agents, in street clothes and unmarked automobiles, are assigned to certain areas of the city to make themselves available to be approached and "solicited" by females. If the female invites the male undercover agent to engage in a specific sex act for a specific price, the female is arrested and charged with a violation of § 22-2701.

Lt. Hersey testified unequivocally that it is neither the policy nor the practice of his agency to make any effort to arrest male persons who are on the streets looking for females with whom they can engage in sexual acts at a price. Although his office does presently employ two female undercover officers, they are used exclusively either as back-up officers³ or in connection with the enforcement of the so-called "pimp" statute.⁴ Female undercover agents are not used for the purpose of ferreting out those males who are on the streets seeking to engage in sex with females for a price. No female non-police officers informants are used for such purposes. When police officers are investigating suspected bawdy houses, and they observe males and females together going in and coming out of such houses, the police officers identify and interview the females but do not seek to identify or interview the males. In searches of the houses or apartments of so-called "call girls," or of suspected bawdy houses, the police have seized lists of male customers; yet they have made no effort to pursue those leads to determine whether any or all of these male customers may have violated § 22-2701.

Lt. Hersey also testified that in calendar year 1973, the Metropolitan Police Department made 550 arrests under the provision of § 22-2701 now before the Court. He testified that all 550 persons arrested were females; none were males. He testified further that in each of these 550 instances the complaining witness—that is, the person who was allegedly solicited—was a male police officer who was put on the street for that purpose.

The proof could not be clearer that it is the explicit policy and practice of the Metropolitan Police Department not to enforce the statute against males who would invite females to engage in sex for a price. Moreover, Lt. Hersey testified that the police department has no present plans for changing its enforcement policy.

I

This case represents a classic example of our historic double standard under which one set of standards is applied to females and another set of standards to males. Under police policy, what warrants criminal prosecution for a female does not warrant criminal prosecution for a male. The Constitution does not condone this result.

If this were a racial case where the evidence proved that it was the explicit policy of the police department to enforce a criminal statute exclusively against blacks and not against whites, not a court in the country would deny these motions to dismiss. Where governmentally-sanctioned discrimination on the basis of sex is involved, the discriminator's activity cannot pass constitutional muster unless, at the very least, a rational basis for distinction is demonstrated. See *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U.S.

³ Back-up officers are used to corroborate that they saw a conversation take place between the male undercover police agent and the female defendant.

⁴ See 22 D.C. Code §§ 2704-2707.

677 (1973) and *Reed v. Reed*, 404 U.S. 71 (1971).⁵

The government in this case has fallen far short of providing a reasonable justification for the discrimination. Its primary contention is that if female undercover agents were to be used in enforcing the statute against male offenders, there would be a danger of entrapment. This contention borders on the absurd. If the police department has trained male undercover agents in the art of capturing female offenders without entrapping them, no reason has been advanced nor does any come to mind why the same art cannot be taught to females. The suggestion that the mere placing of an attractive female on the street constitutes an entrapment of males must be rejected.

It is argued, however, that in the nature of things it is the female who must describe the sex act to be performed and the price to be charged. This argument presupposes, without any proof, that males never describe to females what sex they would like to engage in or what price they would be willing to pay. Common experience is to the contrary—"Courts need not be blind to what all others know."⁶

A further argument tendered by the government in an effort to justify its discrimination is that the employment and use of female undercover agents in a sexually non-discriminatory enforcement program would involve a financial burden too heavy for the police department to bear. Aside from the fact that this is a mere assertion unsupported by facts, financial and administrative difficulties—however real they may be—have never provided a justification for unconstitutional discrimination. See, e.g., *Cleveland Board of Education v. LaFleur*, 414 U.S. — (1974); *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U.S. 677 (1973); *Stanley v. Illinois*, 405 U.S. 645 (1972); *Reed v. Reed*, 404 U.S. 71 (1971); *Shapiro v. Thompson*, 394 U.S. 618 (1969); *Carrington v. Rash*, 380 U.S. 89 (1965). In *LaFleur*, *supra*, the Supreme Court stated:

"While it might be easier for the school boards to conclusively presume that all pregnant women are unfit to teach past the fourth or fifth month, or even the first month, of pregnancy, administrative convenience alone is insufficient to make valid what otherwise is a violation of due process of law. The Fourteenth Amendment requires the school boards to employ alternative administrative means, which do not so broadly infringe upon basic constitutional liberty, in support of their legitimate goals." (emphasis added). 414 U.S. at — (slip op. at 14).⁷

Beyond the question of the employment and use of female undercover agents, the government offers no excuse for its failure to make use of other available resources for the investigation and apprehension of male violators. The police department does not use non-police female informants on the alleged ground that it would be too expensive. And, although the police department has in its possession lists of male customers of so-called call girls and prostitutes, it does not investigate those leads to determine whether any of those male customers violate the statute. When faced with these facts, the government's only contention was that the police can only "make a case" under the statute when the police themselves participate in the criminal conversation, that is, the solicitation. This is an inexplicable construction of the statute, and leads to the bizarre result

⁵ Because of the conclusions which follow, it is unnecessary here, as in *Frontiero, supra*, to reach the question whether a "compelling state interest" has been shown in support of the discrimination.

⁶ *Burr v. N.L.R.B.*, 321 F. 2d 612, 624 (5th Cir. 1963).

⁷ See also *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Ed.*, 402 U.S. 1, 28 (1971); *United States v. Texas Education Authority*, 467 F. 2d 848, 875 (5th Cir. 1972).

that an act is not a crime unless it is participated in by the police. Furthermore, it shrinks the statute to reading: "It shall not be lawful for any female person to invite . . . or to address for the purpose of inviting . . . any male police officer in the District of Columbia for the purpose of prostitution. . . ." The power to define criminal conduct is a legislative power, not an administrative one. *United States v. George*, 228 U.S. 14, 22 (1913).²

Having found as we must that the policy and practice of the Metropolitan Police Department in the enforcement of § 22-2701 denies to females the equal protection of the laws,³ dismissal of these cases is the only appropriate recourse available to the Court.

The proposition that discriminatory enforcement of a criminal statute bars prosecutions under it is not new. That result was reached by the Supreme Court as early as 1886 in *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, where the Court said:

"Though the law itself be fair on its face and impartial in appearance, yet, if it is applied and administered by public authority with an evil eye and an unequal hand, so as practically to make unjust and illegal discriminations between persons in similar circumstances, material to their rights, the denial of equal justice is still within the prohibition of the Constitution." 118 U.S. at 373-74.

The proposition was powerfully expressed in 1949 by Mr. Justice Jackson in his concurring opinion in *Railway Express Agency v. New York*, 336 U.S. 106 (1949):

"[N]othing opens the door to arbitrary action so effectively as to allow those officials to pick and choose only a few to whom they will apply legislation and thus to escape the political retribution that might be visited upon them if larger numbers were affected. Courts can take no better measure to assure that laws will be just than to require that the laws be equal in operation." 336 U.S. at 112-113.

See also *Oyler v. Boles*, 368 U.S. 448 (1962); *Two Guys from Harrison-Allentown, Inc. v. McGinley*, 366 U.S. 582 (1961); *United States v. Steele*, 461 F. 2d 1148 (9th Cir. 1972); *Washington v. United States*, 401 F. 2d 915 (D.C. Cir. 1968); *State v. Fields*, 3d Judicial District of Alaska, June 27, 1973; *Village of Fairbairn v. Fuller*, 8 Ohio Misc. 266, 221 N.E. 851 (1966).

This Court itself, being an organ of the government and being subject to the prohibi-

² The government also makes the suggestion that the statute might be enforced only against sellers of sex and not buyers of sex. Aside from the assumption, probably erroneous, that females are always the sellers and males are always the buyers, if Congress had intended to distinguish between sellers and buyers it would have done so. That legislative option is not open to the police department or to the prosecutor, particularly where the consequence is to single out only females for criminal sanctions. If Congress had been concerned solely with the selling of sex, it would have made prostitution illegal in the District of Columbia, which it has not done. The statute before the Court is applicable to "any person," not merely "women," not merely "sellers." It seems evident that behind this transparent argument looms large the invidious double standard based on sex.

³ It is settled that the guarantee of the equal protection of the laws is embodied in the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment, and is therefore applicable to governmental agencies and officers in the District of Columbia. *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497, 499 (1954); *Schneider v. Rusk*, 377 U.S. 163 (1964); *Hobson v. Hansen*, 269 F. Supp. 401, 492-3 (D.C. 1967) *aff'd sub nom Smuck v. Hobson*, 408 F. 2d 175 (D.C. Cir. 1969); *Washington v. United States*, 401 F. 2d 915 (D.C. Cir. 1968).

tions of the Fifth Amendment, is constitutionally barred from exercising its judicial power in the service of a discriminatory enforcement policy. *Shelley v. Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948); *Barrows v. Jackson*, 348 U.S. 249 (1953). So long as the Metropolitan Police Department persists in its policy of enforcing § 22-2701 solely against females, this Court must dismiss the prosecutions resulting.

Accordingly, the motions to dismiss are granted.

D. L. NORMAN,
Judge.

EULOGY FOR MRS. MARGARET DOLAN

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the health field, the nursing community, and the country have suffered a great loss in the death on February 27 of Margaret B. Dolan. Throughout her adult life, Mrs. Dolan was active in health affairs of the State, National, and international levels. She had served at various times as president of three large national health organizations: the American Public Health Association, the American Nurses' Association, and the National Health Council.

A native of the State of North Carolina, where her father was once a State senator, Mrs. Dolan was a professor and head of the Department of Public Health Nursing in the School of Public Health at the University of North Carolina. She was a graduate of the Georgetown University School of Nursing and she held degrees from the University of North Carolina and Columbia University.

Mrs. Dolan served on many government advisory groups including the Advisory Committee for the Nurse Training Act of 1964 and the President's Advisory Committee on Health Resources. She was a member of the Department of Defense Nursing Advisory Committee and a nursing consultant to the Surgeon General, Department of the Army. She was a nursing consultant for the tuberculosis program of the Public Health Service and a member of the Health Insurance Benefits Advisory Council of the Social Security Administration.

Mrs. Dolan was an outstanding leader in the nursing profession, a worker for improvements in nursing and nursing education, and an advocate for reforms in health care and delivery.

In one of her last public speeches, an address to the Alaska State Medical Association, Mrs. Dolan called for a new health delivery system keyed to "truly preventive health services." It should be based on the idea, she said, that "health is a human right, not a privilege."

Mrs. Dolan's notable career brought her many honors. She received the Pearl McIver Public Health Nursing Award from the American Nurses' Association, was elected an honorary fellow of the Royal Society for the Promotion of Health, the society's first award to a member of the nursing profession. She

was given honorary degrees by Duke University and the University of Illinois.

In addition to her professional achievements and her great contribution to the cause of better health care, Mrs. Dolan was a woman of great personal warmth and charm. She enriched the lives of those who had the privilege of knowing her. She will be sorely missed. My wife, Becky, joins me in extending our sympathy to her husband, Charles.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1974

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join my colleagues in recognizing the Honorable William S. Mailliard for his contributions as a Member of this body from 1952 until his recent resignation to become the U.S. Representative to the Organization of American States.

So many tributes are filled with glowing words of praise, I hope I will be able to convey my sincerity as I speak of Bill's commendable qualities. Bill, possessing an old-school attitude, has never touted his accomplishments. I believe it is for this reason that some have said that he is a cautious legislator who believes in playing the traditional role of the House. I personally view what has been termed "cautiousness" in another manner. He moves with decisiveness and forethought, never rashly, exercising extraordinary judgment and wisdom. Because of his apparent intelligence and good judgment, he is a major source of influence among his colleagues. Only recently has the public become aware of his leadership in this body. Most of us here on the floor realize that when he speaks, we should listen attentively because he has something of importance to say.

Having been a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee since his arrival on Capitol Hill in 1953, Bill Mailliard is technically the most senior member of our committee. He, in fact, served as ranking minority member for 6 years before giving up the position in February 1971 to become the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

It is through the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that I first met Bill and to say that I have learned much from this man is an understatement. Based on my observations during committee meetings, I consider him to be our foremost authority on the laws and problems affecting maritime affairs. His knowledge and ability to express himself can only be defined as brilliant. Bill Mailliard began working at an early date for safety at sea and to improve the status of the U.S. Merchant Marine Fleet. His proposals for new safety regulations were finally signed into law during the 89th Congress, after the sinking of the foreign-flag cruise ship, *SS Yarmouth Castle*, in November of 1965, when public attention was focused

on the problem. Also through his efforts, the committee can point with pride to such major pieces of legislation as the Ports and Waterways Safety Act and the Bridge-to-Bridge Radiotelephone Act. The collision of two tankers under the Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco, which Bill represented, brought home to all of us the fact that the ecology of our coastline cannot tolerate such accidents. The collision under the Golden Gate gave great impetus to the enactment of both the Ports and Waterways Safety Act and the Bridge-to-Bridge Radiotelephone Act. It should also be noted that Bill anticipated such a disaster and had co-sponsored both bills before the collision.

One of the most significant pieces of legislation to his credit is the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, the first major legislation in this area since 1936. Needless to say, enactment of this legislation took considerable effort on the part of many people; however, I often wonder whether there would have been a Merchant Marine Act of 1970 without him. He was the one who led the bipartisan effort that brought about enactment.

Bill has also repeatedly demonstrated its knowledge and particular interest in the activities of the Subcommittee on Oceanography and the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment by promoting much legislation affecting conservation and the environment. The numerous bills included proposals for establishment of various wildlife refuges, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the establishment of the National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere, the Endangered and Threatened Species Act, and the "Ocean Dumping" legislation.

In addition to his leadership in the House in these matters, he has played an important role on the international level—Law of the Sea conferences and Safety at Sea meetings. Because of his interest in oceanography and conservation as well as the merchant marine, he was also appointed as a Congressional Advisor to the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of Nations Jurisdiction.

Although I am not as personally acquainted with his Foreign Affairs Committee activities, I know his reputation is an outstanding one. With his special expertise in Latin American affairs, the President could not have appointed a more capable person as the U.S. Representative to the OAS. My only regret is that he will no longer serve as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. He is a public servant who will not only be missed by his colleagues, but by the Nation.

JOSEPH McNAMARA, SPACE
PIONEER

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a moment to salute Joseph Mc-

Namara, one of the architects of our many space achievements. Mr. McNamara, will retire on April 1, was president of Rockwell International's Space Division. His contributions to aeronautical progress span more than 30 years.

For several years before his retirement, Mr. McNamara headed the organization that produced half of the hardware elements for our lunar-landing program. These included the Saturn S-II, second stage of the Saturn V launch vehicle; the Apollo command and service modules; and the launch escape system. The space division also built four Apollo spacecraft for the Skylab program and will modify the spacecraft and build the docking module for the Apollo-Soyuz test project. It is now developing the space shuttle orbiter, the reusable space transport scheduled to become operational in the 1980's.

Mr. McNamara's earlier work won him the highest honor that a nongovernment employee can receive: the Distinguished Public Service Medal. I believe it fitting that we take this opportunity to honor Joseph McNamara, both the man and the aerospace pioneer.

GENEVIEVE HALL HONORED

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, 19th century author-historian Henry Adams once noted that "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." This citation is no more true than in the case of Mrs. Genevieve Hall who is retiring after 28 years of service to children. Her exceptional qualities both as an educator and as an individual have been passed on to her students and so into the mainstream of our society today.

Born in Nebraska, Mrs. Hall completed high school in her native State. She attended California State University at Hayward and San Jose while receiving her B.E. degree and General Elementary Teaching Credential from the San Francisco State University campus. Her biography reflects further on her activism as demonstrated through her leadership in programs for more able youngsters, at both the elementary and district levels. She has also worked in the international sphere by organizing an exchange program with Uji Junior High, a sister school in Kyoto, Japan. She has been honored with numerous educational awards including the distinguished Honorary Service Award of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. Also, throughout her long teaching tenure, Mrs. Hall has consistently been awarded the highest competency rating. But paralleling those impressive scholastic and professional achievements has been her superior ability to relate to her students. It is from this special relationship that has stemmed the roots of new enlightenment. Her students are the best testimony to her capable guidance and counsel.

I am proud that Mrs. Hall is a constituent of mine and I am privileged to salute her before my colleagues today.

CAREY FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in accord with my own commitment to full financial disclosure for those who hold elective office, I am today submitting a full statement of my net worth, and a report of my tax returns for the last 6 years.

The 6-year period represents the highest period of my earnings as a taxpayer, since it embraces the last increases in congressional pay and covers the annual period immediately preceding such increases.

In no previous year did my earnings, including congressional salary, exceed the earliest and lowest year indicated.

I do this because I believe that the American people deserve to have financial information available concerning those to whom they entrust the powers of government. Because of the revelations of the last year of this administration, I feel those in public life must do everything in their power to restore confidence in public service and public servants. Full disclosure may help in this regard.

Today, I declared my candidacy for Governor of New York. It is consistent with my view of what is needed, in State as well as Federal offices, is full disclosure of financial information.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD, a letter from George Schiller & Co., CPA, a summary of income tax returns for the Federal Government, New York State, and New York City, plus a statement of assets and liabilities as of December 31, 1973.

The statement, as indicated, is true and accurate in all respects.

It may be observed from a careful reading of this statement that in constant dollars I owe more and own less than when I entered public life in 1961, and that I am forced to borrow to make ends meet and that I bear a high tax burden at three levels of government.

That, of course, is something I have in common with my fellow Americans. I am gratified however that when I leave Congress I can say that I did not come to Congress for monetary reward. I, therefore, have no regrets even concerning my outstanding debts.

The biggest debt I owe is one of gratitude that the people of my State gave me the opportunity to serve all Americans and others in the world who needed help.

No material gain could equal the satisfaction I take with me that at least in some part I was able to help through law the children, the handicapped, the families who needed work, the elderly, and have added somewhat to the preservation of the greatest country in the world.

I include the following:

GEORGE SCHILLER & Co.,
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS,
New York, N.Y., March 23, 1974.

HON. HUGH L. CAREY,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CAREY: We have prepared a summary of your federal income tax returns as filed for the calendar years 1968

through 1973 inclusive. This summary also incorporates the payments made for New York State and New York City taxes in addition to federal taxes.

Your income tax returns up to and including the calendar year 1970 have been examined by the Internal Revenue Service. Our

firm prepared the returns for the calendar years 1972 and 1973.

In our opinion the summary of income tax returns presents fairly the said taxes for the periods indicated.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE SCHILLER & Co.

CONGRESSMAN AND MRS. HUGH L. CAREY

SUMMARY OF INCOME TAX RETURNS FOR THE CALENDAR YEARS

	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1968
INCOME						
Congressional salary.....	\$42,500	\$42,500	\$42,500	\$42,500	\$39,375	\$30,000
Interest.....	973	65	59	31		
Consultation and legal fees ¹	15,500	6,453	9,810	9,810	9,810	9,810
Honorariums.....	3,450	3,650	200		850	
Newsletter ²	2,200					
Total.....	64,623	52,668	52,569	52,341	50,035	39,810
Adjustments to income ²	10,267	11,648	10,517	10,217	10,660	6,690
Adjusted gross income.....	54,356	41,020	42,052	42,124	39,375	33,120
DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS						
Contributions.....	2,197	3,556	2,132	2,249	1,858	2,132
Taxes (real estate, income etc.).....	6,515	6,228	6,032	5,189	4,044	5,011

	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1968
INCOME						
Interest.....	\$5,176	\$4,939	\$5,821	\$6,078	\$3,287	\$3,073
Miscellaneous deductions.....	17	17	17	503	830	1,559
Exemptions.....	8,250	8,250	7,425	7,500	9,000	9,000
Total.....	22,155	22,990	21,427	21,519	19,019	20,775
Federal taxable income.....	32,201	18,030	20,625	20,605	20,356	12,345
TAXES ON INCOME						
Federal.....	9,477	4,128	4,580	4,688	4,853	2,416
New York State.....	3,671	1,466	1,677	1,597	1,469	684
New York City.....	883	390	453	243	223	120
Total taxes on income.....	14,031	5,984	6,710	6,528	6,545	3,220
Income taxes as percentage of adjusted gross income.....	25	14	15	15	16	9

¹ The amount reported for 1973 includes \$2,500 prepaid for services to be rendered in 1974.
² Subscription fees received for the publication of a newsletter. Expenses against this income will be paid in 1974, and deducted in that year. (revised ruling 73-356, p. 5)

² The portion of expenses in connection with congressional duties which were not reimbursable.

CONGRESSMAN AND MRS. HUGH L. CAREY—STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES, DEC. 31, 1973

	Cost basis	Current market value
Assets:		
Cash in banks.....	\$10,025	\$10,025
Investment in commercial paper.....	10,000	10,163
Cash surrender value of life insurance.....	16,440	16,440
Residence and related real estate:		
McLean, Va.....	93,777	163,000
Shelter Island Heights, N.Y.....	37,000	50,000
Automobiles.....	4,000	3,000
Household furnishings.....	10,000	5,000
Vested interest in congressional retirement fund.....	32,085	32,085
Total assets.....	213,327	289,713
Liabilities:		
Loans payable:		
Mortgage loan on McLean, Va., residence.....	32,630	32,630
Mortgage loan on Shelter Island, N.Y., residence.....	19,920	19,920
Auto loan.....	1,933	1,933
Bank loans.....	28,800	28,800
Total loans payable.....	83,283	83,283
Federal, State, and city income taxes payable (since paid).....	11,868	11,868
Total liabilities.....	95,151	95,151
Excess of assets over liabilities.....	118,176	194,562

The above statement of assets and liabilities is complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

HUGH L. CAREY,
U.S. Representative, 15th District, New York.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH McNAMARA

HON. JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I am pleased to offer a tribute to a fine American whose contributions to the space program have helped to bring benefits to the entire country. He is Joseph

McNamara, president of Rockwell International's space division, who plans to retire on April 1.

During his more than 30 years in the aerospace industry at Rockwell International, Mr. McNamara contributed to almost every phase of the space program. As vice president of Rocketdyne's Liquid-Rocket Division, he directed development and production of the J-2 and F-1 engines, the Saturn V power plants that sent nine Apollo crews to the Moon. The Space Division, of which he became president in 1970, developed and built the Apollo command and service modules and the Saturn S-II, the second stage of the Saturn V launch vehicle. Work begun during Mr. McNamara's tenure as president also includes development of the space shuttle orbiter, the reusable space transport that will substantially reduce the cost of space operations.

Joe McNamara has contributed much to his country and I wish him a long and happy retirement.

JOSEPH McNAMARA

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, our space program will soon lose through retirement one of its greatest contributors. He is Joseph McNamara, former president of the Space Division, Rockwell International. I would like to make a few remarks of tribute about this gentle but productive man.

Mr. McNamara, who will retire on April 1, spent more than 30 years in the aerospace industry. Among other accomplishments, he directed the development and production of the J-2 and F-1 engines for the Saturn V launch vehicle, the Saturn S-II stage for the same ve-

hicle, the Apollo command and service modules for the lunar-landing program, and the Apollo spacecraft that ferried three crews to and from the Skylab workshop. He represents two generations of aeronautical machines: the airplane and the space vehicle. Each has changed the course of history and each has had a profound influence on our lives. Thus, whether we know him personally, Mr. McNamara and his work have touched your life and mine.

I am honored to have this opportunity to publicly recognize this aerospace leader. For the things he has helped America achieve, we are all in his debt.

NATIONAL SUMMER YOUTH SPORTS PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to grant a 5-year extension to the national summer youth sports program, an excellent program that is in danger of being abandoned at the end of this summer.

The NSYSP was established 5 years ago under the auspices of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the President's Council on Physical Fitness to achieve two primary objectives.

The first goal is to provide supervised sports instruction and competition combined with health and nutritional services to economically disadvantaged youngsters during the summer months. The second is to offer employment and on-the-job training in sports instruction and administration to students in these fields.

The program has been successful to say the least.

Each summer since 1969, more than 40,000 boys and girls have spent 6 weeks at universities near their communities receiving instruction in sports ranging from basketball and swimming to gymnastics, tennis and track. In addition, each enrollee was given a medical examination, daily meals, health education and counseling in study and career opportunities.

College and high school coaches supervise the activities with the assistance of outstanding athletes and physical education students working as staff members.

In my own State of Illinois, more than 2,000 children participate in the NSYSP activities offered by six colleges and universities in the State.

Overall, the program has created jobs for 13,555 professionals, students and supporting personnel and served more than 208,000 youngsters aged 10 to 18 from 71 cities in 36 States and the District of Columbia.

Despite this fine record, the NSYSP is in jeopardy because of the possible elimination of the Office of Economic Opportunity which funds the program.

The program is now operating under a \$3 million annual Federal grant matched by private funds. The Federal money is transferred from OEO to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which acts as the contracting agency with the NCAA. The per diem cost per enrollee is \$2.84.

My bill would raise the Federal appropriation to \$5 million in 1975 escalating to \$7 million in 1976 and then leveling off at \$10 million for the next 3 years.

So far, limited funding has forced the NSYSP to concentrate its operations in its prime target centers, the major metropolitan areas. As a result, children and schools in smaller communities have been excluded from participation.

My bill would help correct this imbalance by providing additional funds that would allow the NSYSP to expand its services to these equally needy, if smaller, areas.

In view of the NSYSP's record so far, I believe the money would be well spent.

By exposing disadvantaged children to a new environment and new ideas, the sports program has a tremendous impact on their attitudes and ambitions. I am convinced that this is one of the best ways to stimulate these children toward self-improvement and urge my colleagues to support this bill so this valuable program can be continued and expanded.

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. Bob Wilson) for taking this special order to honor our distinguished fellow Member William S. Mailliard.

CXX—525—Part 6

I join my colleagues in expressing mixed emotions on Bill's retirement. First, of course, is regret that this Chamber will be losing the expertise that he so generously gave for 21 years. Second, is encouragement for him in his new position as Ambassador to the Organization of American States.

Here in the Congress, Bill Mailliard was able to draw on his broad knowledge of naval affairs in his service as ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Likewise, I am confident his experience in this body, as ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will hold him in good stead in his new career.

My colleagues have already enumerated Bill Mailliard's achievements. I will only say they are considerable. To each of his assignments he has brought vigor and enthusiasm. I expect no less of him in his new position.

As my colleagues know, our relations with our Latin American neighbors are in a delicate stage. We could not ask for a finer man at the helm, as our spokesman in the OAS than our colleague Bill Mailliard. At this time, may I extend best wishes to Bill and his family as he assumes his new duties.

INFLATION: MANY CAUSES, SOME OF WHICH YOU MAY NOT HAVE NOTICED BEFORE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in a recent newsletter to his constituents, our distinguished colleague from Illinois (Mr. ERLÉNBERG) stressed a point that is acknowledged all too infrequently: Regulatory laws mean higher prices. He cites a broad array of recently passed legislation in the environmental, consumer protection and health and safety areas to underscore the old maxim that "there is no such thing as a free lunch" and to remind both the public and Members of Congress that in demanding such legislation, much of it highly necessary and worthwhile, we also give implicit assent to a sometimes significant levy on our paychecks.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full text of JOHN's newsletter at this point in the RECORD:

INFLATION: MANY CAUSES, SOME OF WHICH YOU MAY NOT HAVE NOTICED BEFORE

(By John N. Erlenborn)

A lot of 14th District people have complained to me about inflation, and this is one complaint I am glad to hear. I believe the unwarranted rise in prices is robbing everybody's pay check and is especially burdensome for those persons on fixed incomes, most notably, retired persons.

Many forces work together to produce inflation in the United States, and one of them is that the whole world is suffering from the same malady right now. We are contributing to that global ailment by our deficit spending. Our Federal government currently owes more than \$450 Billion, and every dollar of that debt has made a contribution to inflation.

I have been after Congress to get its appropriating job under control, and we are moving in that direction—slowly but not necessarily surely. During each year, there must be some time when the House and then the Senate must examine the whole budget, the proposed spending and the prospective revenues, and decide whether to raise taxes or cut spending. We can lessen inflationary pressure with balanced budgets.

People complain of high prices without ever considering that some of those prices are high because of laws passed by Congress.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act, for example, demands that business provide safe and healthful places to work. The cost of meeting those standards must be reflected in the price we must pay for goods and services. The Consumer Product Safety Act is a recent addition to the statute books. We hope to get safer products into consumers' hands, and the consumers already are paying for that safety. If these laws provide the safety we expect of them, they'll be worth the price.

My comments are not intended to criticize these laws, but to explain that some price rises are not caused by President Nixon or by big business or by union demands for more pay. Some are caused by laws.

Congress passed the Airport and Airways Development Act. One result has been higher air fares. The Coal Mine Health and Safety Act promises to improve the lot of our miners. Consumers will have to pay for that safety, either in higher priced coal or higher taxes.

Congress has ordered seat belts on all cars. The result has been higher priced cars; and higher priced cars have been one result of mandatory emission controls, too. We have passed laws against pesticides, which means that farmers may have higher costs in producing the food and fiber we need. It also may mean a drop in production.

By creating artificial scarcities, wage and price controls have not lowered prices (as they're supposed to do) but have contributed to higher prices. Medicare and Medicaid have added to our health care costs, which were high enough before these features were added.

Export and import controls also increase the upward pressure on prices.

Most of the laws I have mentioned have passed Congress because of wide public demand. I am not opposed to giving the people what they want, but we need to remember that we don't get anything for nothing.

A COHERENT TRANSPORTATION POLICY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Representative BROCK ADAMS, Democrat, of Washington, has written an excellent article which appears in the March 23, 1974, issue of Nation magazine. We are all aware of Congressman ADAMS' deep commitment to transportation legislation and policy. We know him as one of the principal authors of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act. As a member of the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he has contributed immensely to our effort to achieve a coherent transportation policy.

I am sure that my colleagues will be

interested in this article, which I am pleased to insert here:

OUTLINE OF A COHERENT POLICY: TRANSPORTATION AND ENERGY

(By Representative BROCK ADAMS)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Sitting through hearings before the House Commerce Committee on the effects of the energy crisis has stimulated me to reflect further on the future of our transportation network. I am impressed by the extent to which the lack of a coherent transportation policy has contributed to the severity of the present crisis and I have some suggestions to make for improving our situation in the future.

First, one must identify some of the myths about energy and transportation and some of the transportation games that both the government and the various special interests are playing, using the energy crisis to attain goals they have long sought. We need to sort out real from phony problems, and separate real from cosmetic solutions.

First the Administration: its approach to the problems of energy and transportation has been to let the crisis develop and then apply Band-aids and press-release poultices. So far, its policy makers have dodged decisions that are difficult or that promise to be unpopular. I suppose I shouldn't complain, now that the President has officially pronounced the end of the energy crisis. (I wish he'd tell me the address of his gas station.) The energy crisis isn't over and won't be for the foreseeable future. It is irresponsible for anyone to say that it is.

Examples of Band-aid approaches to the problem are year-round daylight saving time and a 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. There is very limited evidence that these devices have conserved any fuel, and the side effects are awful. The highway speed limit started at 50 miles per hour but no one bothered to ask the truckers—who carry more than 22 per cent of the intercity freight—what the effect of that limit would be. The effect was chaotic. Truck terminals and over-the-road runs are based on 60 mph operations, which determine the length of a day's run. Further, trucks are built to use fuel most economically at the higher speeds. We are still backing and filling and now have a compromise 55 mph speed limit, which is not much of a hardship and probably saves no fuel.

Another example of public relations therapy was the originally proposed fuel allocation for general aviation and private planes. Someone decided that the public would chuckle if those executives who fly around in corporate jets were forced to travel like ordinary citizens for the duration. After the yells of protest had died down and Cessna Aircraft had laid off 2,500 aircraft workers in Wichita, it turned out that general aviation used less than 2 per cent of the jet fuel consumed in the United States. Grounding the entire fleet for a year wouldn't accomplish much. A few telephone calls could have straightened that one out.

The Administration is trying to muddle through without stepping on any sensitive votes. It won't work. If there is a shortage, and I believe there is, the fair method is to ration gas. Rationing by price or by waiting lines is cruelly unfair to those who depend on their cars for their livelihoods. Rationing should have been set up on a temporary basis, with cars used for essential purposes given a priority. Another priority is to insure that transportation modes—bus, air, truck and rail—that can carry large numbers of people and large amounts of freight receive their full fuel needs. We must face the disagreeable fact that overdependence on the car is one of the real villains of the energy crisis.

Private industry has not been slow to seize on the energy crisis as a new approach to some old ambitions. The truckers, hard hit

by speed restrictions and soaring fuel prices, have dusted off their proposal for larger and heavier trucks on superhighways. Seeing another convenient Band-aid, the Administration has supported this idea. It is difficult to see how the energy crisis has changed the arguments of safety hazards and increased wear and tear of the highways which moved Congress to reject this idea several years ago.

The airlines have found in the energy crisis an ideal excuse for getting together to reduce less profitable service to major cities and to drop flights to some smaller cities altogether. By reducing flights the industry will gain a short-term benefit from the fuel shortage, but it will not last long. Already the airlines have \$875 million of equipment on the ground; they are still paying for it (and paying interest as well) while it stands idle. Also, the industry estimates that in 1974 its fuel bill will increase by a staggering \$1.2 billion; if this price is not held down by controls, the airlines will eventually suffer greatly from the fuel shortage, whatever their short-run advantages. Above all, the energy crisis should not be used as an excuse to reduce permanently a vital transportation service to the public.

Since coming to Congress, I have specialized in legislation dealing with the country's regulated transportation system. It is a fascinating subject once you get into it, but in all candor I must say it has not been the most newsworthy or politically exciting subject. However, two events this year have brought the dull realities of transportation life forcefully to the attention of the American people. One was the near collapse of the Penn Central, and with it almost the whole rail service in the East; the other was the truck stoppage.

The total cessation of rail service in the winter of 1974 was averted by the passage in December 1973 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act. This legislative enterprise resembled *The Perils of Pauline*, and it is not the way transportation problems should be dealt with. However, it did awaken Congress to the fundamental importance of railroads in our economy and the troubles they faced. The truck stoppage educated Americans on the hitherto rather esoteric problems of relative fuel consumption among transportation modes, and the difference between common carriers, exempt haulers and owner/operators, which until then had concerned only shippers, lawyers and transportation executives.

My conclusion is that, if the energy crisis is being used for bad purposes, we might do well to try to produce from it some good results for our national transportation system. Since we must suffer through it in any case, let us finally adopt a sensible, coherent transportation policy which, in the words of the Interstate Commerce Act, will "recognize and preserve the inherent advantage" of each transportation mode. This goal has until now been applied only to setting freight rates at levels such that each means of transportation is protected from the others. It has not been used to develop a sensible plan for allocating private and governmental resources to transportation.

A classic example of bad planning was the construction of an interstate highway system with no consideration of the effect on the total transportation system. This put the Eastern railroads out of business. For example, the New Haven made a lot of money hauling sand and gravel and cement for the highways, but once the highways were opened the railroad collapsed into bankruptcy. The Highway Trust Fund encouraged spending for roads and until recently its coffers were locked against mass transit. We must now make a huge capital investment to construct the mass transit systems that should have been started ten years ago. Since 1946, \$26.7 billion have been spent on waterways, airline cash subsidies, airport and airway

development and the Merchant Marine. On top of this, federal user taxes since 1946 have given the highways \$68.7 billion, and state and local treasuries have supplied \$100 billion. The point is not that these expenditures are wrong—the airline service we have today wouldn't exist without the airport construction program, and barges certainly assume renewed significance as movers of bulk freight in a fuel shortage. The point is that there has been no sensible balance among modes and no attempt to use federal aid to make sure that there is coordination between them, so that each does what it can do best.

Partly that is the fault of the railroads, which clung to a 19th-century dream of economic dominance, refusing to wake up to the realities of the new century. While the truckers pushed hard for the interstate road system and the barges fought for expansion of the waterways, the railroads until recently have never pushed aggressively for equal treatment by the government. The Regional Rail Reorganization Act marks the first time Congress has enacted a full-scale program to revitalize this ailing system. For their lack of enterprise, the railroads are now paying a heavy price—while the right of way of their competitors is paid for in whole or in part by the federal government, their right of way is kept in shape at their own expense. That is where the public also pays a price, because the first thing a railroad in trouble does is put off maintenance of its right of way. Since the costs of maintenance of way are deducted from current earnings deferred maintenance can artificially boost earnings. Ultimately, the service deteriorates to the point where the railroad cannot bring it back. It has been estimated that \$600 million to \$800 million will be necessary to rehabilitate the sprawling Penn Central system. But the argument for saving the Penn Central and all the railroads is a very convincing one at this time: in terms of freight movement for long hauls, a railroad is four times as efficient a user of fuel as are trucks.

The first step in achieving a coherent transportation policy will be to get the railroads back into such a state that they can form part of the system. I have sponsored legislation which would provide a program of guaranteed loans for the purchase of rolling stock and, more important, for investment in improved freight yards, rebuilt rights of way and better computer systems to enable the railroads to use their equipment at maximum efficiency. This needed investment in right of way and facilities will also have a beneficial effect on passenger traffic (which also uses fuel very efficiently). At present, 40 per cent of Amtrak's trains run on track owned by the Penn Central. Once this track is brought back to standard, the trains can be fast, safe and on time.

And while we are injecting needed capital into this capital-intensive industry, we should begin to reform the regulatory system, so that it regulates but does not cripple the whole transportation system. Such things as local imposts which tax railroads at rates higher than those for other industries, and the legal requirement of cheap rates for government shipments should be eliminated. Rate regulation should be designed to encourage innovative techniques, rather than discourage them.

Our most important reform, however, in devising a new transportation policy is to stop dealing with each mode in isolation. We should have a unified transportation budget, which would show how much each mode is getting in federal assistance and would justify that expenditure, not on the basis of how it will improve competition between the modes but on how much it will help coordination of the modes. The trucks and the railroads consider themselves competitors. To a great extent they are not, or should not be. The most efficient mode for the long haul

in terms of cost and fuel is the railroad; for the 200-to-250-mile haul, the truck is the most efficient. Further, although they do compete, one mode could not exist without the other. Piggyback business (a truck trailer or container carried on a railroad flatcar) was up 18 per cent last year, and this year is 15 per cent ahead of 1973. Therefore, it seems to me that the public's money would be better spent on facilities to expedite the interchange of piggyback traffic than on building more highways.

The fuel shortage supplies the impetus. It is astonishing, but true, that fresh fruits and vegetables now move by truck from California to the East Coast markets. Yet to move a given amount of freight across the country by truck uses 70 percent more fuel than the railroad would need for the job. With the price of fuel rising, transcontinental truck routes will become unprofitable. This year, Arizona lettuce growers expect the price of a truckload haul from Arizona to the East to go from \$1,500 to \$3,000. In my state of Washington, the cost of trucking a box of apples has gone from \$1.70 a box to \$2.10 per box. This level of price increase will inevitably force a return of traffic to the rails—if the rails are able to accept it. But given adequate container facilities, it need not cripple the trucking industry, which can supplement, not compete with, railroading. The Task Force on Railroad Productivity of the National Commission on Productivity described the future well in a recent report: "The rail industry should gradually phase out its fleet of all-purpose freight cars, replacing it with a fleet of trailers (or containers) and flatcars. . . . Trucks could be employed to pick up and deliver containers, thus specializing the rail system as a wholesaler of freight transportation and trucking as a retailer." The sensible statement describes a goal which governmental policy and financial assistance should encourage.

That is one example of how the government, by carrying out a policy aimed at efficiency, could improve our transportation system. The government could bring about needed change in other areas as well. For example, the railroads possess vast reserves of coal, which could be used to generate the electricity to power locomotives on high-density lines. Electrification could not only help to keep fuel costs in line; it would substantially reduce the equipment maintenance expense, and provide surplus electricity for other uses.

Surface transportation would not be the only part of transportation to benefit from a sensible allocation of federal assistance to transportation. I foresee in the airline industry a joint federal-private sector project to develop a short-haul, commuter plane to provide the service needed by smaller communities. Until now, American commercial jets have been the offspring of military aircraft. There is little military need for the type of smaller jet I think we should have, and the expense of developing such a plane is too great to be borne by private industry alone. But such development is vital if adequate air service for small communities is to be assured. Large jets cannot efficiently serve these communities.

These are only a few examples of what can be done by a well-planned study of our transportation network. Without such a study, we shall have continued inequities in federal aid to transportation, declining levels of service for some areas, and overall an inefficient transportation system. I do not hesitate to argue for government participation in the improvement of the various modes of transportation, for I view transportation more as a necessary public utility than a purely free-enterprise business. The United States is the only country in which transportation is not nationalized; instead, it is privately owned and government-regulated. I see government

assistance through loan guarantees (which need not involve direct costs to the taxpayer) or through government-sponsored research and development as perfectly proper. Government assistance for transportation has been part of our history since the building of the Erie Canal. To me it is a necessary and proper investment in the basic structure of our economy. As we meet the energy crisis we should face the realities of the future and plan and produce a new efficiently coordinated transportation system. If we do, at least one good result will have come from the present travail.

GEORGE MEANY'S CONVERSION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News, in its lead editorial on Tuesday, March 12, very appropriately directed the attention of its readers to an interesting about-face on the subject of wage and price controls by the Honorable George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO.

The editorial is as accurate, timely commentary on Mr. Meany's economic inconsistencies as any I have ever read. The editorial follows:

GEORGE MEANY'S "CONVERSION"

"The one way I know to stop inflation at this time is by imposition of controls."—George Meany, Aug. 9, 1971.

"We are facing an inflation rate of over 15 per cent this year. . . . Give the free economy a chance."—George Meany, March 6, 1974.

Yes, it's the same George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, in both cases. And judging from his ringing defense of the free market delivered to a Senate subcommittee the other day, Meany appears almost ready for a visiting lecturer's chair on the University of Chicago economics faculty.

Meany, of course, is entitled to change his mind. Many earlier disciples of controls, including several noted businessmen, rue their applause for President Nixon's wage-price freeze on Aug. 15, 1971. Now they and Meany speak as one: Controls have got to go.

But closer followers of Meany's economic odysseys know that he isn't quite the complete apostle of free enterprise.

His motive in urging an end to wage-price controls is clear: He believes the working man has gotten the short end of the deal and Meany wants to go for some massive catch-up raises, unhindered by Washington as a senior partner at the bargaining table.

But was that "Free Market" Meany who only a few days ago told members of the AFL-CIO executive council: "Maybe the time has come for an all-out campaign to nationalize the oil industry?" It was.

He didn't explain how government, which he admits couldn't run the wage-price structure, could hope to do any better with the complex oil industry. Nor did he acknowledge that in most nations nationalized industries have usually given consumers fewer goods of poorer quality at higher prices. Maybe he has nationalization of oil in mind as a forced means of cutting consumption.

It appears that Meany learns the hard way, but we'd hate to pay the price to teach him about nationalization—even with the goal of converting him further to the economics of free enterprise.

MEDIA COMMITTEE REPORT

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, previously I have addressed the House concerning the activities of the Second Congressional District Youth Advisory Council which consists of a representative from each high school in my district. In the three and a half years since it was formed, the Council has initiated studies of particular legislative proposals in the U.S. Congress as well as problems in our State of Missouri from which I have benefitted greatly by gaining the perspective of tomorrow's leaders.

Their reports have been thorough, informative and have covered a wide range of important issues. Today, I would like to submit the latest report, recently completed by the Media Committee of the Council, concerning violence on television:

MEDIA COMMITTEE REPORT

March 1, 1974, James Symington's Youth Council—Committee Members: Michael Shuman—Chairman; Karen Enchelmaier—Assistant Chairman; Art McCluskey, Jr.; Ed Brimer; Becky Smith; Mary Linton; Lisa Robinson; Marc Shmuger

"Murder and mayhem, bigger and bolder than ever, again is erupting on U.S. television screens—to the rising anger of Congressmen, press, clergy and other citizens across America." These words stated by U.S. News and World Report, October 29, 1973 brought to light a series of unanswered questions dealing with our free media. How much violence is there on television? Is it a significant amount? What is the effect of television violence? What measures should be taken to resolve any problems? To answer these and other questions, our committee did research by both reading and experimentation.

First, we must ask ourselves how much violence there is, especially since a recent Gallup Poll suggests that almost two-thirds of the American people believe that there is too much violence. Right after the assassinations of the mid-60's, the published statistics about violence were quite startling. Public outcry pushed Congressmen to urge the network to "review its policies". The networks agreed, and for a time it seemed that they had taken major steps (e.g.—cutting down in the number of Westerns).

Now with the new outcry, we decided to take a random sampling of television for ourselves. Our first sampling was during the week of November 25–December 1. We wished to determine if any generalizations could be made about days, networks, or time slots in relation to the amount of violence. To accomplish this, we assigned ourselves different days with different networks in which we would count the number of acts of violence we saw. The criteria (no doubt flawed) that we decided to use included murder, shooting, robbery, stabbing, chases and accidents, rapes, fights, and other miscellaneous acts of violence. A further category we added was that of verbal references to violence, for we felt that a threat could have as adverse an effect as the actual act. Our initial results told us little about time slots and days, but they tended to show that ABC had a rather low amount of violence in comparison to the high amount NBC had. This latter fact led to our basic objective in the next survey.

To compare ABC and NBC exclusively we surveyed the weeks of January 22–February

4. When our total showed that ABC had more violence than NBC for that period, we could only conclude that again no generalizations could be made.

More definitive observations could be made when looking at the grand totals and their averages. In all of the surveyed weeks, the average number of acts of violence per day was about 20. Furthermore, in both surveying periods, about 30% of all violence fell in the category we labeled as verbal references to violence. The significance of these results is certainly large.

Consider that the average child watches 15,000 hours of television in those formative years up to age eighteen. In an hour of prime time as our figures showed, a child would see about 5.7 acts of violence. Thus by the time a child reached majority age, he would have watched over 85,000 acts of violence!

The fact that 30% of all this violence is verbal, merely shows that the steps networks have taken do little to reduce the overall violence picture. By substituting threats for physical violence, the networks feel as though they have done their part.

Now that we have determined amount and general nature, we have to ask ourselves

about the effect. This is unfortunately a question that no one answer will suffice. Experts themselves seem widely separated. In an examination of many scientific experiments, Andre Gluckman concluded that one cannot simply classify violence as cathartic, mimetic, or neutral. One must deal with the specific instance, and even when dealing with a specific, no solid judgment can be made. Thus, we see that many questions must still be answered, and we therefore forward the following suggestions which we hope the Senate Communications Committee along with others, will consider.

(1) The networks need to again reexamine their programming structure. Though little proof exists to verify the harm of viewing violence, there can be little doubt that the viewing of 85,000 acts of violence cannot have a beneficial effect.

(2) No legislative action should be taken to restrict the networks, for the freedom of the media must be preserved. But legislative incentives can and should be set up. Recognizing the fact that conflict is the basis for plot, we realize that one surefire way to lower the amount of television violence is to put more programs on the air of an educational nature. These incentives should not

only be provided to the PBS to provide a good alternative to violence, but to the major private networks, so that the alternative of violence becomes miniscule.

(3) Such incentives could come in the form of financial assistance, tax breaks (legal exemptions), or government advertising. There are a thousand ways to make the networks want to produce good educational programs.

(4) The unanswered questions of the effects of violence must be answered. A central governmental organization should be set up to coordinate scientific findings from around the world. There are hundreds of experiments being conducted right now, but many are not aware of the others' existence. When results are found, many who are interested will never hear them. Some area must be set up to bring all of this information into some organized answers.

(5) If in the near future, the harm of television violence is virtually unrefuted, and the networks themselves do nothing, then it is the responsibility of the government to its people to set up protective controls. Note that this is basically a last resort.

Hopefully, our recommendations will help to solve what appears to be a growing national problem.

THE WEEKS OF JAN. 22-FEB. 4

	Network																												Total
	ABC, date														NBC, date														
	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	1	2	3	4	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	1	2	3	4	
Classification:																													
Shooting (dead)	6			5	1				2	1				2				1		2	1			2		2		1	30
Shooting (alive)	2		14	2				9		1	7	8	1	1	7														56
Robbery			1				1				1			1	1								2				1		12
Stabbing	2																												7
Chases (accidents)	2	1	5				1	2	1		2		2	1	2				3		1		4		4	1	3		41
Rapes	1			2																3	4			4				2	3
Fights	4	3	12	4			2			1	6	8	3	2	6			4	8	3	13		4		1	2	5	7	93
Miscellaneous murder		2	2				1				3	4											2	1				1	16
Reference to violence	2	4	32	9			2	2		6	35	15	4	1	35			4					2	4	3	4	2	6	213
Miscellaneous violence	1	4	6	1	3	1	1			3	5		1		3			2	14	4	12		1		1	14		6	79
Subtotal	20	14	80	17	3	8	16	2	8	56	35	15	6	22	5		14	24		52		13	12	9	25	8	26		302
Week's total (ABC)																													228
Week's total (NBC)																													
Grand total																													
Acts per day (ABC)																													530
Acts per day (NBC)																													21.5
Average																													20.7
																													21.2

THE WEEK OF NOV. 25 TO DEC. 1

Date	Network			Sub-total
	ABC	CBS	NBC	
Sunday	24	29	67	120
Monday	7	17	31	55
Tuesday	2	31	37	70
Wednesday	1	13	10	24
Thursday	6		6	12
Friday		10	26	36
Saturday	2		25	27
Subtotal	42	100	202	344
Acts per day	7	20	28.9	19.1

RETURN VETERANS DAY OBSERVANCE TO NOVEMBER 11

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation seeking the return of our Veterans Day observance

to November 11. The justification for this is largely one of tradition, precedent, and long-established custom. Veterans Day was always observed as Armistice Day—the occasion of the end of the First World War on the western front in Europe, the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month—and has a very special and important significance because of that historical fact. As has often been pointed out, the number 11 is very much a part of Armistice Day—Veterans Day—and should remain associated with that memorable event.

This traditional observance took place, each and every year, until the enactment into law of H.R. 15951, the so-called Monday holiday law, on June 28, 1968. The law, however, Public Law 90-363, did not go into effect until January 1, 1971.

It is important to note that, technically, there are no national holidays in the United States. Each State has jurisdiction over its holidays, which can be designated by executive proclamation or legislative enactment. The President, by

executive proclamation, and the Congress, by legislative enactment, can legally designate holidays for the District of Columbia and Federal employees throughout the United States. In practice, however, most States observe the Federal legal public holidays.

As a matter of fact, there were a total of 32 States which observed Veterans Day on November 11, in 1973. In addition, California's legislature made its Veterans Day law, observing November 11 effective for 1974. Thus, there will be a total of 33 States—66 percent of the United States—which will recognize the wisdom and merit of designating November 11 as Veterans Day in 1974.

As the American Legion magazine wrote, in an editorial in its issue of November 1972:

Certainly if we are going to ignore VE Day and VJ Day and the Korean cease-fire, and the hoped for Vietnam war-end, one is entitled to ask what is wrong with November 11th as the single day upon which to lump together their symbolic meaning. A war did end on that day, but no war was ever ended on the fourth Monday in October.

Indeed, one is entitled to ask what is wrong with November 11 as the single day to honor America's veterans with a day that has great and meaningful significance. It is a day rich in history, still a day remembered by Americans everywhere, still a day engraved on the hearts and minds of those who survived what was called at the time "the Great War."

The Nation has fought three wars and suffered countless casualties since that fateful day, long ago, in 1918. But a grateful and proud land owes a debt to the memory of all who have served, and it is fitting that November 11 be once again recognized as a Federal observance of Veterans Day—a day for all Americans to honor those who answered America's call in its hour of need.

TWO NEW STUDIES SHOW HOW PRICE INFLATION VICTIMIZES THE POOR

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, although poor people are not responsible for inflation, they are the group most severely hurt by it—especially in the all-important category of food, which can amount to 40 percent or more of a typical poor family's income.

Two recent studies in Atlanta bear this out.

Economic Opportunity Atlanta, Inc., conducted a survey in impoverished neighborhoods in the city and found, among other things, that prices of nine staple items rose an average of 75 percent in the last year. Mr. William W. Allison, Executive Administrator of EOA, has observed that the findings of this survey "are alarming, and bring home the urgency of developing strategies to address this problem."

The other study was made by Dr. Loraine Donaldson, professor of economics at Georgia State University. She found that lower income families "are faced today with critical budgetary problems resulting from food inflation, and will face further erosions of their purchasing power as food prices continue to rise and are joined by inflation in other basics as a result of the energy crisis."

Mr. Speaker, in submitting the two studies for the RECORD, I hope that we can act to prevent further huge increases in prices and provide some protection for poor people.

The studies follow:

THE IMPACT OF FOOD PRICE INFLATION ON THE POOR IN ATLANTA (By Loraine Donaldson)

The poor suffer more from food inflation such as that currently underway than other income groups. Recent food price rises have eroded more of the purchasing power of Atlanta's urban poor than that of the average Atlanta consumer whose loss of purchasing power can be gauged by the BLS food price

index. People with incomes in the range of \$1,500 a year or less per family member are faced today with critical budgetary problems resulting from food inflation, and will face further erosions of their purchasing power as food prices continue to rise and are joined by inflation in other basics as a result of the energy crisis.

In the first place, the poor purchase a different market basket from that of the average consumer. While they may purchase some of the same items that the average consumer purchases, invariably such common items will make up a different weight or percentage of total purchases. And the poor will purchase many items, such as pigsfeet, fatback and neckbones, not included in food pricing lists for the average consumer. When food items from the representative market basket of the poor were priced in December 1973, the index showed that it cost \$150 to purchase at chain supermarkets the market basket items of the poor that cost \$100 in August 1969,¹ four years and four months previously. The food price rises for the average consumer over this period were 10 points lower as of December 1973, i.e., it cost the average consumer \$140 to buy groceries, produce and meat that cost \$100 in August 1969. Were independent stores included in the representative sample of stores priced for the index for the poor, as they are in the BLS, the difference in the two indexes would be even higher.

Second, the poor spend a much larger percent of their income on food than other income groups. Food makes up between 30% and 40% of their cost of living as compared to 20% for the average consumer. Food prices rises such as the 22% rise in Atlanta from December 1972 to December 1973 result in a 3-5% cost of living rise for the average or above average consumer; the same rise for the poor's purchases would result in a 7-9% cost of living increase. The estimated rise of 28% for the poor's market basket from December 1972 to December 1973 means an 8-11% cost of living rise for the poor from food inflation alone. The rise from August 1969 to December 1973 represents a change in the cost of living for the average consumer from food inflation of 8%, and a change of 15-20% for the poor. Moreover, there is no "give" in the budget of the poor—it is hard to reduce spending for necessities like food, rent, utilities and transportation. Needless to say, the diets of the poor, especially the urban poor without gardens, have been affected as price rises in, e.g., meat, force them to forego meat items formerly consumed, and rising wheat prices make it difficult to purchase the basics.

The price index for groceries was 148 in December and 152 in February for the poor, meaning it cost \$152 to buy what \$100 bought in 1969. The same index for groceries for the BLS was 139 in December. The reason for large increases in the index for the poor is that the basic items, items with minimum processing that make up the bulk of the poor's groceries, have been hit hardest by price increases, particularly the grains inflation. Price indexes for groceries, produce and dairy items with heavy weights in the index include the following:

	December 1973	February 1974
Canned fish.....	208	205
Sugar.....	174	183
Flour.....	171	171

¹ August 1969 is used as the base period because data for the market basket of the poor were collected at that time.

	December 1973	February 1974
Lard.....	168	228
Evaporated milk.....	143	147
Rice, macaroni, spaghetti, dried beans.....	205	218
Corn.....	157	159
Eggs.....	150	156
Bread.....	164	157
White potatoes.....	154	192

Since the poor are already reduced to purchasing the cheaper sources of nutrition, when these items rise there are few avenues for substitution. Sweet potatoes can be substituted for corn and white potatoes. But the flexibility for substitution is rigidly limited in the case of the current food inflation.

The dramatic rise in meat prices has not escaped the cheaper cuts, but has actually resulted in higher increases on those types of meat than the average meat price increases. One reason for this is that as higher priced meat cuts increase in price, people substitute lower-priced meat, increasing demand for that meat at a time of rising costs and short supply. This has driven prices on such meat higher than more expensive meat. The index for meat prices for meat purchased by the poor stood at 162 in December and 164 in February. A look at price increases on specific items explains why:

	December 1973	February 1974
Hamburger.....	201	223
Stew meat.....	174	181
Beef liver.....	178	178
Shoulder ham.....	151	183
Streak-of-lean, fatback, pigs- feet.....	235	207
Spareribs.....	149	137
Pork neckbones.....	258	229
Fryers.....	151	156
Bologna.....	122	171
Weiners.....	176	176
Oxtails.....	206	218

The result of rising fatback, pigsfeet and neckbone prices is that the very poor must be going without even this type of meat. While these items were well below 50¢ a pound in 1969, none today is except when advertised specials are run. Specials on pigsfeet at a couple of "soul food" stores reduced the price to 25¢-35¢ a pound. Specials on meat consumed by the poor are not customer attractors for the average supermarket, and thus they do not reduce prices. The poor cannot turn to canned fish as it has risen along with beef and pork, while even peanut butter, an alternative source of protein, is no longer a cheap alternative to meat.

Public welfare payments have not kept pace of the increase, free food commodities have been in short supply, and private charity payments allocated to food buy less, while donations will usually be lower in inflationary periods when people feel they have less to give. Yet, the poor on welfare may not have lost as much purchasing power in relation to their 1969 position as the working urban poor who are ineligible for food stamps.

The indexes presented herein are based on data for Atlanta, Georgia. Similar results can be expected in most large cities that have an urban poor with similar food baskets to the poor of Atlanta. Thus, the findings for Atlanta would be fairly representative of other cities, or at the minimum, would be superior to the BLS index since the relative weights for groceries, produce, meat, poultry and fish would be more representative of the market baskets of the poor.

FOOD PRICE INDEX COMPARISONS: ATLANTA BLS COMPARED TO INDEX FOR ATLANTA'S POOR

[Base period: August 1969]

Food at home	1974					
	1973, December	January	February	March	April	May
BLS (Atlanta).....	140.3	142.5	147.3			
Atlanta's poor ¹	151.0	151.8	155.4	158.3		
With nonfood ²	148.2	148.9	152.1	154.6		
Independent.....		154.5	162.3	176.3		
Groceries:						
BLS (Atlanta).....	138.5	138.4				
Atlanta's poor ¹	147.9	146.2	151.5	155.2		
With nonfood ²	143.3	142.1	146.3	149.8		
Independent.....		164.2	159.9	161.4		

Food at home	1974					
	1973, December	January	February	March	April	May
Produce:						
BLS (Atlanta).....	132.1	136.4				
Atlanta's poor ¹	135.0	146.7	144.5	151.3		
With nonfood ²	135.1	146.7	144.4	151.1		
Independent.....		129.5	136.1	185.0		
Meat, poultry, fish:						
BLS (Atlanta).....	149.6	151.0				
Atlanta's poor ¹	159.7	160.8	163.6	163.6		
With nonfood ²	159.6	160.8	163.5	163.6		
Independent.....		147.9	172.2	198.8		

¹ Index includes prices for chainstores only. BLS index includes independents.² Includes nonfood items—cigarettes, soap, toilet paper, etc., purchased at grocery stores by the poor, weighted according to their relative importance.³ Downtown without nonfood (area with high competition for meats, poultry, and fish).⁴ Techwood without nonfood (formerly A. & P.).⁵ Ashby-Simpson without nonfood.

THE IMPACT OF RISING FOOD PRICES ON LOW INCOME FAMILIES

(By William W. Allison)

(1) PRICES ON 9 STAPLE ITEMS

	1973 prices	1974 prices	Percent increase
Bread (king size).....	\$0.41	\$0.55	34
Eggs (large).....	.65	.89	36
Milk (gallon).....	1.09	1.79	64
Sugar (5-lb bag).....	.79	1.55	96
Margarine.....	.17	.49	188
Crisco (3-lb can).....	.99	1.89	90
Cornmeal (5-lb).....	.79	.89	12
Pinto beans (2 lb).....	.58	1.60	175
White potatoes (5-lb).....	.69	1.19	72
Total.....	6.16	10.84	75

These nine staple items cost \$6.16 in 1973. In 1974, these same items cost \$10.84, a 75% increase. If one takes into account that the nine staple items listed to *Not* include meat, fresh fruits and vegetables, and cleaning supplies, the 75% rise in food costs from 1973 to 1974 would doubtless be even more astronomical.

2) Prices on nine (9) Staple Items (referred to above) in a Supermarket as contrasted with the prices on the same items in small neighborhood grocery stores.

SUPERMARKET PRICE

Total—Nine (9).

Staple Items \$9.16.

SMALL NEIGHBORHOOD STORE

Total—Nine (9).

Staple Items \$12.27.

PERCENT INCREASE

33%.

The majority of large supermarkets are far distant from the low income shopper. During 1973, some of the few supermarkets within low income communities closed their doors and relocated their stores elsewhere in metro Atlanta. Low income families who wish to travel to other parts of the metro community must either pay taxi fare from the supermarket back to their own neighborhood, or drive their own cars, which is costly because of ever increasing gas prices.

It is the observation of the staff and residents that many small neighborhood stores victimize shoppers through such practices as charging to cash welfare and social security checks, forcing persons to purchase a specific dollar amount of food before cashing checks, and raising the prices of food at the first of the month when Social Security and Welfare checks are issued. It is reported that large supermarkets are also raising prices the first of the month when checks arrive.

3) Staff at the EOA Neighborhood Centers talked with selected families this week to specifically determine the impact of spiraling food costs on these families.

The situations of two (2) of these families depicts the impact of rising food costs:

Mrs. R. and three other family members "try to exist" on \$250.00 per month. Mrs. R. spends \$190 per month for food, an increase of \$40 over her 1973 monthly food costs and she "buys less food now."

After buying food, she has \$60.00 left each month for all of her other expenses—rent, clothing, and medical expenses. She shops at a supermarket out of her neighborhood, riding the bus to the market but taking a taxi home (to transport the groceries) which costs \$8.00 a month. Says Mrs. R., "bacon, beef, especially steaks, are no no luxury items."

Mr. and Mrs. C., an elderly rural couple, receive \$210 each month from Supplemental Security Income, (SSI). They were receiving surplus commodities but are no longer eligible for these because they receive SSI. It costs them \$40.00 each month at the grocery store to replace the items they were receiving through the surplus commodity program. Their other food costs have risen to almost twice that of 1973.

4) Owners of small markets also note the impact of rising food costs. The owner of a downtown market patronized by low income shoppers has observed persons purchase more expensive items, such as meats and fresh vegetables, during the first week of the month. As the month passes, fewer shoppers frequent the store, and those who do shop are buying only the most essential items on which they can survive.

One elderly resident summed up the problem of rising food cost by saying simply "We are now just Existing".

COSPONSORS SOUGHT FOR LEGISLATION TO INCREASE PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS FROM \$750 TO \$1,000

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 13712, legislation to increase the personal exemption on Federal income tax returns from \$750 to \$1,000. This is companion legislation to that introduced last week by Senator VANCE HARTKE. I will be seeking cosponsors on this measure in the near future.

By increasing the personal deduction, we will be providing a measure of relief to those hit hardest by the rampant Nixon inflation—the low- and middle-income taxpayers. Our present tax structure places the foremost burden of tax-

ation on these citizens, while corporations and the wealthy all too often escape paying their share of taxes by maneuvering through loophole after loophole in the Internal Revenue Code. One need only look at a few statistics to realize that our progressive system of taxation is rendered fairly inoperative through tax shelters and loopholes: since 1960, corporate tax revenues have dropped from 35 percent of total Federal revenues to around 15 percent. Corporate tax revenues have fallen to third place, behind personal income taxes and social security payroll taxes, as revenue producers for the national treasury. The higher income taxpayers pay the Government about 30 cents on each dollar they earn, if they pay their taxes at all.

The personal deduction is supposed to reflect some of the costs which exist in just being alive in the United States. During World War II the deduction was \$500. Two years ago it was finally increased to the present \$750, yet the costs of food, fuel, and shelter have skyrocketed beyond belief. Inflation has taken a great chunk out of the pocketbooks of the low- and middle-income taxpayer. We can help these wage earners meet these increased costs by allowing them a measure of relief on their income taxes. A country full of people worried about how they can afford milk and bread for their children, gasoline to get to work, and payments on their homes is a country in a tired and frustrated state. I would hope that this legislation I have introduced will be a first step toward reducing that anxiety and hopelessness that so many now feel.

COMPARE GASOLINE PRICES

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in these days of inflation, it is well to compare our gasoline prices with those abroad. You have heard it before, but you need to hear it often, because you go by the gas station two or three times every week.

Folks have said the cost of gasoline is

up as high as 60 cents a gallon here in their neighborhood.

Let us look at what they are paying for gasoline in other countries:

Germany, \$1.28; Italy, \$1.31; France, \$1.45; England, \$1.20; India, \$1.90; Sweden, \$1.20; Israel, \$1.50; and Greece, \$2.15.

It reminds you of that old saying, "How is your mother-in-law?" With an answering comment, "Compared to what."

We should all remember that we are fortunate to live in the United States.

ABUSING THE PRESIDENCY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the President has frequently stated his determination to oppose efforts that he feels would result in a weak and unstable presidency if they were to go unchallenged.

In that regard, an editorial appearing in the March 20, 1974 edition of the Peoria Journal Star entitled "Abusing the Presidency" addresses the problem of the President versus the Congress and I suggest that my colleagues might profit by reading the editorial.

I include the text of the editorial in the Record:

ABUSING THE PRESIDENCY

In Chicago last week President Nixon raised the question of a weak and unstable presidency as the future condition of the American Republic.

It is a side of the present proceedings that his accusers have persistently ignored and constantly sneered at.

Yet, if our priorities place the nation above any one man it is a consideration we ought to, at least, soberly examine . . . and the first thing we discover is that there is a basic protection still against that result.

Former Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Arthur Goldberg has pointed out that the Congress does not have the last word on impeachment, after all.

The U.S. Supreme Court CAN rule on an appeal in an impeachment case, says the former justice, and he adds that in his opinion if Andrew Johnson had been successfully impeached by the Senate that case should have been reversed by the high court.

That is a weighty opinion on a crucial matter.

Where does the Supreme Court come into the thing? On the question of whether Congress conducted the affair in a constitutional manner.

Goldberg has pointed out that the Supreme Court did reverse the House of Representatives when they ousted Adam Clayton Powell on the grounds that he was not judged on the criteria required by the Constitution.

Thus, Congress is NOT a law unto itself, and its judgment and decisions as to what constitutes an impeachable offense is subject to the decision of the Supreme Court.

If they try a President on grounds not provided according to the court, the impeachment would be null and void.

One's first thought is that this means the whole matter may go on until the year 2,000.

However, the second thought is that the House of Representatives really does face a momentous decision on whether to proceed

with impeachment at all and on what grounds—for the grounds they choose may have a profound effect on the validity of the trial or a profound impact on the future nature of our government.

Archibald Cox, the special prosecutor whose dismissal directly inspired the impeachment resolution in the House in the first place, has emphasized the dilemma by giving his blessing to impeachment for "abuse of power" and proceeding directly to where that leads.

Cox says that in pursuing this the House of Representatives "must articulate standards defining . . . unacceptable political and official behavior in the conduct of the presidency."

It involves he says some "prickly questions" that must be resolved—and he refers to the task as awesome. It is clear in the light of Goldberg's comment that those "prickly questions" must be answered correctly—or the Supreme Court may find the whole process, itself, an unconstitutional abuse of power by the Congress!

Cox makes it clear that to try a President on the grounds proposed by the House committee they must "articulate the standards of conduct by which the President's discharge of his duties is to be judged."

That is precisely the kind of thing that makes it a case for review by the U.S. Supreme Court for the purpose of deciding if those standards decided by the House are Constitutional, and, indeed, if the House has the Constitutional authority to write a job description for the Presidency.

That would seem to be the business of the Constitution, itself, not of the House of Representatives, and if they can do it and get away with it it bestows on the Congress long-sought but never-exercised power to stipulate the powers of the presidency and impose them on the Office of the Presidency itself.

If the committee proceeds as it has so far, it seems clear that in the future any member of the House can formally level any accusation he chooses against any President—and the mere fact of that accusation automatically empowers the House Judiciary committee to demand presidential records of all kinds.

Any refusal would be regarded as a "sign of guilt" and grounds for impeachment for but fifty accusations!

This is the position they have taken in this case, although there is not an accusation but fifty accusations—

The precedent will stand regardless if they make it stick.

By this attitude, in fact, of course, every President the United States has ever had was "impeachable"—and it is pretty foolish to think that adopting such a standard does NOT profoundly alter the nature of the presidency, the power of the Congress, and thereby the whole system of government as we have known it.

That is the consideration and the consequence the Supreme Court would have to consider if this thing continues on its present course.

The Moment of Truth in this whole affair thus still seems a long way off—and when it comes it will involve the future of the Republic, itself, and matters vastly more important than the Watergate raid of 1972.

If the President is "defending the presidency" for fundamental reasons of governance—or for personal defensive reasons only—the fact remains that others are playing carelessly with the Form of Government, itself.

And that what the Congress does with it will be subject to reexamination by the Supreme Court if they proceed in the manner they have started.

And the question before the Court would not be presidential abuse of power in such case—but the question of possible Congressional abuse of power . . . pre-empting the Constitution, itself.

OIL FOR GUNS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat perplexing to me to note, in this time of détente, that the major powers of both the East and West are escalating their peddling of conventional weapons to lesser-developed countries.

Recent "oil-for-guns" deals made by the French and the British Governments are illustrative of the problem, but of course the United States continues to lead the rest of the world in total military sales and assistance. Since 1950, it is estimated that the United States has sold over \$18 billion worth of military hardware across the globe, while some \$36 billion worth of weapons have been given away. Last year, the United States sold approximately \$3 billion worth of arms, while the Soviet Union weighed in at \$2 billion worth of munitions sales. Certainly, the massive American military assistance program to Iran, involving the very most exotic of U.S. military hardware—including F-14 and F-15 jet aircraft—is somewhat comparable to the oil-based deals we have witnessed on the part of our European allies.

It is a measure of the incipient disintegration of elements of the post-World War II world order that the so-called "have" nations now find themselves as "have-nots" as far as oil is concerned, and hence are supplying massive amounts of military technology and ordnance to the formerly "have-not" nations—hardware that is generally not needed for legitimate defense purposes, and which generally threatens to exacerbate tensions in the affected regions of the globe. For all its potentially explosive impact on world peace, the issue of conventional arms transfers—either on a grant or sale basis—is being neglected, to our common detriment. It seems to me that our efforts toward control and management of arms should not focus exclusively on strategic weapons, for sooner or later greater attention must be focused on the international movements of conventional arms, and efforts should be made to restrict, by multilateral agreement, conventional arms sales and other forms of transfers.

Mr. Speaker, the Boston Globe recently published an article on the weapons trade written by Richard Burt. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues, and urge that they consider it in the context of the growing global arms race:

IF YOU NEED OIL, SELL ARMS

(By Richard Burt)

LONDON.—In the 1930s they were known as "The Merchants of Death"—the profit-hungry munitions makers who peddled their wares to any regime that had the money to buy them.

But during the last decade the international sale of military hardware became a major international enterprise and, in the wake of the Middle East oil squeeze, an accepted means of securing political influence.

France's recent arms-for-oil agreement with Saudi Arabia highlights the key role

that weapons transfers have come to play in relations between the big powers and the Third World. In the French deal, King Faisal was promised money, industrial technology and arms, including the Mirage fighter, in return for a guaranteed, 20-year supply of petroleum.

Britain is working out a similar accord with Faisal and other Persian gulf leaders, and Germany is seeking to procure oil supplies through industrial sales, which reportedly include its new battle tank, the Leopard.

The United States, meanwhile, is helping Iran to become the most heavily armed nation in the Third World. Although the sale of such weapons as the Navy's sophisticated F14 fighter are not specifically designed to secure fuel, Iran is seen by Washington as a potential pillar of stability in the vital region.

Although the Soviet Union is not now faced with the problem of guarding against another oil cut-off, the Kremlin has recently pumped an estimated \$1 billion worth of military hardware into the region, in order to keep its fickle friends—Egypt, Syria and Iraq—happy.

But the massive influx of arms into the Middle East and the Persian Gulf forms only part of a larger phenomenon which one journal recently called "the worldwide boom in the arms trade."

Available statistics support this claim. According to the authoritative Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the international weapons trade has doubled in less than a decade and is now reported to total over \$7 billion a year.

Another research group, the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies, reports that 93 major arms deals were negotiated last year, most of them between rich and poor nations.

According to SIPRI statistics, the main purchasers of arms are the countries of the Middle East, South Asia and Latin America. The main sellers are the United States, the Soviet Union, France and Britain. Other significant weapons suppliers include Sweden, Germany, Italy, and Czechoslovakia.

The United States is said to have sold roughly \$3 billion worth of arms in 1972, the Soviets a little over \$2 billion. The figure for both countries is said to have risen last year. Since 1950, the Department of Defense estimates that the United States has sold over \$18 billion worth of hardware. During the same period, over \$36 billion worth of arms has been given away.

Comparative figures are not available for the Soviet Union, but in the last five years Soviet arms transfers to the Third World are known to have exceeded US levels.

Arms sales have long been viewed by some countries as a cheap means of gaining political clout. Particularly for the Soviet Union, which jumped into the arms game in the 1950s, Moscow weapons deals have been used to support any regime that was willing to break away from the West.

There is a consistent pattern, then, to Soviet sales: nations, from Indonesia to India to Cuba, have turned to Moscow for weapons when they couldn't buy them anywhere else.

But Soviet military trade aid usually comes with a political, as well as an economic, price tag. India, for instance, was obliged to provide the Russian Navy with Indian Ocean port facilities in order to gain such sophisticated Soviet weaponry as the MIG 21.

Critics of US arms sales policies argue that Washington also uses hardware as a political club often with unintended results. US weapons sales to Portugal, justified in terms of providing for the common defense of Europe, have often been employed against insurgents operating in Lisbon's African colonies.

Despite the character of European arms-for-oil diplomacy, political objectives do not

play as prominent a role in British and French weapons salesmanship. But for both of these countries, the manufacture and marketing of arms is viewed as a commercial necessity.

The French have especially become aggressive armaments merchants, scoring significant "breakthroughs" in the Latin American and Middle East "markets" during the late 1960s.

The primary reason behind the French success was the US decision, taken by the Johnson administration, to impose ceilings on military purchases by countries in these regions in order to head off possible Third World arms races.

But because European arms dealers were only too happy to pick up the slack, the Nixon Administration last year announced that the policy of arms ceilings had failed. The Department of Defense soon after authorized the sale of the F4 phantoms to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and copies of a less sophisticated fighter, the F5, to Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Venezuela.

But Britain, even more than France, has become economically dependent on foreign arms sales. The country's steadily worsening balance of payments problem makes these transactions a valuable source of foreign exchange, and the British military now runs comprehensive studies to determine whether a new weapon has potential for foreign sales before the government decides to buy it for its own defense.

Since coming to power in 1970, British Prime Minister Edward Heath has lifted embargoes on arms deals with South Africa and Spain, despite mounting criticism from the opposition Labor Party.

FIRST WOMAN ELECTED TO NAB BOARD

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a woman well known in my district for her many accomplishments and who now has distinguished herself nationally as the first woman to be elected to the Television Board of Directors of the National Association of Broadcasters, trade association for the entire broadcasting industry.

Kitty Broman, vice president and clerk of the Springfield Television Broadcasting Corp., and host of her own daily program, "Kitty Today," on channel 22, was elected last week at the NAB's national convention in Houston. Her election is a tribute to her familiarity with the day-to-day details and the long-range possibilities of the television industry. Mrs. Broman has served in a management capacity 18 of her 22 years at channel 22.

This highly prestigious position in the communications field is the culmination of many years of service to her community and State. She is a member of the Governor's Committee on the Status of Women, secretary of the Massachusetts Educational Communications Commission, president of the Carew Hill Girls Club, consumer adviser to the First Bank of Hampden County and a past president of the Valley Press Club—the only woman ever elected to that office.

Mrs. Broman has been honored for her service through many local and national awards—among them McCall magazine's "Gold Mike" for her service to her community and the "Woman of the Year" award of the Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce.

Personally, I can say that the qualities Kitty exhibits—her professionalism and leadership capability, along with her ability to successfully combine her duties as wife, mother, television executive and community leader—serve as a splendid example for her fellow women. Her example can make it easier for more women to be accepted in hitherto all-male strongholds.

I think I speak for the entire Springfield community when I say how proud we are of her fine work. I extend to her my heartiest congratulations for this so well-deserved honor.

PLYMOUTH CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, MINNEAPOLIS, AMNESTY RESOLUTION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Howard Conn, senior minister, the Minneapolis Plymouth Congregational Church forwarded to me a March 12 "Amnesty Resolution," the product of five Sunday morning meetings at the church. Reverend Conn indicates that 32 members of the congregation participated and:

We found surprising unanimity to the proposition that the U.S. Government should offer unconditional amnesty to all draft resisters and deserters.

Reverend Conn added in his letter transmitting the resolution:

Our people feel that amnesty means "to forget" and should not involve a judgment as to the rightness or wrongness of the acts involved.

The text of the resolution follows:

AMNESTY RESOLUTION

Whereas, the United States has granted amnesty after every war in some form or degree, as well as after several insurrections, as have other nations from time immemorial; and

Whereas, amnesty is a legal act, the law's way of forgetting past differences and political offenses so that the body politic may be given the chance to heal, and thereby strengthen our country; and

Whereas, amnesty is not a rendering of moral judgment and, therefore, may for good and proper reasons, be supported by citizens whether or not they agree with those who would receive amnesty; and

Whereas, citizens have engaged in acts of civil disobedience because of their fundamental disagreement with our government's policy on Indochina, their opposition to the draft and other military laws number in the hundreds of thousands; and

Whereas, this nation has been built on the fundamental principle of diversity of opinion and respect for conscience, and dare not abandon it; therefore

Be It Resolved, that we, the undersigned, urge the granting of a general and unconditional amnesty by the Congress of the United

States, and the President to all draft refusers, deserters, persons convicted by courts-martial for military offenses not punishable under civilian law, veterans with less than honorable discharges, and civilian protesters and resisters to the war, thus allowing full restoration of all civil, political, property and other rights.

METRIC SYSTEM IS GROWING

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the American consumer is now finding products on the grocery shelves marked in units of the metric system. An increasing number of products are appearing which are marked in both the conventional English units and the metric units. These products include Gerber baby foods, Nabisco crackers, and some breakfast cereals.

The metric bill, H.R. 11035, would provide for a program of public education to help the American housewife to learn the metric system. This bill would establish a National Metric Conversion Board with a life of 10 years to conduct this program of public education, and to assist our schoolchildren in learning the metric system. I am hopeful that this bill soon will be before the House, and I think the Members of the House will find it a constructive and reasonable bill.

An article describing the effects on the American housewife of this ongoing change to the metric system recently appeared in the Washington Post, and I insert the text for the information of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

METRIC SYSTEM IS HEADING OUR WAY

(By Joseph C. Davis)

Take a look around the canned goods and other packaged goods in your kitchen. You might be surprised to find that the weight on a few of these items is printed in metric units (grams) alongside of the units customarily used (pounds or ounces).

In the United States the practice of printing these metric equivalents started to catch on a few years ago and is becoming increasingly prevalent. Principal reasons for this development are twofold: (1) the expected changeover nationally to the metric system within the next 10 or 15 years, and (2), with these equivalents on the label, the packaged items can be exported and sold to foreign countries without having to change the box or label.

Underlying these two reasons is the tacit understanding by everyone that the metric system is much simpler than the present system.

Some companies doing the metric thing are: Gerber (baby food), McCormick (spices), Fritos (bean dip, but not potato chips), Nabisco (crackers and cookies), and Devonshire (natural food products).

The Wasa Co. of Stamford, Conn., imports the Ry-King Swedish Crisp Bread and uses both types of units on labels. Apparently the special brand packaged goods merchandised by companies such as A and P or the Safeway are not marked with equivalents because they are not exported in appreciable quantities, if at all.

Why is there near-certainty that the changeover to the metric system will come? It is coming because it is a concept whose time is here.

For one thing, the U.S. is one of the few nations of the world that either does not use the simple and practicable system or has not made a start towards its adoption. Japan adopted it in 1971 and England (since 1969) is slowly making the change. France has had it since the French Revolution. The Soviet Union has had it for years.

Technically oriented American companies are beginning to understand the need. They are starting to investigate changeover problems and are sending representatives to Europe to examine the experiences and problems of other countries. The drive in this direction and the increased interest in many sectors of our economy, resulted in a study within the last 5 years by the National Bureau of Standards, with the cooperation of industry, labor unions and other groups, to determine the feasibility and problems.

The study was made following the enactment of a public law by Congress in 1968, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to make a study "to determine advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States."

The report shows that the metric system is already used in a number of areas of our lives. Examples are prescriptions which are written in terms of milligrams, distances in track and swim events which are spelled out in meters and kilometers. Watts, kilowatt-hours, amperes and seconds, which are household words, and all parts of the metric system. Ski shoes are sold in centimeter sizes. The calorie, the unit of heat which we all try to avoid, is metric.

The Bedding Industry, the report says, planned to go metric in 1971 to eliminate odd sizes. The single mattress was to have been standardized at 100-by-200 centimeters and the double mattress at 150-by-200 centimeters. In scheduling the change, the mattress makers were helped by the fact that existing sheets, blankets and quilt sizes would fit the new beds. However, a check revealed that the mattresses in Washington still come in inches.

Experiences of conversion in Japan and England will be helpful during our conversion period. Japan adopted the system abruptly, while England decided to take the long-planning and slow-conversion route.

By implication the report favors the English method over the Japanese method.

Probably, toothpastes and cosmetics will be dispensed in grams. Food manufacturers may consider changing the weights of contents of packaged foods so as to provide a sensible series of quantities that soon will be familiar to the consumer, e.g. 125 grams as a close approximation of 1/4 pound, 250 grams for 1/2 pound, and 1 kilogram for 2 pounds.

However, some changes may shake up the householder a bit. The weather man may just overnight start quoting in degrees Celsius (Centigrade) instead of degrees Fahrenheit, or he may quote millimeters of mercury instead of inches of mercury (e.g. 29.93 inches) when he's talking about barometric pressure. Maybe air conditioner and furnace outputs will be specified in watts instead of BTU/hr. No matter, your children will explain it all to you.

JOE McNAMARA

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, one of America's foremost engineers and executives will retire on April 1. Joseph P. McNamara spent almost his entire working

life in the forefront of aerospace progress. I would like to mention a few of his contributions.

When he retired, Joe McNamara was president of Rockwell International's Space Division. This is the organization that developed and built the Apollo command and service modules that carried nine crews to the Moon and returned them safely to Earth. His division also built the Saturn S-II, second stage of the Saturn V launch vehicle. While a vice president at his company's Rocketdyne Division, Joe directed development and production of the J-2 and F-1 engines for the Saturn V—work that earned him the Distinguished Public Service Medal.

Joe McNamara helped to make space exploration a reality and the United States the leader in space achievements. In behalf of the House of Representatives, I extend him our sincerest appreciation.

BEN COLLINS HAS SERVED MASONRY AND HIS FELLOW MAN

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, some men accept things the way they are. Others give of themselves to bring about changes that will benefit their fellow man.

Such a man is my friend, Ben Collins, who will complete his year as grand master of Masons in Florida the latter part of April. It will be a milestone in what has been nearly a lifetime of service to the Masonic fraternity.

It has been a long road, a road filled with personal sacrifice and dedication by a fine young man whom I am proud to call my friend.

Ben began his Masonic service as a member of the youth group sponsored by the Masons, DeMolay. He was made a master Mason in Arlington Lodge No. 309 in Jacksonville, Fla., on March 10, 1954. He rose rapidly through the ranks of the lodge, serving as worshipful master in 1960 where he first came to the attention of State leaders as a young man with potential for service.

In 1961 he was named district deputy grand master and the opportunities for service increased tenfold. Ben is one of those fellows who never stops working. Not only was he an administrative leader, he became one of the acknowledged leaders in our State in the conferring of the various degrees and what is generally referred to as the "work."

One of the things that impressed me about Ben Collins from the day I met him was his willingness to work at the most humble of tasks. He is one of those rare individuals who are natural leaders, but is humble enough that the most insignificant of tasks is not beneath him.

It is interesting to note that Ben has attended every grand lodge session since 1954 and has served on committees such as arrangements, memorials, digest sales, Americanism, seminar for lodge officers, let your pennies make good cents, and public schools.

It is not just that he served, but that

he served so well. In the 2 years that he was chairman of the "Pennies" program, it reached new heights. This is a program where Florida Masons are asked to contribute a penny a day in support of our Masonic home.

In 1965 and 1969, he served as senior grand deacon under my good friends, Clyde Gleason and Carvie Webb, respectively. This is perhaps the highest appointive honor a grand master can confer.

Ben had time for service in the appendant bodies as Masonry became more and more a part of his life. He was active in the degrees of his Scottish Rite from 1955 to 1963, served in the oriental band of Morocco Temple from 1957 until 1963, and for 4 years served on the advisory board for the Arlington Chapter of DeMolay, a chapter he organized.

A member of the York Rite, he served as worthy patron of his Eastern Star chapter in 1956, and today proudly displays his DeMolay Legion of Honor.

The Masons of Florida honored this outstanding young man with the ultimate call to service in 1970 when they elected him their junior grand warden. The years since have seen him render yeoman service as senior grand warden, deputy grand master, and this year as grand master.

If there have been any recurring statements and themes throughout this year, Ben Collins should be remembered as the man who expressed the deep concerns felt so deeply by those who are worried about the future of the fraternity.

The continuing loss of membership by most grand jurisdictions points out the need for an assessment of where we have been and where we are going. Ben is a leader among that group which feels Masonry must always be relevant to the time and that its contributions to mankind are too important for its problems to be ignored by members and nonmembers alike.

Out of Masonry have come many bold and innovative programs that have helped the elderly, healed crippled children, fed the hungry, and helped develop our educational system.

Yes, the contributions of Masonry have been many through the years. Personally, I think that because of men like Ben Collins, it will have a new birth of enthusiasm and make itself more relevant to our time.

That task will not be easy. It never is. Yet, Ben Collins and I share a belief that the goal is too worthwhile and the end too important to mankind not to try.

Ben Collins is a professional lawman. For 13 years he was a member of the Duval County Sheriff's Department where his interest in traffic safety led him to a new career. He was a traffic safety education officer for 8 years and then joined the Jacksonville Safety Council.

Today he is the executive director of the council.

In this position, Ben has been innovative and creative. He has an unusual ability to perceive difficult problems in their proper light. Instead of cursing problems, it can be truthfully said that he goes after solutions. That is the kind

of person this great and good man really is.

Life has been good in many ways to this Presbyterian who was born in Tampa and had the pleasure of being elected grand master there last year in the only grand lodge session ever held in Tampa.

But Ben has been good to life. He is one of those rare individuals who continually give of themselves for others. Because of his friendship, so many of our lives have been enriched.

Because of his service, mankind for time to come has been enriched.

10TH DISTRICT GASOLINE DEALERS GIVE THEIR OPINIONS ON THE FUEL SHORTAGE

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the fuel shortage has affected all of us in one way or another, and in varying degrees. It has come to be a fact of life that we must live with, and try to make the best of, until solutions can be found and the crisis can be remedied.

But as much as all of us have been inconvenienced, the group of people that has been hit the hardest by the shortage perhaps are the gasoline dealers themselves.

In February, having lived with the shortage for several months, having listened to the voices of my constituents on the crisis, and trying to deal with solutions in the Congress, I embarked on a project to try to find some answers as to how the shortage was affecting the gasoline dealers in my district and their opinions on the shortage itself.

I sent an allocation survey to approximately 600 dealers throughout my district using telephone directories as a reference to try to send me to every dealer, and received a return of 23 percent. Of those responding, 53 percent were dealers in Austin, Tex., and the remaining 47 percent provided a good representation of the rest of my district.

As I indicated that all personal information in the survey would be held in strictest confidence, I feel that those dealers responding gave their true feelings and honest figures, and I feel that the survey was worded objectively and should for all purposes be considered a valid poll.

As a result of this survey, I have become more aware than ever of the different problems encountered by our gasoline dealers during this time of shortage. Many of the dealers responding to the survey complained of hard situations which we have since been able to alleviate or are presently working to alleviate. Many provided suggestions for improvements of the allocation program and for relief of the shortage, which I have passed on to the Federal Energy Office for consideration.

I also learned that the shortage took its toll by forcing several stations in my

district to completely close. This is a bitter pill to swallow, and in my mind is the saddest reality of the whole situation.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, the survey has proved to be a very beneficial tool. It has been beneficial to me as a Representative as a means of alerting me to the problems these dealers have been facing. As a direct result of the survey I have been working to try to change the base allocation period from 1972 to 1973, which I think is a much fairer base; and I have also been working closely with the FEO to try to work out discrepancies and unfair practices that have come to light as a result of the allocation program. I might not have been alerted to the need for these revisions had it not been for the response of the dealers in my district.

And I believe it has been equally beneficial to the dealers in my district who have had to live under extremely difficult conditions in this time of shortage to know that we want to try to solve their problems and are working to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the findings of my survey at this point in the RECORD:

GASOLINE ALLOCATION SURVEY RESULTS

There were 134 replies out of approximately 600 sent out, giving an approximate return of 23% to the survey.

4% of those responding purchase petroleum supplies independently; while 96% deal with a major oil company.

39% of those responding purchase their wholesale gasoline from a jobber; while 63% purchase directly from the company. (The discrepancy here which makes the total 102% is due to the fact that several dealers replied that they purchase from both a jobber and a major company.)

Under the new allocation system, each dealership should be receiving the same monthly wholesale deliveries as in the same month of 1972, or as much of that amount as oil company reserves will allow. This survey took place in the month of February, and the figures for February, 1972, and February, 1974, were requested in the survey. Of those responding, 9% gave no answer and 16% gave figures only for one year, thus rendering their reply useless for computation purposes. 6% indicated that their supplies were the same in 1974 as they were in 1972; 5% indicated that in 1974 their supplies were greater than in 1972; and 63% indicated that their supplies were greater in 1972 than in 1974.

When asked for figures for supplies in December of 1973, an intermediate month, 43% replied that their supplies were greater than they were in either 1972 or 1974. 15% gave either no answer or information irrelevant to computation.

When asked if major companies are trying to put independents out of business, 27% answered "yes," 36% answered "no," 31% were undecided, and 6% gave no answer.

When asked if major companies have caused you inconvenience, 64% replied "yes," 25% replied "no," 5% were undecided, and 6% gave no answer.

When asked if you believe the fuel shortage is real, 25% replied "yes," 54% replied "no," 19% were undecided, and 2% gave no answer.

When asked if gasoline would become too expensive were price controls to be removed, 22% replied "yes," 58% replied "no," 17% were undecided, and 3% gave no answer.

When asked if your supplier is doing the best possible job under the circumstances, 61% replied "yes," 19% replied "no," 16% were undecided, and 4% gave no answer.

At the end of the survey, it was requested that any additional comments be added to the survey in a blank space. 61% did jot

down additional comments, which have been or are in the process of being replied to, and 39% had no additional comments.

In an attempt to ascertain the efficiency of the gasoline allocation system, I am distributing this questionnaire to each gasoline dealer in the 10th Congressional District.

At the end of the questionnaire are spaces for the name and location of your dealership. Please feel free to delete names if you desire, but I am asking that the city in which your dealership is located be included. All information in this survey will be held in strictest confidence.

ALLOCATION SURVEY

1. Does your dealership sell gasoline from a major oil company, or do you purchase supplies independently? Independent —, Major Oil Company —.

2. From whom do you purchase your wholesale gasoline? Jobber? —, Directly from company? —.

3. Under the new allocation system, your dealership should be receiving the same monthly wholesale deliveries as in the same month of 1972, or as much of that amount as oil company reserves will allow. In February, 1974, how much fuel will be available to you through your wholesaler? How much was available to you in February, 1972? Feb., 1974 — gal., Feb., 1972 — gal.

4. How much wholesale gasoline was available to you in December, 1973 under the voluntary allocation system? Dec., 1973 — gal.

Please check yes, no or undecided on the following questions:

5. Are major companies trying to put independents out of business?

6. Have the major companies caused you inconvenience?

7. Do you believe the fuel shortage is real?

8. Would gasoline become too expensive if price controls were removed?

9. Is your supplier doing the best possible job under the circumstances?

10. If you have additional comment or suggestions on the mandatory allocation program, please enter them in the space below.

JOSEPH McNAMARA

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, a man will retire on April 1 who deserves our acknowledgment and gratitude. He is Joseph McNamara, former president of the Space Division of Rockwell International. Few men in the aerospace industry can match his contributions to the national space program.

Before he joined the Space Division, he had earned the highest honor given a non-Government employee: the Distinguished Public Service Medal. This was in recognition of his work in directing the production of the Saturn V's J-2 and F-1 engines. The Space Division, which he headed from 1970 until his retirement, produced the Saturn S-II booster for the Saturn V Moon rocket and the command and service modules for both the lunar-landing and Skylab programs. Other Space Division work initiated under his direction includes development of the docking module for the Apollo-Soyuz test project and design and development of the Space Shuttle orbiter.

Mr. McNamara's interests, however,

are much broader than aerospace. He served on special industrial committees of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and the California Manufacturers' Association. He also was recognized for his civic activities by the community of Neosho, Mo., which presented him its Outstanding Citizen's Award.

I know all of you will join me in wishing Mr. McNamara the very best in his retirement years.

A SCOUT SPEAKS ABOUT SCOUTING

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, a young constituent of mine, Leo Cabezas, a Star Scout in St. Ann's Roman Catholic Troop 25, recently delivered a speech at a dinner in Washington sponsored by the Boy Scouts of America.

It is my privilege and honor to include Mr. Cabezas' remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. After reading it, I am sure that my colleagues will concur with the observation of the Honorable William Simon, guest speaker at the dinner, that Leo's speech was the main event of the evening:

SCOUTING

I have been in Scouting for two and a half years. During that time I have advanced from tenderfoot to star Scout. And in another year I plan to complete my Eagle Badge Requirements. Some of the requirements are hard. Citizenship in the Nation was a lot of work. There was a lot of reading and a lot of writing to do to earn that one. I learned what goes on inside of buildings such as the United States Capitol, and The Supreme Court. Then last spring my troop took a trip to Washington, D.C. and I really got to walk into those buildings where all these things are done.

I guess the trip to Washington is the kind of thing I like about being a Scout. We get to do things. It could be a camping trip, swimming, cleaning the church yard, hockey games, touring West Point and a lot of things. Scouting is fun. My assistant Scoutmaster says that the reason he is still in Scouting is because of what he got to do as a Scout. And the same goes for me. I guess you might consider Scouting an investment. I don't know a lot about the future and am just learning about the past. But I do know that I will be living in the future. I know that what I am learning in Scouting will help me in the future.

A guy like me doesn't always do something because it is good for me. I do things for a variety of reasons. I learned the Scout Oath and Law because learning them was part of the requirements for the Tenderfoot Badge. But I remember them and as time goes on I better understand what trustworthy, loyal, brave, thrifty and all the others mean. I can't even say I have advanced in Scouting because that would be good for me. A lot of times I do something because the guys in the troop have done them. The guy who got me into Scouting, my friend Victor, became an Eagle Scout a couple of weeks ago. And I want to prove that what Victor, who is fourteen, can do, I can.

Scouting is learning how to work with other Scouts, and learning how to lead. Scouting is being aware of your neighborhood and the world and learning what you

want to be in that world. A guy like me has a lot of different ways he can go in the city. Not all of them are so good. To me Scouting is showing me a good way and is fun at the same time.

Now my troop has started on a new project. We are going to do what we can to learn how to conserve energy. I don't know all the facts or the reasons why the energy situation has happened. But I, as a Scout and my troop can learn how to not waste energy and to give other people the facts about energy conservation. We're going to keep in mind the slogan think a little and save a watt.

There are a lot of other cool guys who could tell you about Scouting as well as I can. Maybe even better. They might not even have to use a chair. I am just an average guy. An average Scout. I am not perfect and I don't know what being perfect is. But I think I am learning how to be a better person by being a Scout. And I know that all the other Cubs, Scouts and Explorers in New York City thank you, as do I, for your support for Scouting.

JOLIET NAMED TO NATIONAL EDUCATION PROJECT

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, in my hometown of Joliet, Ill., educators and community leaders have long recognized the importance of strong career and vocational education programs.

Through their cooperative efforts, Joliet has produced some of the most successful programs in this field so it comes as no surprise to me that Joliet was recently chosen to design a prototype career and vocational education program as part of a national demonstration project.

I would like to take this opportunity to give special recognition to Joliet's educators for their outstanding work in occupational education and am inserting for the RECORD an article from the Joliet Herald-News describing the new project their districts will be participating in.

The article follows:

JOLIET NAMED FOR NATIONAL PROJECT

(By Meg Fletcher)

Joliet school districts have been chosen for a national demonstration project to devise an exemplary career and vocational education program for students from kindergarten through sophomore year in college.

The three-year \$225,000 project is a cooperative venture between the three school districts—grade school, high school and junior college, it was announced at a joint press conference today.

The tri-district proposal was approved for an urban demonstration project in competition with 13 other districts by the state Division of Vocational and Technical Education and the federal Office of Education. It will be federally funded with \$75,000 each of the three years.

"This is one of the best things we have gotten out of the federal government," according to U.S. Rep. George O'Brien (R-Joliet). He attended the breakfast conference at the grade school's administration building with about 60 other school and commu-

nity leaders. "The whole nation will look on us as a prototype," O'Brien said.

Sen. Charles Percy (R-Illinois) sent a congratulatory telegram.

"Occupational education is the highest priority in education," according to Sherwood Dees, director of the state board of vocational education and rehabilitation's division of vocational and technical education.

It is estimated that students in the elementary schools today will change their occupations eight to 10 times during their lifetimes, according to Dees. Training is a key to success, and Illinois is a leader in career education in both elementary and secondary schools, he said.

Named to direct the project is Thomas Boldrey, 30, former coordinator of vocational education for the Joliet Grade School District. The Joliet Township High School District will serve as the administrative district.

The choice of Joliet for the demonstration project is not surprising, according to Dr. Donald D'Amico, grade school superintendent. "Project JOLIET (the grade school's career education program) is the single most successful program of its kind in the nation," he said.

Education comes alive and learning is meaningful after students have direct contact with workers and related classroom experiences, D'Amico said.

The career demonstration project will mean closer coordination between the districts' ongoing career programs and the elimination of possible duplication of effort, according to Dr. Arthur Bruning, high school superintendent.

Among the junior college's career programs which will be expanded during the project are systems for self-paced learning, computerized career information and a nationally-noted program for determining career objectives, according to Dr. Harold McAninch, Joliet Junior College president.

Director Boldrey said the career and vocational education project will mean implementation and coordination of a broad range of projects including planning tools, delivery system, curriculum, evaluation procedures and guidance orientation. No new buildings are needed for the project.

Between now and July 1 the emphasis will be on planning. The summer and 1974-75 school year will be used for staff development and in-service training, the development of new programs and the expansion of old ones, Boldrey said. During the 1975-76 school year educators from all over the nation will be visiting Joliet schools and they will be supplied with information so they can establish similar programs in their schools, he said.

Boldrey emphasized that the entire community played a role in Joliet's selection as the demonstration center. "Local government, business and industry have demonstrated an ability and willingness to cooperate with the schools. This cooperation has been a key factor in the success of several previous programs."

**DÉTENTE, PEACE AT ANY PRICE
ALWAYS COSTS MORE THAN
WAR**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the administration, relying on a legal ruling from the Attorney General, has resumed its détente pro-

gram of Export-Import Bank credit loans to the Soviet Union to the tune of \$44.4 million, is only exceeded by the awaited anticipation from consumers to the arrival of the new Soviet automobiles on the American marketplace.

Reportedly, this latest taxpayers' subsidy of the failures of communism in the Soviet Union bring to a total to Soviet Eximbank loans from the U.S. taxpayers of \$299.4 million. We are told that we are subsidizing an international trade center in Moscow, natural gas exploration, installation of machinery for a truck factory on the Kama River, a canal, a valve-making plant, and helping this country's balance of payments.

In addition, we learn that the Soviet Union has now engaged three West German firms, including Krupp, the Nazi arms manufacturer, to build a huge steel mill at Kursk.

In the meantime, while the U.S. industrialists and their counterparts under the Soviet system continue to reap the benefits of détente, in Detroit, Mich., we learn that 100,000 U.S. autoworkers are now on food stamps, not because they are striking, but because they are indefinitely unemployed.

Concern arises among the American workers despite the assurances from the administration that the cost of détente would be softened because those workers displaced by imports are being assured of a payment from the Federal Treasury representing 70 percent of their average weekly pay for the first year and 65 percent for the second year.

Congress is now faced with a military supplemental authorization bill to come up with an additional \$500 million for Vietnam, an additional \$1.9 billion for the Middle East readiness and an additional \$29 million to fortify the tiny island of Diego Garcia. All this is a result of the failures of détente at any price to stop the aggression of international communism out of its home base in Moscow.

Détente, a relaxation of strained relations or tensions, is a price that should be borne multilaterally in concessions. To date, the entire cost of détente is borne unilaterally by the American taxpayers, with the Soviet Union receiving all concessions and giving nothing.

If the very purpose of détente is to help prevent another war, which is what Dr. Kissinger claims, then why are we asked to spend all these tax dollars on additional armaments? Are we expected to believe that peace costs so much more than war?

What have the American people gotten out of the so-called détente?

Related newsclippings follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 1974]

EX-IM BANK RESUMES CREDITS FOR SOVIETS
(By Dan Morgan)

The Nixon administration, buttressed by a legal ruling from the Attorney General after 12 days of uncertainty, resumed its program of credits to the Soviet Union yesterday with a \$44.4 million package of loans.

The administration's announcement that it was going ahead with the credits to the Soviet Union and three other Communist nations ended a brief showdown between the White House and Congress over the program,

which is a key element in the policy of expanded economic cooperation with the Communist world.

The credits had been halted March 11 over a legal technicality.

After Attorney General William B. Saxbe upheld the loans' legality, the U.S. Export-Import Bank yesterday approved a total of \$74.9 million in credits for 11 projects in the Soviet Union, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia.

Included in the \$44.4 million in loans earmarked for American projects in the Soviet Union was financing for constructing and equipping the \$80 million international trade center in Moscow. The center in symbolic because it is to be the headquarters for American and possibly other Western businessmen seeking to expand trade with the Soviet Union.

White House officials had indicated concern about the unexpected suspension of the loans last week. One purpose of Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger's trip to Moscow, which is to start this weekend, is to convey the message that the Nixon administration is ready and able to continue its policy of economic cooperation.

Soviets officials had begun to express concern about the future of this cooperation.

The Senate is considering a trade bill whose provisions—opposed by the administration—would have the effect of cutting off the credits and denying Moscow's exports to this country preferential tariff treatment.

A number of senators — have attacked the government credits and guarantees as a form of unjustified "foreign aid" to the United States' main adversary.

Yesterday's action was also a sign to Congress that the administration will fight for détente.

Sen. — said yesterday that he was "greatly disappointed" with the Attorney General's upholding of the legality of the credits. Last week Schweiker released a finding from the General Accounting Office—the investigative arm of Congress—that the credits to the Communist countries had been extended under an illegal procedure.

Export-Import Bank President William J. Casey told — at a private meeting yesterday that Saxbe had concurred in the resumption of the loans.

The GAO had contended that the President should have made a finding that each individual transaction involving a Communist country was in the national interest and reported this to Congress.

— said last week that he favors East-West trade but fears that huge sums of American capital will be invested in Siberian natural gas developments, instead of in energy exploration at home.

Yesterday he introduced a measure to block Soviet-American energy deals and to prevent the bank from approving a pending loan application for \$49.5 million for natural gas exploration by an American consortium in the Soviet province of Yakutsk.

The four loans approved yesterday for Soviet projects will finance the construction of the trade center, as well as the shipment and installation of machinery for a motor factory, a canal and a value-making plant.

At the time the bank ordered suspension of business with Communist countries "pending clarification" last week, it had extended \$255 million in direct loans for Soviet projects. The credits have promoted an upsurge in American exports and, the administration argues, helped this country's balance of payments.

Yesterday's decision also cleared the way for approval of financing for a number of projects involving petrochemicals, computer systems, textiles, aircraft sales and machine plants in Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia.

Two deals involving the sale of four Boeing aircraft to Yugoslavia—blocked after the GAO ruling—were ratified by the bank yesterday.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 1974]
KRUPP AT KURSK

BONN—The government announced that the Soviet Union has agreed to pay three West German firms, including Krupp the wartime arms manufacturer, \$1 billion to help build a huge steel mill at Kursk, 280 miles southwest of Moscow.

Krupp, Salzgitter A. G. and Korf Stahl are to provide the equipment and technology for direct reduction of iron ore. The plant will have an annual capacity of 5 million tons of iron pellets and 2.7 million tons of rolled steel, according to the Soviet news agency Tass.

[From the Washington Star-News, Mar. 17, 1974]

THE RUSSIANS ARE COMING—MAYBE
(By Charles Yarbrough)

Confirming rumors of the last year or so, a recent dispatch from Dow-Jones says the Russians are indeed thinking of putting one of their subcompacts into the American market.

The story says the Soviets will take about six months to decide "after taking into consideration such problems as U.S. tariffs, safety and emission standards."

Covering that course in a mere half a year would be an achievement itself.

Even United States auto builders are still bewildered.

What the Russians are being called upon to consider—and anticipate—are such governmental dictates as the environmental plumbing system and what's coming (or disappearing): interlock ignition systems; air bags—or something better; bumper standards and how to make fuel out of wheat.

Most likely Russian automotive candidate for the U.S. market appears to be the Lada, which Dow Jones compared loosely with the Fiat 124.

It could be expected that performance figures for the trim little car as it is currently operating in Russia will be deflated when American gadgetry is applied.

Examples: Claims of 27.7 miles per gallon and a top speed of 87 miles an hour.

The Lada has a four-cylinder, in-line engine with 73.1 cubic inches and 65 horsepower; a five-bearing crankshaft and overhead cam; a two-barrel Weber carburetor. Four-speed transmission is manual.

Its dry weight of 1,962 pounds is on a 95-inch wheel base.

It comes, at least in the Russian version, only as a saloon-sedan four-door for five passengers; bucket seats in front. Price was not available at this writing.

Were it not for U.S. standards—toughest in the world—this country could be deluged with imports most motorists here have never seen, including more from Russia. Almost comparable are the Zaz 968, the Moskvich and the Volga.

(A contrast would be the Zil 114 limousine of 7,000 pounds and eight cylinders and a top speed of 118 miles an hour).

Rough comparisons could be made of the Lada and the British Ford Cortina 1300; the French Citroen GS Berline and the Peugeot 204, plus a half dozen small cars from the Japanese.

No comparison at all could be made with the Ford Pinto, Chevrolet Vega, AMC Gremlin.

Nearest thing to a comparison even in names diligent auto historians might be able to ferret out, might be "Lad's Car," a juvenile "auto" for two small passengers, which was produced in kit form at Niagara Falls, N.Y., from 1912 to 1914.

Or, the "Lady," a 2½ horsepower creation which flitted into history from Coventry, England, in 1899.

Its distinction, other than brevity, was a two-seater body.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 23, 1974]
UAW SEEKS CURES ON AUTO IMPORTS

(By Dan Morgan)

The president of the United Auto Workers called on Congress yesterday to institute temporary restrictions on foreign car imports to relieve a job situation in the industry "more disastrous than anything since the Great Depression."

UAW leader Leonard Woodcock warned in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee that unless Congress imposed quotas, foreign small car manufacturers could seize 30 per cent of the American market while United States plants were changing over to production of more economical models.

At the same time, Woodcock outlined a shift in his union's traditional support of free trade measures. He said that his organization "rejected in its entirety" the administration's trade reform bill because of "woefully inadequate" provisions for compensating workers and communities hurt by imports.

Most of the American labor movement, led by President George Meany's AFL-CIO, supports provisions of a far more protectionist measure introduced in the Senate and in the House.

Woodcock told — that the UAW is "still not standing along with the rest of the labor movement in supporting your bill." But he made clear that the energy crisis, which he said has resulted in the unemployment rate of 20 to 25 per cent in Flint, Mich., required stronger safeguards on job protection.

Woodcock said that Congress should empower the President to approve quotas, or, as an alternative, a temporary increase in tariff rates. He said either restriction should end in the fall of 1975, by which time the domestic industry would have had time to satisfy the demand for smaller, more economical cars. Canadian imports, which include United States makes manufactured there, should be exempted from the restrictions, he said.

"Let me underline that we have taken this step most reluctantly," he said in his written statement. "We have no interest in sheltering the American industry from the competition of more efficient foreign producers. . . . We are not GM's spear carriers."

According to the UAW president, this country's 3 per cent automobile tariff is lower than those of the European Common Market (11 per cent) or Japan (6.4 per cent).

The administration's bill, approved by the House in December, 272 to 140, gives the President broad discretion to negotiate internationally for lower tariffs and more liberal world trade.

The House measure also provides that workers displaced by imports would receive 70 per cent of an average weekly pay for half a year and 65 per cent for the second year.

Woodcock said this is inadequate in light of the fact that 100,000 auto workers are indefinitely unemployed and the rate of unemployment in Michigan now is 10.6 per cent.

U.S. OIL EQUIPMENT SOLD TO RUSSIA
(By Paul Scott)

Washington, D.C.—With the U.S. facing a serious energy shortage, one would expect that all American equipment and supplies would be going to develop new oil and gas resources inside the U.S.

This assumption is a very logical one, but this isn't exactly what is now going on.

The astonishing facts are that U.S. oil equipment and service suppliers are now well on their way toward selling a billion dollars worth of their products to Russia with the full blessing and encouragement of the Nixon Administration.

In many instances, loans from the U.S. Export-Import Bank, the government's international lending agency, is financing the deals with the Soviet Union seemingly in defiance of the will of Congress.

Examples of a few of these sale contracts negotiated by U.S. corporations with the Kremlin in recent months include:

\$80 million worth of ball valves from Cameron Iron Company;

\$42 million worth of crawler tractors for pipeline construction, from International Harvester;

\$20 million worth of valves from Wallwoeth Company;

\$3.5 million worth of oil exploration items from Halliburton-Welch and Dress Industries;

\$2.5 million worth of anti-blowout controls from Koomsey-Stewart-Stevenson;

500 submersible oil pumps from Reeder Pump and Byron Jackson;

Thousands of tons of pipeline coating from Kendall Polychemical.

Commerce Department officials report that more and bigger deals of this kind are in the offing and are currently under negotiation.

Armco Steel Corporation has just signed a five-year scientific and technical exchange agreement with the Soviet Union. This company, a subsidiary of gigantic U.S. Steel, will trade with Russia in the field of iron metallurgy and in offshore oil field equipment.

Occidental Petroleum Corporation has obtained preliminary approval for developing Siberian gas fields with the aid of funds from a consortium of American banks, and is now seeking additional funds from U.S. Export-Import bank to finance the deal.

While the gas is supposed to eventually come to the U.S., at an unspecified future date, American Intelligence Authorities have warned the White House that there really is no guarantee that this part of the commitment would be carried out.

"Who can believe that the Soviet Union would be any more reluctant than the smaller Arab nations have been lately to turn off any supplies of oil and gas we might obtain from their territory in order to influence U.S. foreign policy," states one CIA official.

CONGRESSIONAL OPPOSITION

The financing of U.S. trade with low interest loans from the Export-Import Bank is being vigorously opposed in Congress by a bi-partisan group of lawmakers headed by Representative Richard H. Ichord (D-Mo.), and Representative John Ashbrook (R-O.). Their position is outlined in a memorandum now being circulated in the House, stating:

"We believe that American financing of Soviet gas exploration at this particular time in history, especially at an interest rate of 6 percent (which is in effect to be subsidized by the American taxpayers), smacks not only of poor business judgment but suggests a disregard for our national security. Every nation's defense capacity is directly related to its energy resources."

The Ichord-Ashbrook group is now seeking a congressional inquiry into how U.S. trade and credit policies are adversely affecting the nation's security position in the world.

The lawmakers have joined with 135 other House members in urging the passage of a resolution which would bar any further Export-Import financing for deals with the Soviet Union until after the Senate acts on the Trade Reform Act which is now pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

The objective is to force the Export-Import bank to end their lending to Russia until the whole question of financing U.S. trade, es-

March 26, 1974

pecially that involving U.S. oil equipment and supplies to Russia, can be fully debated in the Senate.

Note. In addition to \$750,000,000 credits granted Russia by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Export-Import Bank has granted loans totaling \$160 million to the USSR. The Bank also has made tentative commitments to give Russia another \$200 million.

REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT U.S. SUBSIDIZATION OF SOVIET ENERGY DEALS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, despite our country's own energy shortages—which are profound—the United States is undertaking the resumption of credits so the Soviet Union can proceed with mammoth energy and fuel production projects. I think this is wrong. I think we ought to concentrate our efforts—and spend our taxpayers' moneys—on meeting our own energy needs, before we start building the energy resources of our principal adversary within the world community.

What is particularly distressing about the latest announcement is the way in which the administration is circumventing the clear intent of the Congress, as well as a recent ruling by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The General Accounting Office, which is headed by the Comptroller General, recently ruled that the President of the United States should have to make a finding, with respect to each potential credit transaction, that the extension of credit to a Communist country was "in the national interest" of the United States. I repeat—the national interest of the United States—not that of the Soviet Union. The GAO ruling was made public by the senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Representative BLACKBURN from Georgia, who, together with many Members of the Senate and House, myself included, has opposed the extension of credits to the Soviet Union, unless such credits were predicated upon an actual showing by the Soviet Union that it was relaxing significantly its internal restraints on political freedom. Such demonstrations have not, of course, been shown.

In the face of nearly three-fourths of the Senators supporting the holding back of credit extensions until changes are made within the Soviet Union, in face of the House-passed version of the proposed Trade Reform Act containing such a holdback requirement, and in face of the specific ruling of the Comptroller General/General Accounting Office, the administration, through the Attorney General, has proceeded to OK massive energy related credits to the Soviet Union.

On Friday, March 22, the administration resumed credits, announcing a \$44.4 million loan package with the Soviet Union. The administration announced,

at that time, that it was also going ahead with such trade packages for three other Communist nations. The total approved that day—for the Soviet Union, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia—totaled \$74.9 million. These credits are underwritten by the credit of the United States, through the Export-Import Bank, and to the degree that those credit arrangements are at an interest less than that borrowed by the Government of the United States to stand behind them, they actually constitute a subsidy to those Communist nations.

These matters cannot be allowed to go either unnoticed or without restriction.

Last Friday, Senator SCHWEIKER introduced a measure in the Senate, S. 3229, which would prohibit Soviet energy investments unwritten by U.S. credits.

Today, I am pleased to cosponsor this measure by sponsoring its introduction in the House. The bill, the Soviet Energy Investment Prohibition Act, would prohibit any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States from directly or indirectly providing assistance to finance or otherwise promote the export of any commodity, product, or service from the United States, if the intended use of such commodity, product, or service involves energy research and development or energy exploration in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

I think that we ought to spend American tax dollars building up American fuel inventories. There is an overwhelming need—as the recent Arab embargo showed us—for the United States to obtain greater independence from reliance on foreign fuel sources. I do not believe we should ever abandon the consumption of foreign produced fuels; to do so would be to forfeit those sources to other nations—like the Soviet Union. But, I do believe we must do all we can to increase production, for that is the real key to ending the lines and driving prices back down. We can increase production only when there is adequate exploration and recovery of domestic sources. I never want to see a single American waiting in a gasoline filling station line because we sent money to the Soviet Union to develop its fuels, instead of spending it on developing our own, nor do I believe we should subsidize the development of Siberian natural gas fields which will cost the consumers in my State of New York and this country higher prices for this important source of clean fuel.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the leadership of the Committee on Banking and Currency, whose committee has legislative jurisdiction over such foreign credit transactions, to consider prompt action on this legislation. It is needed by the American people, and it is needed by them now.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained yes-

terday and was unable to be in the Chamber for two rollcall votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on roll No. 107 and "nay" on roll No. 108.

AHEPA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Order of AHEPA it was my distinct honor to join with many of my colleagues on Monday night at their 21st biennial national banquet in honor of Members of Congress. As in the past it is an event which I took great pride in attending, and this year's edition was in the usual fine tradition of excellence.

It is significant that this year's American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association dinner fell on the same day that many other Hellenic-Americans were celebrating the 153d anniversary of Greek Independence Day. It is a day when we reflect on the enormous contributions of the Greek nation and people to the democracy we enjoy today.

The history of the Greek nation is rich with cultural and educational achievements. It is one of the sociological and cultural wonders of modern times that the nation of Greece was able to maintain its cultural identity, nationalistic pride and consciousness after 4 centuries of Ottoman rule.

By the time Constantinople fell in 1453, the Turks controlled the entire Greek mainland. Under Turkish rule Greece was partitioned and polarized into numerous administrative and military districts. As the Ottoman Empire began its slow deterioration, the economic and social position of the Greeks became increasingly unbearable. Corruption and military defeats led to increased taxation as the marked contrasts between the advances of Europe and the stagnation of the Ottoman Empire grew greater.

Another source of extreme humiliation and injustice which the Greeks faced during this era was the conscription of their children for what was known as the Janissary Corporation. Every 4 years, one fifth of all young Christian males were conscripted and sent to Constantinople to be reared in the Moslem faith and to serve the Sultan as his personal bodyguard. For centuries this body constituted the mainstay of the Sultan's personal authority and insured the military superiority of the Empire.

In 1821 the Greeks revolted, proclaiming their independence under a constitution. This struggle continued until 1831 when Greek independence was established under the monarchy of the Bavarian prince, Otto.

We in America would do well to take time and reflect on the Greek contribution to the freedoms and liberties we enjoy today. As we approach our bicentennial celebration, let us use the inscrip-

tion of the National Archives Building which reads "What Is Past Is Prologue" to serve as a tribute to the great Greek nation and people who have contributed so much to this Nation.

SUPPORT OF SPORTSMEN VALUED

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, because I value my reputation as a friend of sportsmen and am proud of my record in Congress, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent release issued by my good friend, Arthur Wager, vice president of the New York State Conservation Council:

NEWS RELEASE OF ARTHUR WAGER

"An apparent deliberate distortion of the record of a Congressman who over the years has proved a loyal friend of area sportsmen," Arthur Wager, Vice-President of the New York State Conservation Council, and past President and present Director of the Dutchess County Federation of Fish and Game Clubs today labeled a recent release from Seattle, Washington, attacking the record of Congressman Hamilton Fish, Jr.

The release, which appeared in area papers last weekend, criticized Congressman Fish for being absent on a December 21, 1970 vote to exempt 22 rim fire ammunition from the 1968 Gun Control Act, and for allegedly "refusing" to introduce legislation to repeal the 1968 Act at the request of the Federated Sportsmen's Clubs of Ulster County.

"On both counts the release distorted the facts," Wager said. "Among other things, the release neglected to point out that Congressman Fish was among the original sponsors of the legislation to repeal the 1968 controls on 22 rim fire ammunition, as well as the fact the bill passed the House by a vote of 246 to 59, something Congressman Fish knew would happen."

Wager said he had seen a copy of the letter from Congressman Fish to Frederick Faerber III of the Ulster County Federation in which the release alleged Congressman Fish "refused" to introduce the proposed repeal legislation.

"What Congressman Fish did tell Mr. Faerber was that two bills (H.R. 216 and H.R. 957) proposing the repeal of the 1968 Act had already been introduced and were under consideration in the House Judiciary Committee and assured Mr. Faerber that in addition to transmitting the organizations views to the Committee, he would keep them in mind during future deliberations on the legislation," Wager explained.

"From the number of half truths contained in the release, it seems clear to me that for some reason some organization is deliberately attempting to discredit the record of one of the best friends gunners of our area have ever had in Congress," Mr. Wager said.

Mr. Wager said that it was due to this record that Congressman Fish was the first Member of the House of Representatives to ever receive the Sportsman Conservation award as "Congressman of the Year," presented by the New York State Conservation Council.

"I might also point out that Congressman Fish is supporting repeal of control over black powder sale, as well as also still backing the repeal of the control over 22 rim fire cartridges, which although it passed the House in 1970 never became law as the Senate failed to act on the measure," Mr. Wager concluded.

IS SCIENCE WILDLIFE'S BEST HOPE FOR THE FUTURE?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, both simple and sophisticated scientific devices are helping man today keep track of species of wildlife and the following article in the National Wildlife publication by the National Wildlife Federation explains the progress and status of these worthy efforts:

IS SCIENCE WILDLIFE'S BEST HOPE FOR THE FUTURE?

(By Peter Gwynne)

Orbiting around the Earth, a Nimbus-B weather satellite helps wildlife researchers in Florida to track the baffling migratory routes of turtles across hundreds of uncharted ocean miles. Situated in one corner of a small laboratory in New York City, a high-powered scanning electron microscope enables scientists to identify animals from a single strand of hair or silver of skin.

From the cosmic to the microscopic, many of the same disciplines that contributed to the demise of certain animal species—chemistry, weaponry, even behavioral science—are now playing an instrumental role in bringing them back. But in an age of cybernetics, optical physics and ethology, perhaps the most significant wildlife breakthroughs are occurring in the preeminently natural process of propagation.

All other factors being equal, of course, the key to the survival of any species is its ability to reproduce. As it happens, however, all other factors decidedly have not been equal. And until recently, the options for breeding endangered species under controlled conditions have been limited to two very different environments: game parks that attempted to duplicate life in the wild, including predators and competitors for food, and ordinary zoos that offered protection from such challenges—but precious little else. Such zoo creatures as the big cats and the great apes—animals that are almost as selective in their choice of mates as humans—can hardly be expected to propagate in a sterile environment with a mate they might not find compatible.

Between these two extremes, however, a number of other scientific techniques for encouraging reproduction are emerging. Some are being applied in sanctuaries where animals are protected from all hazards, both human and animal, but left to their own devices in breeding. Other methods are used in wildlife "farms," where small breeding herds of endangered animals are carefully combined in replicas of their natural environments with other animals. And for those animals which are almost over the edge of extinction, scientists are developing methods of collecting and banking sperm that should allow impregnation of females of the species anywhere in the world, helping to ensure survival.

The fabled whooping cranes offer a classic example of how scientific techniques can be used to increase the population of a species. Only a century ago, the tall white birds with black wingtips ranged far and wide over the North American continent. But they were rapidly decimated by the onrush of man and, by 1916, their numbers had fallen so low that an international agreement was signed to protect them. Since then, two sanctuaries have been established, 2,500 miles apart, to help keep the whoopers alive. The birds winter at the 47,000-acre Aransas National Wildlife Refuge on the Gulf Coast of Texas, and they breed during the summer at the Wood

Buffalo National Park in the north central region of Canada.

But although every possible precaution has been taken in the sanctuaries to protect the cranes from interference by man and beast, only 51 of the birds were counted two years ago. Sadly, wildlife officials concluded that more than a dozen cranes had perished in the preceding year. Under those circumstances, a more active and direct means of stimulating whooper production is clearly essential. And scientists in the United States and Canada have cooperated in a novel scheme to do just that.

At both ends of the whoopers' migratory trail, studies have shown that only a quarter of their eggs laid in Canada produce young birds that show up in Texas. One reason for the loss is lack of adequate parental protection for the youngest birds. Normally, each female whooper lays two eggs. The first chick to hatch enjoys the undivided attention of both parents—but only until the second egg hatches. Then, each chick is cared for by only one parent and, under that arrangement, mortality is high.

In one experiment, Canadian wildlife biologists entered the whooper breeding areas in the Wood Buffalo park and took one egg from each nest. As a result, the parents could devote themselves to the solitary remaining egg and, when it hatched, to the single chick. The chick therefore received twice as much parental protection as it would under normal circumstances, giving it an increased chance of survival. Eggs were taken only during odd-numbered years, and since the experiment began more young cranes arrived in Aransas from the flocks hatched in these same odd-numbered years. So removing one egg from each nest has actually increased the numbers of birds surviving.

Meanwhile, the eggs taken by the wildlife officials are rushed by jet to the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Laurel, Maryland, to be hatched under conditions best fitted to the comfort of any young crane—apart from the lack of parents. So far, the center has produced about 20 whoopers of its own, all of which live in captivity. Currently, the staff at Patuxent is considering a variety of methods for getting those cranes back into the wild. Among the possibilities are release of juvenile whoopers alone in the Canadian breeding areas, release of juveniles accompanied by adult cranes, and even release of fertile eggs. The latter scheme involves a large "cuckoo-style" operation: the whooper eggs may be placed in the nests of wild sandhill cranes in northern Canada. Hopefully, the sandhills will hatch the whoopers and escort them on their first migration south. In this way, an entirely new whooping crane flock may be established under similar refuge conditions to the present flock—if the sandhills, the whoopers and the elements all cooperate.

The sanctuary concept is not, of course, restricted to birds. A major effort is now underway in India, Nepal and Bangladesh to create a series of refuges for the Bengal tiger, whose numbers have fallen to not more than a few thousand. But for most threatened mammals, and particularly the big cats, a supervised life in natural surroundings is impossible both financially and practically. Thus the best hope of survival through accelerated reproduction remains the zoo—or at least, an offshoot of the conventional zoo designed in the light of knowledge of animal behavior.

In the normal zoo, the problem of persuading any male and female animal to mate is all but insolvable. "You can't take animals from a rain forest, stick them on a concrete slab, and expect them to reproduce," notes one zoologist. "How would you feel if you were locked up for thirty years in a cage with a partner you couldn't stand?" And certainly, zoo breeding successes have come slowly.

The first lowland gorilla was not born in

captivity until 1956; the first baby cheetah did not arrive until 1960, and the first giant panda has yet to be produced. At zoos in both New Orleans and San Antonio, whooping cranes have been bred in captivity. But probably the best-known tale of zoo breeding concerns the spectacular failure of keepers in the London and Moscow zoos to breed their giant pandas, Chi Chi and An An, who eight years ago were the only members of their species in captivity outside the Chinese mainland.

Though habitat destruction is the biggest threat to endangered wildlife, in some conservationist circles conventional zoos have been singled out for blame. According to Jeremy Mallinson, zoological director of the Wildlife Preservation Trust on the Channel Island of Jersey, every animal on exhibit in a city zoo represents about nine of the same species that have died either from disease contracted during captivity, or from poor handling. But in recent years, a number of zoos and wildlife organizations have set up animal breeding farms that, while open to spectators on a limited basis, have the primary purpose of increasing the world's stock of threatened species.

The philosophy behind these "planned sanctuaries" is simple enough: build up larger herds of animals than conventional zoos either want or can afford; keep them in surroundings as close to their natural habitats as possible, and surround them with other animals that co-exist peacefully with them in the wild. Most important of all, the animals are given the specific environmental stimuli—discovered as a result of behavioral studies on the species both in captivity and the wild—that best encourages breeding.

One typical example of this approach is an 8,000-square-foot run constructed last year at the Hogle Zoological Gardens in Salt Lake City to encourage breeding of cheetahs, which have proved notoriously infertile in captivity. Behavioral research has shown that two criteria are essential for cheetah breeding: isolation of the female, and a male dominated hierarchy. Thus, the run was put together in such a way that the two females in the breeding group had plenty of space to be alone, while the nine males were kept at close quarters to indulge in the power struggle that both produces a fit suitor and stimulates the females to be receptive to his advances.

This scheme rapidly proved successful. Last November one of the females bore an infant in what University of Utah zoologist Dr. Richard F. Smith, who supervised the project, described as "the first programmed birth of a cheetah in captivity." Unfortunately, that infant died of a blood clot—not related to the circumstances surrounding its birth. By that time, however, the second female was pregnant.

The need to understand the mating behavior of threatened species was illustrated by an incident at the Hal Bar reserve of the Israeli Nature Reserves Authority in the Negev Desert. Seeking to return to the area all animals that had once roamed there, the reserve authorities recently imported from Iran several pairs of onagers, the sub-species of ass on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem. But unlike the cheetahs, the onagers do not thrive on male competition. The male asses broke out in frequent and furious fights that often ended with the victor tipping his victim over on his back and castrating him. Only when the number of adult males in the herd had fallen to two did breeding begin.

One of the most promising recent developments in the field of programmed breeding is the creation of wildlife game farms as adjuncts to many city zoos. These are not the drive-through habitats that claim to give their car-bound customers a close-up look at animals "in the wild." (In fact, the space in

drive-through areas is generally quite restricted, and the animals are too close to people, cars and other animals to act naturally in any way.) In the true breeding park, epitomized by the 1,800-acre Wild Animal Park of the San Diego Zoo in California, the animals are free to roam over large areas but the spectators are kept on the perimeters. Generally, steps are taken to keep predators and their potential victims apart, and any hostile reactions between species are monitored by curators, who make daily counts of the herds.

To ensure continual breeding in the San Diego herds, older animals are regularly moved out of the park—generally to be sold to other zoos—and replaced by younger members of the species. Here again, success is spectacular. Seven white rhinos, which are in danger of extinction in Africa, have been born in the Wild Animal Park in the past year; other births have included such endangered creatures as Hartmann's mountain zebras, slender-horned gazelles, and Formosan Sika deer.

For a few endangered species, however, numbers have fallen so drastically that even the protection and care afforded by a wildlife park is insufficient to do more than delay their eventual disappearance. For these animals, which possibly include the polar bear, the Texas red wolf and the Bengal tiger, there is now fresh hope of survival from the biological laboratory. Pioneered by Dr. Stephen Seager of the University of Oregon Medical School, the new technique involves the use of sperm banks, artificial insemination and, possibly, fertility drugs.

The concept seems simple enough: collect sperm from a male of an endangered species, place it in glycerin and freeze it, thawing it later to inseminate a female. In practice, however, technical difficulties are numerous. The first step is collection of sperm. The sperm of timber wolves, Seager has found, can be collected manually when the animals are suitably sedated. But for large cats Seager was forced to devise an electrical method to stimulate ejaculation. The cat ejaculate is then divided into about ten portions, for separate inseminations, each of which is mixed in a vial with egg yolk and glycerin, and frozen to minus 320 degrees.

So far, Seager has collected sperm in this way from a variety of threatened species, including nearly all the big cats—lions, Bengal tigers, Siberian tigers, cheetahs, and ocelots—and even a 1,200-pound polar bear. The technique is also applicable to elephants, even though they are in no immediate danger of extinction. Understandably, zoo-keepers prefer to avoid the rampaging presence of a bull elephant to impregnate their cows. Due to obvious difficulties with direct collection, sperm is collected from the female after copulation.

After collecting the sperm, there is still the problem of insemination. "Inseminating a cow and inseminating large cats are two entirely different things," notes Seager wryly. One purely technical difficulty is the fact that many cats have short vaginas, making insertion of the thawed semen difficult. A more difficult problem arises from the nature of female wild cats; many of them ovulate only a number of hours after copulation. In other words, copulation stimulates their reproductive machinery, making them hardly amenable to artificial insemination. This difficulty is being overcome, however, by the use of fertility drugs similar to those developed for humans.

To date, Seager's major success in artificial insemination using frozen sperm has been a healthy litter of timber wolf pups. At Cornell University, ornithologists have successfully bred both peregrine falcons and golden eagles through the use of artificial insemination technique. Seager is confident that the methods he is testing will eventually prove

successful in a variety of creatures, and he believes that the frozen-sperm operation can be made entirely portable allowing zoologists to carry it out entirely in the wild.

Perhaps the major objection to breeding threatened species in captivity is that the creatures produced will be identical with the original species only in looks. Usually, their natural hunting instincts and their ability to learn will be dampened so greatly that they cannot be returned to the wild. Certainly, animals that have been brought up in zoos show devastating effects from lack of parental training. Lions reared in captivity do not know how to go about eating dead antelope even when it is cut open for them. Many creatures become impotent after a few years in captivity.

On the brighter side, however, animals brought up in the supervised open space of the typical wildlife park appear to develop behavioral patterns very similar to those of species in the wild. And, as Stephen Seager puts it: "Although there's no doubt that natural breeding is by far the best method, we've got to face an unavoidable fact: in many cases it simply is no longer possible."

THE 56TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 56th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. This country has existed as a distinct community on the Baltic Sea for hundreds of years, but it tragically lost its cherished independence when it was annexed by the Russian Empire in 1795 as part of the third partition of Poland. Freedom did not reign in Lithuania again until 1918, when the people of this nation courageously broke the bonds of foreign domination.

Sadly, their independence was short-lived, for the Soviet Union, in collusion with Nazi Germany, reconquered the Baltic lands during the Second World War. The United States has never recognized this conquest and has never accorded it any legal validity.

The Lithuanian people continue to yearn for freedom and the establishment of a truly independent Lithuanian State. In 1971 Simas Kudirka, a Lithuanian radio operator, attempted to escape from a Soviet ship to the United States but was handed back by the U.S. Coast Guard to the custody of his shipmates. Kudirka told the court that sentenced him to 10 years of hard labor:

I do not consider Russia to be my fatherland.

In March 1972, more than 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics signed a protest memorandum addressed to Secretary General Kurt Waldheim of the United Nations calling on him to intervene with the Soviet Union in their behalf against the religious persecution which they had suffered.

Two months later, a 20-year-old youth set himself afire in Kaunas, the second largest city in Lithuania, to protest his country's lack of independence. His

death was followed by 2 days of street demonstrations in which several thousand youths took part, shouting, "Freedom for Lithuania."

We in the United States who have consistently supported the principle of self-determination add our voices to theirs. "Freedom for Lithuania," so long suppressed, hopefully will rise again.

RELENTLESS RALPH

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, another example of the publicity-minded posturing of Ralph Nader, who is a modern day example of the 3R's—relentless, ruthless, and ridiculous, is contained in a recent article from the San Diego Evening Tribune, authored by the distinguished rector of St. Andrews by the Sea Episcopal Church.

I include this article, as a portion of my remarks:

RELENTLESS RALPH OFF BEAM ON X-RAY ISSUE
(By Rev. R. E. Thrumston)

One relatively new phenomenon in our society is the emergence of the "professional critic."

Usually the critic is a private group or government agency. Sometimes it is an individual. Once in a while it is an individual that has become a group, as in the case of Ralph Nader, the apostle of material perfection.

Generalizations are the province of adolescent minds of all ages. They are best whispered, not shouted. But there are several things most professional critics seem to have in common.

First, they don't really stir up much of a public fuss. People are usually tolerant of both the complainer and the object of his complaints. The critic will of course describe the tolerance as apathy, except when he benefits from it.

Second, news media are quick to focus on the critic. His very contrast to the easy-going public makes him newsworthy. The trick is not to confuse notoriety with importance.

Third, the professional critic is often willing to jeopardize the whole of society in order to avert a minor risk or inconvenience that affects only a few. Failing to gain public support because of what he chooses to call apathy, he will resort to the courts and somehow convince them that the way to satisfy the common good is to pile up appeasements in favor of the noisiest advocates of individual good.

There are many professional critics, mostly of ecological bent, who exemplify all three points of this generalization. One of them is Ralph Nader, if only in his latest display of prima donna pique.

Nader doesn't think much of the X-ray equipment required by the Federal Aviation Administration to inspect airport luggage, and to protect the public against hijackers. He maintains that renegade rays miss the baggage and hit people, mostly the operators of the equipment. He charges that this illicit bombardment is hazardous to health and a threat to genetic integrity.

For the sake of argument I shall concede the point to Nader. The main question, however, is what to do about it.

In the absence of public outcry Nader might have gone to court to force the FAA to provide lead suits for all exposed employees, or to implement other safety measures with all reasonable dispatch. Instead, early this week he filed suit in federal court to abandon use of the machines altogether. By some legal witchery he won his case, pending invited appeal.

In 1973 these little X-ray machines flushed out more than 58,000 concealed weapons, and plunked 3,120 potential hijackers in jail. Not a bad track record.

Nader's over-riding concern is the safety of a few hundred airport employees who are not chained to their jobs. His eagerness to expose millions of passengers to grave danger in order to spare the few from a minor risk, otherwise avoidable, is beyond my comprehension and offends the most rudimentary morality. Even more puzzling is the court's apparent willingness to consider the immediate issue apart from its consequences.

It is a fact of life that society is protected from major harm only by the readiness of a few to accept the risk of even greater harm. Without this, everything would fall apart. And so in a spirit of joyous genocide, I wonder when relentless Ralph will call for the elimination of patrol cars and fire engines? These too are hazardous to those who use them.

WEST POINT SOCIETY MARKS ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, recently the West Point Society of Western Pennsylvania gathered in Pittsburgh to observe the 172d anniversary of that famous military Academy. The occasion featured the first presentation of a new award to be presented annually to a member of the community in recognition for outstanding service and dedication.

The society initiated the award in honor of Matthew B. Ridgway, the general who won fame as commander of U.S. Forces during the Korean conflict and who, since his retirement from the military, has become extremely prominent in civic and charitable endeavors. General Ridgway, a resident of Pittsburgh, was on hand to personally present the award in his honor to a gentleman who has won admiration and respect as a military man, a priest, an educator and an administrator: the Reverend Henry J. McNulty.

Father McNulty was a chaplain in the U.S. Air Force for 14 years and now holds the rank of brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. He also is president of one of Pittsburgh's leading educational institutions, Duquesne University, and is particularly known for his work with the youth and young adults of the area.

Principal speaker at the society's anniversary dinner was another who has achieved recognition as a soldier and administrator: Lt. Gen. William A. Knowlton, Superintendent of West Point. General Knowlton addressed his remarks to activities and programs at the Point and reported that applications to the Academy have skyrocketed. In what he de-

scribed as "the best year we have ever had," General Knowlton reported that 10,000 young Americans had opened application files and 5,800 were nominated for the 1,400-man entering class.

Mr. Speaker, my duties in Washington prevented me from attending the society's observance so I am taking this opportunity to commend it for what it symbolizes, to applaud it for its selection of Father McNulty as the first recipient of the Matthew B. Ridgway Award and to wish it continued success in upholding the honor, the integrity and the reputation of West Point.

PENNY LEFEW EXTOLLS BALD EAGLE

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, recently an essay contest was sponsored by the Eagle Valley Environmental Corporation of Cassville, Wis., on the subject of "What the Bald Eagle Means to Me."

Miss Penny LeFev, daughter of Mayor and Mrs. William R. LeFev of Harvard, Ill., was the first principal winner in this essay contest held at the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I have been most impressed by this touching and inspiring essay which I am privileged to attach to these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to congratulate Penny LeFev both on her insight and on her inherent talents in expressing a beautiful and meaningful message in behalf of the bald eagle:

The essay follows:

WHAT THE BALD EAGLE MEANS TO ME
(By Penny LeFev)

Symbol of beauty, in my mind I can see you flying among vast hilltops surrounded by blue sky and large white clouds. You are a part of the brilliant atmosphere and the sight of you gliding in the air seems to fulfill one of nature's magic promises. You fly as if the sky were your supreme possession! Yes, I can see you in my mind—but only in my mind.

Symbol of strength, I have always been told that you represent the dignity and greatness of the land in which I live. You are the national bird because your existence is one of power and virtue. Suddenly, however, I have come to the realization that your existence may soon be no more. How can a creature of such vital strength simply vanish? How can Americans be so careless as to let you, the symbol of this country, die without cause?

The thought frightens me, perhaps because I cannot help wondering that if we allow the symbol of our nation's strength and beauty to become extinct, what else will permit to vanish purposelessly—our freedom, our democracy?

Symbol of Eternal Liberty, more and more of your kind are being forced into captivity. It seems almost ironic that the greatest emblem of freedom may soon be found only in zoos or special exhibits. Must you lose your liberty in order to show all the people that freedom must forever be watched and closely guarded? Is your imprisonment necessary to

make Americans realize that if freedom is taken for granted, it could be hopelessly lost?

I see you once again in my mind. You are soaring in the air: no walls, no cages, no bars. If only everyone could see how magnificent you look in my imagination. Perhaps then they would realize that you are truly the greatest symbol of strength, beauty, and eternal liberty!

AMBASSADORSHIPS: SOLD OUT AGAIN?

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, for months now, President Nixon has been making feeble denials to charges that he has virtually sold ambassadorships to large political contributors.

Ambassadorships "have not been for sale," he said at his February 25 press conference. They "cannot be purchased."

Yet what did Mr. Nixon do just last week? He nominated Leonard K. Firestone, a director of the Firestone Tire and Rubber Co., to the post of ambassador to Belgium.

Mr. Firestone contributed \$115,000 to the President's 1972 reelection campaign and his two brothers, the late Harvey C. Firestone Jr. and Raymond C. Firestone, gave \$48,712 and \$64,441 respectively, according to reports filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the General Accounting Office as quoted in *The Washington Post* March 23.

Mr. Firestone just may have some special qualification to be Ambassador to Belgium. But it seems hard to believe that there is not someone somewhere in the Foreign Service with better credentials than a tire company executive.

It at least appears that Mr. Firestone got the nomination for one reason and one reason alone—because he and his family gave a lot of money to the President's campaign.

I say this nonsense has got to stop.

Not only are our diplomatic posts too important to be entrusted to wealthy amateurs, but the whole practice of a President selling ambassadorships or anything else to large contributors calls into question the basis of our entire political system.

President Nixon should withdraw this nomination.

And if he does not, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should—and I am certain that they will—take a good hard look at Mr. Firestone's qualifications for the job.

But even more importantly in the long run, Congress should get to work and pass a public campaign finance law which limits the amount of money any one contributor can give and makes sure no one can give enough to bid for special favors.

The bill (H.R. 7612) which I have introduced along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) would place a limit of \$2,500 on contributions to Presidential campaigns and \$1,000 on gifts to House or Senate candidates.

At the same time, the bill would en-

courage candidates to seek out contributors of \$50 or less, whose contributions would be matched by Federal funds. These contributors would be people with no favors to ask and nothing to gain from their gifts except good government.

President Nixon, in what he insists is a campaign reform proposal, did suggest a contribution limit of \$15,000 for Presidential campaigns although an additional \$15,000 could be given for all of the primaries combined. But even if contributors were limited to only one \$15,000 gift a year, this still would be far more than the average guy could ever afford to give.

At the same time, the President rejected the idea of public campaign financing. He said the American people shouldn't have to pay for candidates to run for office.

Again I say nonsense. The American people are already paying for elections—and it is a staggering price, through wheat deals, milk deals, and the dubious representation we get in foreign capitals from amateur diplomats.

We have estimated that under our bill we could have clean elections and finance candidates for President, the House and Senate—in primary as well as general elections—for a cost of less than \$1 a year for each taxpayer.

The polls have shown that the public favors the concept of public financing of campaigns. Mr. Speaker, this is definitely an idea whose time has come.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH McNAMARA

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, America's aerospace industry will lose one of its most distinguished innovators as Joseph McNamara begins a well-deserved retirement.

Joe McNamara has been in the forefront of the movement which has brought America to world supremacy in space. As president of Rockwell International's Space Division, Joe presided over an organization that has been the major producer of America's manned spacecraft. Under his leadership, Rockwell International built the Saturn S-II, second stage of the Saturn V launch vehicle, and the Apollo command and service modules that carried our nine crews to the Moon and three crews to the Skylab workshop. Earlier in his career at Rocketdyne, Joe directed the production of the Saturn V's J-2 and F-1 engines, for which he was awarded the Distinguished Public Service Medal.

Although Joe has decided to retire, the benefits of his leadership will be enjoyed for generations. As he steps down, the Space Division continues on two projects he began: the docking module that will be used in the Earth-orbit linkup of an Apollo and a Soviet Soyuz spacecraft and the space shuttle orbiter—the reusable, space van that will carry unmanned spacecraft, laboratories, and scientists to and from Earth orbit.

For many years, I have had the honor to include Joe McNamara among my friends. Those of us who are vitally interested in America's space program and its future know how much we owe to his intelligence, dedication, and wisdom.

I wish Joe McNamara many happy years of retirement in the company of his wonderful wife Elizabeth. I know that my colleagues join me in thanking him for a job well done.

REPRESENTATIVE KEMP TALKS ABOUT CAMPAIGN REFORM

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, no issue in recent years has yielded such broad bipartisan support as campaign finance reform. Illegal campaign practices, unethical tactics, dirty tricks, and influence peddling in the 1972 and prior campaigns have brought about a unity of outrage from the American people.

THE RESPONSE OF THE CONGRESS

While the Congress has acted in the past to curb campaign abuses, particularly in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, this session of Congress will likely see the most far-ranging reforms to effect our electoral process since women got the right to vote in 1920.

Thus, it is essential that Congress act soberly and with an eye on history if we are to see improvements in the integrity of our political system. The astute political observer, David S. Broder, mixed a dash of wisdom with a reporter's cynicism when he wrote—

The only thing more dangerous to democracy than corrupt politicians may be politicians hell-bent on reform.

We therefore must act with discretion if we are to avoid trying to remedy campaign abuses with poorly conceived law which risks either changing the nature of our democratic electoral system or opens still greater loopholes which risk even more serious and corruptive abuses.

BASIC REFORM PRINCIPLES

The goals I seek are the same as those supported by such groups as the League of Women Voters, Common Cause, the AFL-CIO Committee on Public Education and others who share the view that our political system must be ethical to be fair. We must insure the public's right to know; we must combat corruption and influence; and we must enable candidates to compete more equitably for public office.

The 20th Century Fund, in its report on campaign reform, concluded that if there were full public disclosure and publication of all campaign contributions and expenditures during a campaign, the voters themselves could better judge whether a candidate has spent too much. To those of us in the Congress with confidence in the decisionmaking ability and will of the American people, the 20th Century Fund conclusions are welcome.

Individual decisionmaking and the

accountability of elected officials to the voter are underlying premises on which our political system is based. The American electorate is fully capable of making hard political choices if it is assured the option of holding elected officials accountable at the voting booth each November. As long as accountability is maintained, we have the greatest deterrent to political corruption yet devised, that is, removal from office via the ballot box.

It is my belief that the U.S. political system should be dynamic, and flexible, open to all candidates, highly competitive, capable of attracting the best minds and candidates available and should provide an open forum for debate of all the issues and principles for which the candidates seek office.

KEMP LEGISLATION

In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, in September 1973, I introduced comprehensive legislation which would make it immensely more difficult for Federal candidates or their campaign committees to engage in deceptive, unethical, or unlawful practices. The legislation was specifically designed to provide more equitable opportunities to challengers. Provisions of my legislation, which are embodied, in principle, in the Senate-passed S. 372 as well as all major legislative proposals currently pending in the House of Representatives include:

Weekly reporting of all campaign contributions for the last 60 days of a campaign;

Weekly reporting of all campaign expenditures during the last 30 days of a campaign;

Quarterly reports on both contributions and expenditures;

Establishment of a nine-member, Federal election commission to oversee all Federal campaigns and elections;

Provide for the mailing of an informational voter pamphlet giving equal space to challenger and incumbent;

Strict limitation on cash contributions;

Limitations on the amount a candidate or his family can contribute to a campaign to prevent the buying of public office by wealthy candidates;

Limits on campaign fund depositories a candidate or his campaign committee can maintain;

A requirement that all expenditures be made through a single bank; and

Doubling of the amount which individuals may deduct from Federal income tax to encourage more citizens to contribute in small amounts to candidates of their choice.

PUBLIC FINANCING

A good deal of debate in the Congress has revolved around the issue of public financing of Federal campaigns. Many such proposals have been put forth in an effort to broaden candidate participation, encourage small contributions, equalize incumbent-challenger resources, and diminish the influence of money in campaigns. To the extent that such proposals contribute to the aforementioned objectives, they deserve support.

Several proposals, however, would discourage public participation in the campaign process, are not voluntary in nature, and risk running aground of the

first amendment. As H. Leonard Court and Charles E. Harris concluded in a 1972 Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review article:

Unfortunately, current measures do not reflect the careful analysis necessary to insure that First Amendment rights are preserved.

The tax checkoff method for financing Presidential election campaigns has, however, met with marked success. The IRS and GAO recently announced that if the current level of public participation continues through 1976, the Presidential election of that year will be completely financed via the checkoff.

I would hope that the Congress will insist on retaining volunteerism in any public or public-private campaign financing formula.

THE PUBLIC ETHIC

Finally, it is important that each of us have realistic expectations about what changes in the law alone will achieve in helping eradicate campaign abuses. Our national legacy of individual responsibility demands from each of us the highest ethical vigilance. Unless a higher more inflexible ethic is insisted upon by the American electorate, and is reflected in the voting booth, no amount of campaign law will correct campaign abuses and corruption.

This does not, however, relieve us of our responsibilities to help create an atmosphere in which integrity is encouraged and corruption is discouraged. We, in the Congress, have an obligation to write into law meaningful and practical revisions to our present form of campaign financing. So, too, each American has an obligation to be vigilant in insisting that his or her elected representatives maintain the highest ethics and personal integrity humanly possible. To that end I pledge my very best efforts.

ABINGTON HIGH WINS BASKETBALL TITLE

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I express my heartiest congratulations to the Abington High School Basketball Team for capturing the Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic Association Class A Championship on Saturday, March 23.

Abington's 53-48 victory over Pittsburgh Peabody was the culmination of a 28-3 season in which the Galloping Ghosts fended off opponents in five other play-off competitions before reaching the State contest. It was the first time in Abington's history that it has clinched the coveted State title, and the first time in the past 11 years that a team from the eastern part of the State has emerged as victor.

As the Congressman who represents Abington, I am extremely proud of this fine achievement. I extend special praise to the team's coach, Jim Wilkinson, for his outstanding work in building Abington squads for the past 7 years. The three assistant coaches—Dick Koch, Sam Rines, and Tom Parsha—also must be

mentioned for their valuable contributions.

And I salute the 15 members of the team who made the victory possible—Richard Wright, Dave Torresani, Temen Adams, Mike Martin, Jim Greenberg, Matt Chesterman, Ricky Reed, Barry Queen, Mark Derracotti, Bill Brennan, Robert Harvey, Mark Daniel, Ricky Bellett, James Robinson and Gary Peoples. My thanks to them for their hard work and dedication and for a job well done.

THE ENERGY BILL VETO AND WHAT IT COSTS AMERICA

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I believe the President made a tragic mistake in vetoing the recently passed emergency legislation passed by the Congress. That measure was more than an attempt to roll back energy prices which had long since become usurious to the public and obscenely profitable to the major oil companies benefiting from them. It dealt with a number of vital questions in the energy area which were long overdue for attention. And while the price rollback provision was written promptly into another bill which passed the House, the vital portions of the original energy bill, killed by the President's veto, were not received and have perished for the present.

The President's chief argument with the original measure dealt with the section calling for a rollback of prices on that part of domestic production now exempt from price controls. That oil today amounts to about one-sixth of our supply of petroleum. For the President to suggest that a reduction in the very high price of this oil would worsen current shortages and force gas rationing was sophism at its worst, and an injustice to logic and the people who are paying the prices demanded by the major oil companies.

Perhaps some critics are correct when they claim that the veto needed an excuse and that the previously mentioned provision was just that. That the excuse was needed to kill off the excellent provisions in the bill which would have gone far too change the energy equation now so much to the oil monopoly's liking. What else was killed along with that particular provision?

There was added unemployment compensation for those losing jobs as a result of the shortage. There was protection for gasoline station operators against arbitrary cancellation of their franchises by the major oil companies, one of the little known but worst feared weapons used by these monopolies to keep their employees cowed and fearful. Thousands of gas station dealers have been wiped out overnight by the majors' use of this weapon of coercion.

There were requirements for methodical collection of statistics on energy that the Federal Government today lacks, to its everlasting shame. Here is a crucial point, to say the least. The oil monop-

only has been able to get away with so much in recent decades because the National Government has no accurate information on energy. What it has is provided by the oil companies themselves through their lobbies in the Capitol, such as the American Petroleum Institute or the American Gas Association. The Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Geological Survey, the main agencies aiding and abetting the industry's policies within the Government, are able to plead the industry's statistics as an argument in favor of the industry's policies. By not guaranteeing that Government will gather its own information from the industry and about its doings, we ensure continued blindness of the public's enforcement agencies. Here is perhaps the greatest victory scored by the industry as a result of the President's veto, and he had to know this.

There were also rules to govern an orderly conversion of power plants for coal without bypassing and violating the Clean Air Act. There was also authority for the President to impose gasoline rationing.

The rollback provision itself set limits to the heights to which crude oil prices would have been permitted to rise. Vetoing that bill ensures that the major oil companies will be able to continue to fatten their purses at the expenses of the consumers of the Nation.

As a result of all the vast heavings of the last few months, when the smoke clears, what do we have? First of all, energy prices have risen to astronomical levels, enriching the Arab oil states and making the major oil monopolies wealthier than they ever dreamed was possible. Some \$13 to \$15 billion in excess profits have gone into their already well-lined pockets. This wealth is so embarrassing that they have to take out vast numbers of national advertisements to convince the public that these incredible profits are justified. Those ads, by the way, are all tax-deductible.

The Federal Power Commission, adding to the problem, has deregulated the price of natural gas at the wellhead in a de facto manner, by allowing huge price hikes on an individual case basis.

What auctions of Federal offshore oil and gas lands and oil shale leases which have taken place have been dominated by the oil monopolies, using joint venture bidding to squeeze out any possible competition from independents.

And the few meaningful reforms, plus an attempt to roll back prices, have been vetoed by the President. The tax loopholes are intact, and the average consumer is still being robbed by the millions to further enrich the lives of the few. Think about it when you pull up at the gas pump next time, or pay a fuel bill.

JOSEPH McNAMARA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, Joseph McNamara will retire on April 1. His achievements and his dedication to the

national space program are two of the reasons America is the world's leader in space. I want to review briefly some of the highlights of his long and notable career.

Prior to his retirement, Joe McNamara was president of the Space Division of Rockwell International. This division produced much of the hardware for the lunar-landing program, including the command and service modules; the Saturn S-II, second stage of the Saturn V launch vehicle; and the launch escape system which, incidentally, was never needed. The team Joe helped mold is now developing and will build the Apollo-Soyuz docking module and the Space Shuttle orbiter, the reusable spacecraft that will carry payloads and scientists to and from Earth orbit. Earlier, at Rocketdyne, Joe directed production of the two Saturn V power plants: The J-2 and F-1 engines. NASA recognized this work by awarding him the Distinguished Public Service Medal.

Although he was employed by a private company, most of Joe McNamara's achievements have benefited the public. I am certain I speak for all of America's public servants in extending him our warmest appreciation.

KILPATRICK BLASTS LEGAL SERVICES BILL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that nationally syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick, long a supporter of legal services for the poor, has characterized the Senate version of the legal aid bill as an "abomination."

I certainly agree with Mr. Kilpatrick's description of this legislation. In my CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speech of March 19, I pointed out that the bill would pave the way for legal service attorneys to get as politicized as they want. Mr. Kilpatrick voices a strong second to this view, contending that the "Senate bill erects no more than paper barricades against the activism of superliberal legal eagles who would be free to pursue social reform behind a camouflage of aid to the poor."

Following is the complete text of Mr. Kilpatrick's editorial appearing in the March 25 edition of the Washington Star-News:

RECONSIDERING THE LEGAL AID BILL (By James J. Kilpatrick)

It is a familiar rule of parliamentary procedure that a motion to reconsider can be made only by a member of the prevailing faction. Because I have long supported the concept of legal services for the poor, perhaps I am qualified to turn against the bill soon to be reported from a conference committee. Mr. President, I would like to say, I move to reconsider.

By every indication, the compromise legal services bill will be fairly close to the Nelson-Javits bill approved by the Senate in December. The bill is an abomination. It is a perversion of the whole concept of giving the poor person a chance at equal justice under the law. If the Senate and House should agree to this devious proposition, the Presi-

dent will have to be asked to use his veto power.

In supporting a legal services act, I have been guided by certain principles and observations that seem to be almost beyond dispute: The first is that the concept of equal justice under law is among the greatest ideals of our political system. The second is that our nation has served that concept poorly. Despite impressive improvements in recent years, especially in the appointment of public defenders in criminal cases, we still have two systems of law—one for the rich, another for the poor.

A system of federally subsidized legal aid should have but one purpose, and that is to redress the imbalance. The poor family that has been bilked into a usurious installment contract should not be helpless at the hands of a well-heeled merchant. The poor person wrongly evicted from his home should have some aid in standing up to the slumlord. The ignorant or illiterate citizen, struggling with the complexities of a highly regulated society, often needs legal advice that he cannot possibly afford.

A revitalized program of federal legal aid ought to have these aims in mind, and these aims only. Because the possibilities for abuse are quite real, a new Legal Services Corporation should be bound down by chains of law. At the very minimum, the corporation should be federally chartered for a limited term of no more than five years, at which time Congress could review the entire operation.

The Senate bill that now prevails is a far cry from the administration's recommendation. It bears no resemblance to a House-approved version that has some faults, largely as the result of fatuous floor amendments, but has many virtues also. The Senate bill erects no more than paper barricades against the activism of super-liberal legal eagles who would be free to pursue social reform behind a camouflage of aid to the poor.

These mischievous provisions are not immediately apparent. On the surface, the Senate version seems unalarming. It is only when the bill is examined line by line, as Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina has examined it, that the shortcomings emerge.

Two examples may suffice to indicate the slippery business here afoot. The Senate bill contains a provision that could make available to legal aid attorneys "particular support functions of the federal government, such as the General Services Administration, the federal telecommunications system and other facilities." Helms calls this a "mind-boggling blank check," and it is. This loosely drawn authorization could equip the activist attorneys with everything from office supplies to free long distance telephone service, all at the taxpayers' expense.

For a second example: The House version wisely prohibits the proposed Legal Services Corporation from using private funds for purposes for which public funds could not be spent. The Senate version ominously omits this safeguard.

The concept of equal justice remains valid. Nothing is wrong with the idea of providing legal aid to the poor. But the disappointing and deceptive bill that now heads back toward the Senate floor, while it doubtless would accomplish many good things, would constitute an invitation to legal activists to come have a ball. This is not the idea. It is not the idea at all.

LITTLE BOY BLUE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, among this fearless forum of learned men and charming women are those whose inner-

most feelings are always touched by the wonderfully written and nostalgic poems of Eugene Field. I include for the RECORD an old favorite:

LITTLE BOY BLUE

The little toy dog is covered with dust,
But sturdy and stanch he stands;
And the little toy soldier is red with rust,
And his musket moulds in his hands.
Time was when the little toy dog was new,
And the soldier was passing fair;
And that was the time when our Little Boy Blue
Kissed them and put them there.
"Now, don't you go till I come," he said,
"And don't you make any noise!"
So, toddling off to his trundle-bed,
He dreamt of the pretty toys;
And, as he was dreaming, an angel song
Awakened our Little Boy Blue—
Oh! the years are many, the years are long,
But the little toy friends are true!
Ay, faithful to Little Boy Blue they stand,
Each in the same old place,
Awaiting the touch of a little hand,
The smile of a little face;
And they wonder, as waiting the long years
through
In the dust of that little chair,
What has become of our Little Boy Blue,
Since he kissed them and put them there.

NEWSLETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO RESIDENTS OF THE 19TH OHIO CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week I am sending out approximately 155,000 newsletter-questionnaires to residents of the 19th Ohio Congressional District, which includes Mahoning and Trumbull Counties. The newsletter discusses some of the major issues facing our Nation, such as: Watergate, inflation, shortages, and the energy crisis. The questionnaire asks my constituents' opinion on these and other pressing problems. As soon as my constituents have responded, I will insert the results of the survey in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to insert the newsletter and questionnaire in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues in the Congress. The newsletter-questionnaire follows:

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES J. CARNEY REPORTS
FROM WASHINGTON

Dear Friend:

Now that the second session of the 93rd Congress is underway, I would like to take this opportunity to report on the work done in Congress to date, and to ask your opinion on some of the crucial issues which Congress will face in the weeks and months ahead.

The Republic created by the Founding Fathers which has served us so well for nearly 200 years is being tested by serious economic and constitutional problems. Widespread doubt exists as to whether our system of government is capable of solving these problems.

Watergate continues to haunt the political life of the nation. It is a national tragedy for two reasons: first, it has caused many Americans to lose faith in their government and elected officials; second, it has diverted the nation's attention from other pressing problems. In reaction to the Watergate and re-

lated scandals, hundreds of residents of the 19th congressional district have written to me urging that President Nixon be impeached and removed from office. Many others have written to me opposing any efforts to impeach the President. I am very grateful to all the people who have made their views on impeachment known to me. It must be remembered that while the House of Representatives has the power to impeach, only the Senate can remove the President from office.

To help restore public confidence, this constitutional crisis must be resolved as quickly and as fairly as possible. Judiciary Committee Chairman Peter Rodino has pledged that the committee will submit its findings to the House of Representatives without any unnecessary delay. After the Judiciary Committee had completed its inquiry, I will make my own judgment based on all the evidence presented, and put the best interests of our country ahead of partisan politics. In addition to Watergate, 1973 seemed to bring one crisis after another, including skyrocketing prices, food shortages, and the energy crisis.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

The nation's economy is experiencing the highest rate of inflation since 1947. Each year since 1970, Congress has given the President the authority to control prices, wages, interest rates and rents. When a bill to extend this authority came before the House last year, I voted for amendments which would have rolled back food prices and rents. Unfortunately, none of these amendments passed. Instead, Congress extended the President's authority to control wages, prices, interest rates and rents for one more year. In August, 1971, President Nixon used this authority to freeze prices. Regrettably, the President lifted the price freeze just as it was beginning to work. Administration attempts to reimpose the price freeze in June, 1973, were unsuccessful.

Congress has passed good laws to deal with the high cost of living, but Congress cannot implement those laws. That responsibility lies with the Executive Branch of Government. Unless the President uses the laws passed by Congress wisely and effectively, even the best laws will not solve our nation's economic problems.

From the Russian Wheat Deal to intentionally restricting the food supply, from miscalculating the foreign demand for food to freezing food prices at the highest levels in years, the Nixon Administration has pursued a policy which has hurt the American consumer. In the summer of 1972, Russian grain buyers came to the United States and bought up 25% of our wheat crop at \$1.63 per bushel. In August, 1973, the price of wheat rose to \$5.28 per bushel. Within months, higher grain prices resulted in higher prices for bread, meat, eggs, poultry, butter and other foods.

The Russian Wheat Deal was negotiated by the Russians and a few private American grain companies. The U.S. Department of Agriculture either was negligently unaware of the deal, or else kept silent about it. Congress was not consulted or asked to approve this transaction. However, congressional committees have conducted extensive investigations of the Russian Wheat Deal. In addition, legislation has been introduced to make certain that excessive amounts of grain will not be exported in the future. I am co-sponsoring several bills, including the "Export Priorities Act," which would control food exports and guarantee adequate supplies of food for American consumers at reasonable prices. I firmly believe that we should meet the needs of our own people here at home before we sell food and other products to foreign countries.

ENERGY CRISIS

Our country is experiencing an energy shortage. This energy shortage came about because: domestic energy production has not kept pace with rapidly rising energy consumption, environmental protection laws have caused a switch from abundant "dirty"

fuels to scarce "clean" fuels, and energy conservation has not been practiced. The Arab oil embargo and big price increases by oil producing nations have made the shortages even worse. The government was late in reacting to the energy shortage largely due to the misguided policies of the Nixon Administration and a lack of reliable information about the oil industry. The deal with this situation, I co-sponsored the "Consumer Energy Act," which would provide essential information on energy costs and supplies to the public, insure competition in the oil industry, and increase energy supplies to the consumer at reasonable prices.

Before Congress adjourned in December, laws were passed: 1) requiring the President to implement a mandatory fuel allocation program so that the public health, safety and welfare are protected and the harmful effects of the shortage are minimized; 2) authorizing construction of the Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline, and 3) setting an emergency maximum national speed limit. This year, the House has passed the "Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act," which would provide \$50 million over a 5-year period to demonstrate the practical uses of solar heat and cooling technology, and the "Federal Energy Administration Act," which would create a temporary Federal Energy Administration as an independent agency to administer programs for energy conservation, production and distribution.

The most important energy-related bill passed by the 93rd Congress to date was the "Energy Emergency Act." This Act would: 1) give the President the authority to establish a nationwide gasoline rationing program, if necessary; 2) delay motor vehicle clean air emission standards; 3) allow power plants to use coal instead of oil during the current shortage; 4) require broader public disclosure of oil industry production, reserves, distribution, and use of petroleum products, natural gas and coal; 5) protect service station operators from arbitrary cancellation of their franchises; 6) rollback crude oil prices, and 7) provide additional unemployment compensation for workers who lose their jobs due to the energy shortage. President Nixon objected to the price rollback and vetoed the bill. Congress is working on a new Energy Emergency Act without the price rollback provision.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

War Powers Resolution—reaffirms the constitutional authority of the Congress to protect the nation by requiring the President to consult with Congress if at all possible in advance of committing U.S. troops to hostilities, and by requiring the President to obtain congressional approval within 60 days whenever he sends troops into combat abroad.

Budget and Impoundment Control Act—reforms the budget process by requiring Congress to establish spending priorities and an overall spending ceiling. It also provides for congressional review and control of presidential impoundment of funds. (awaiting final action)

Pension Reform Act—establishes minimum standards for the administration and funding of private pension plans; establishes minimum requirements for vesting a worker's pension rights, and provides Federal reinsurance against pension plan termination. (awaiting final action)

Social Security—increases Social Security benefits by 7% in March, 1974, and another 4% in June, 1974; provides an automatic cost-of-living increase in June, 1975.

SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

For the first time in the history of our congressional district, we now have two full-time district offices to expedite solving the problems of individual constituents. A district office is located at 1108 Wick Building in Youngstown (tel. no. 746-8071, ex. 3345) to serve the residents of Mahoning County. Another district office is located in room 17 of

the Post Office Building on 201 High Street, N.E., in Warren (tel. no. 399-5725) to serve the residents of Trumbull County. In addition, a new part-time, sub-district office has been opened in the basement of the Post Office Building, 43 W. Park Avenue, in Niles (tel. no. 652-9079), for the convenience of residents in that area. The Niles office is open Monday, Wednesday and Friday from 1:00 P.M. to 4:00 P.M. If you ever have a problem involving the Federal Government, please do not hesitate to contact one of these offices, or write to me at my Washington office, 1123 Longworth Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

AMERICAN FLAGS

American flags, which have been flown over the Capitol, can be purchased through my Washington office. They come in two sizes: 3 ft. by 5 ft. for \$4.39, and 5 ft. by 8 ft. for \$9.14. Anyone wishing a flag should send a check, made payable to the House Office Supply, to me at my Washington office.

WELCOME SENATOR HOWARD METZENBAUM

On January 21, 1974, Democrat Howard Metzenbaum took his seat in the U.S. Senate. Senator Metzenbaum has been most cooperative whenever I have requested his assistance.

QUESTIONNAIRE

As your Congressman, I would like to have your opinion on some of the major issues facing the 19th District and the nation. Although the final decision rests with me, your answer to these questions will carry great weight and will help me to better represent you in the United States Congress. Please fill out the questionnaire, fold along the dotted line, attach a stamp (no envelope is needed) and return it to me at your earliest convenience. As soon as the results have been compiled, it will be made available to you. Thank you for participating in this survey.

1. The President's authority to control wages and prices expires on April 30, 1974. What action should Congress take regarding these controls?

(a) Congress should extend the President's authority to control wages and prices for one more year.

(b) Congress should not extend the President's authority to control wages and prices.

(c) Congress should pass a new, stronger law that will be more effective in controlling prices and more fair to working people.

2. Do you think that year-round Daylight Savings Time should be abolished?

(a) yes.

(b) no.

3. How should campaigns for election to the Presidency and the Congress be financed?

(a) the present method of financing Federal election campaigns should be maintained.

(b) there should be strict limits on the amount of money a candidate can spend and also on the amount of money an individual citizen can contribute.

(c) each small individual contribution to a candidate should be matched by an equal amount of public funds.

(d) campaigns for Federal offices should be financed totally from public funds and no private individual contributions should be allowed.

4. If there is still a gasoline shortage this spring and summer, which policy do you favor?

(a) allow the price of gasoline to increase in order to reduce the demand.

(b) raise the tax on gasoline in order to reduce the demand.

(c) establish a nationwide gasoline rationing program with coupon books.

(d) let each State decide how to distribute its gasoline allocation.

5. What policy should Congress adopt toward the oil industry?

(a) tax the excess profits of oil companies.

(b) regulate the oil industry like the public utilities with a fixed profit.

(c) nationalize (government ownership) of the oil industry.

(d) the government should assume a hands-off position.

6. Which statement best describes your views about the Watergate affair and related scandals?

(a) I believe that the House Judiciary Committee should stop investigating President Nixon and let him serve out his term.

(b) I have lost confidence in President Nixon and feel that he should resign.

(c) I believe the House of Representatives should vote to have the Senate hold a trial to determine President Nixon's innocence or guilt of the charges to Watergate.

7. What do you think is the most serious problem facing our nation?

His.

Hers.

8. What do you think is the most serious problem facing the Mahoning-Trumbull County area?

His.

Hers.

NEED FOR ALTERNATE ENFORCEMENT METHOD

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, as we on the Judiciary Committee move forward with the impeachment inquiry, which was overwhelmingly mandated by this body, we are rapidly approaching the point at which enforcement of our subpoenas may be necessary. It is, of course, my hope that no group or individual will ignore or refuse our subpoenas since I am confident that they will be issued fairly, but if this undesirable situation occurs, I feel we must be prepared to move ahead vigorously. Believing that the congressional procedures for compelling obedience to such subpoenas are cumbersome and inadequate, I yesterday introduced legislation which will provide for their enforcement through the Federal district court.

This concept is not new. In fact, my proposal closely parallels S. 2641 which was enacted into law last year and which, as you will recall, provided for judicial enforcement of subpoenas issued by the Senate Select Committee on Watergate. Under my proposal, the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia would be granted jurisdiction over certain civil actions brought by the Judiciary Committee to enforce any subpoenas issued in the conduct of the impeachment inquiry. These actions, under this legislation, would be given top priority and heard at the earliest practicable date.

Presently, Congress has only two methods of forcing compliance with its subpoenas, neither of which is totally acceptable, especially in the instance of an impeachment inquiry.

The first method of subpoena enforcement, which is rarely used, is derived from Congress' common law power to conduct its own trial to determine contempt of witnesses before its committees. If an individual is adjudged in contempt of Congress by the House under this procedure, punishment is limited to one of three forms of physical confinement. Confinement under this procedure has

not been used extensively, therefore, it has become customary to utilize the statutory provisions contained in title 2, section 192 and 194.

In accordance with the lengthy procedures outlined by these statutory provisions, the Judiciary Committee would be required to certify to the House that someone has refused to obey one of its subpoenas, the Speaker would then certify to the U.S. attorney the question of contempt, and finally the matter would be presented to a grand jury for consideration. If the grand jury should return an indictment, a trial would be necessary and the issue of contempt would be prolonged even further. Ultimately, if found guilty, the individual would be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 nor less than \$100, and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months.

Both of these procedures have flaws making them unsuitable for us in the current impeachment inquiry. The statutory procedures, for example, will clearly involve weeks or perhaps months of delay at a time when the American public is clamoring for answers to questions which should have been answered long ago. The common law approach while more expeditious does not provide for the objective and detached enforcement necessary to insure a credible impeachment inquiry.

If we are to avoid entanglement in the troublesome and time-consuming process of congressional subpoena enforcement under the existing methods, the legislation which I am proposing is necessary. This proposal would offer a third option of subpoena enforcement for the current impeachment inquiry which is both expeditious and objective. Under this measure the committee, through its counsels, would bring suit in the district court requiring the enforcement of its subpoena. While there are those who might suggest that this procedure would contaminate the House's power of impeachment, I disagree. From a practical point of view, anyone disobeying a congressional subpoena would appeal to the courts with or without this legislation. It is only reasonable, therefore, that we initiate any necessary enforcement in the courts, while reserving the right to implement other methods of congressional enforcement if deemed necessary.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge adoption of this legislation.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1974 marked the anniversary of the Byelorussian people's proclamation of their national independence. Barely a year after their 1918 declaration they became one of the first victims of Bolshevik expansionism. Today, Byelorussia is administered by Moscow as a puppet state, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

While Americans of Byelorussian descent are observing the 56th anniversary of the proclamation of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, I would like to pay tribute to the Byelorussian people for their undaunted and valiant struggle for human rights, independence, and freedom.

The history of Soviet Russian-dominated Byelorussia is a record of inhumanity, persecution, and violation of human rights. The present relations of Moscow to Byelorussia are colonial and have two distinct aims. One is to exploit the Byelorussian natural resources for the benefit of Russian imperial expansion; the other is to eradicate Byelorussian nationalism in the hope of fostering a homogeneous Soviet empire.

Only Russians are permitted to occupy the key positions in the BSSR; the industrial development in the BSSR is primarily channeled for the express purpose of developing the Russian empire in Siberia and Central Asia; the Byelorussian language has been almost completely eliminated from administrative use, from institutions of higher learning, and from secondary schools. Still, the ceaseless attacks by the Communist press and radio on "Byelorussian Bourgeois Nationalism" prove that these policies are failing, and that Soviet Russia will never succeed in stifling the desire of the Byelorussian people for their national freedom.

On March 25, 1918, the highest aspirations of the Byelorussian people for a free and independent life were fulfilled. Today, March 25th is a symbol of a dynamic spiritual force for Byelorussian Independence which unites all Byelorussians wherever they may be. The fight for Byelorussian independence is also a fight for the emergence of all captive nations, which is a necessary prerequisite for the establishment of lasting peace in the world.

**MRS. CARR WORLAND, OF ST. LOUIS,
NAMED JOINT ACTION IN COMMUNITY SERVICE VOLUNTEER OF
THE YEAR OF REGION VII**

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I have learned of the selection of one my constituents, Mrs. Carr Worland, of St. Louis, as the JACS Volunteer of the Year of Region VII embracing the States of Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa.

Mrs. Worland and the other Volunteers of the Year for the other regions will be honored here in Washington on Thursday, March 28, at a luncheon when the Secretary of Labor Peter J. Brennan will present the awards.

JACS was created in 1967 on the belief that it could reach and involve the multitude of social service, civic, religious, fraternal, and other community-oriented groups, as well as educational institutions, business, industry, and labor organizations in a nationwide series of local efforts to help Job Corpsmen make the most of their new-found skills.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in a story published on March 18, tells of the work of Mrs. Worland for which she is being honored which I believe will be of interest to all Members of Congress. The article is as follows:

**SHE HELPS YOUTHS GET JOBS—AND GETS
AWARD HERSELF**

A young ex-Job Corps member is given the encouragement to enroll in college—and win a baking contest.

An 18-year-old who received training in welding doesn't know where to start to find a job in St. Louis. But a smiling helper finds him a job—and also helps him enroll in night school.

A saddened youth—whose best friend has died—finds someone to talk to in his battle against drugs and in his efforts to go straight.

The St. Louis "friend" who encouraged and helped all three youths—and about 500 other former Job Corps members the last five years—will be honored March 28 as the Midwest Volunteer of the Year in the Joint Action and Community Service program.

Mrs. Carr Worland will go to Washington, D.C., to accept the award from U.S. Secretary of Labor Peter Brennan at a luncheon at the National Press Club.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. Gerard N. Glynn, director of the Newman Center at Washington University and area coordinator and a member of the national board of directors for the program also will attend the awards program.

Mrs. Worland's award, Msgr. Glynn said, brings into focus the work that has been done by volunteers here to help more than 2,000 low-income St. Louis area youths live up to their potential in education and employment.

Under the program begun by Msgr. Glynn in 1969, volunteers work to provide tutoring, counseling, job assistance and encouragement for ghetto and underprivileged youth who return to St. Louis from Job Corps centers.

The average age is about 18. But some are as young as 16 and some as old as 21. Some have received training at the federally sponsored job centers for up to two years—some for six months or only a few weeks.

The program has been operated for five years out of the Newman Center, but plans are being made to raise money to expand the work of the self-help organization and provide more education and counseling.

Msgr. Glynn said it is hoped to raise a minimum of \$20,000—with the long-range goal of \$50,000 for a three-fold expansion of the local program.

The projects proposed include establishment of paid counseling work by three Ph.D. candidates who would work with the individual boys, estimated to cost \$10,000, and organization of a revolving scholarship fund to pave the way for more of the former ghetto youths to enroll in college. The goal for the scholarship fund also is \$10,000.

The long range goal, estimated to cost \$30,000, is to establish a residence counseling program in a house in the ghetto, Msgr. Glynn said. The house, to be operated full-time, would provide a temporary residence for youths returning to the city from Job Corps centers and give them full-time counseling and assistance in jobs.

Mrs. Worland, 30, began working as a volunteer in 1969 while her husband, Julien, was a graduate student. She sees the program as a great opportunity to help underprivileged and poverty-level youths.

She has worked almost full time in the program except for short leaves when two sons, Christopher, now 4, and Jody, 3 weeks old, were born.

She took Christopher along with her to the offices before he was old enough for nursery school, and now she'll take Jody along as she maintains a monthly telephone chain with the youths needing help.

The monthly phone calls are a big part of the program of encouraging youths to stay on the path to achievement.

ABORTION—A MATTER OF CONTROVERSY

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision of January 22, 1973, striking down State laws forbidding the procedure of abortion during the first 3 months of pregnancy, has aroused a great deal of controversy.

Like all of my colleagues, I have received a great deal of mail from my constituents on this issue. These letters are eloquent and express deeply felt convictions on both sides of the question.

I should like to share with you some examples from my file of these letters:

From a family in Dennis, Mass., came the following:

We are seriously distressed by the Supreme Court decision that laws prohibiting abortion are unconstitutional.

We believe that abortion is immoral and that if it is allowed to become prevalent the character of our nation will be seriously impaired.

A doctor from our district wrote:

The common misconception about abortion is that most of the patients having this procedure done are young kids who are promiscuous and not accepting responsibility for their actions. Unfortunately, I have had many patients who are indeed conscientious and responsible but who find that no birth control measure is one hundred percent effective. For the sake of these people I urge you to allow the Supreme Court decision to stand. While no one should be forced to have an abortion I feel equally well that no one should be forced not to have an abortion who conscientiously and sincerely desires it.

A man in Centerville wrote:

I urge you to listen to the people and do what you can to bring about a reversal of this decision. You have the facts of abortion at your disposal and if you have checked the facts you must indeed know by now that abortion is in fact the violent destruction of human life.

A woman in Sagamore wrote:

This is to inform you that I approved of the Supreme Court's decision on abortion. To reverse this law would be taking many steps backwards. I am a 56 year old mother and grandmother who hailed the Supreme Court's approval of abortion as a step forward in these changing times.

A man from Marshfield wrote:

I agree with the editor of a well-known magazine when he said: "Anyone who kills a human embryo, therefore, has to admit to at least the possibility he or she is killing an innocent human person. He may believe he is not, he may be totally convinced he is not. But the fact is, he has no way of ruling out either the possibility or the probability he is not."

A clergyman wrote to me that:

No one wants abortions, but neither do we want our nation to go back to all the illegal abortions which were performed before abortions were declared legal. I lost a cousin at the hands of an untrained abortionist, and I don't want to see that happen to anyone.

From Sandwich, on the Cape, a man wrote:

Very literally, of course, this is a matter of life or death and constitutes an opportunity to live up to our commitment as human beings to the course of life.

A couple in Cohasset wrote:

The question of abortion cannot be easily answered and therefore it seems inappropriate for the government to pass a law taking a religious position and forcing everyone to abide by it. The family directly involved should make the decision as to whether an abortion is necessary.

A couple from Hingham wrote:

When the Supreme Court decreed that abortion should henceforth be legal, we were stunned. Neither of us could believe that our country could sink to so low an evaluation of human life. To deprive human beings of life without due process of law seemed so obviously against the Constitution.

Another doctor from our district wrote:

In the case of women desiring the end of unwanted pregnancies one is compelled to admit that the patient herself should have a choice. I have been in medicine just long enough to have dealt with a good many hundreds of such women and am aware that the situation is generally complex and requires great tact. For some women there is no substitute for abortion. It has been, out of necessity, required for me to send such patients to England in the past.

Were backward steps to be made (immediately) on the status of abortion we would once again be able to help the rich and not help the poor. And even the help to the rich would be second rate.

I would like to add that I personally hope nobody in my family would need an abortion procedure. But I think they should have the right to have it even though I personally would not feel happy about it happening.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the many letters I have received on this subject.

The diversity of opinion is very clear and very strong. Even our religious leaders are divided. Consequently, I have always believed that this is a highly personal area in which the government should not intervene. I do not, therefore, plan to support a constitutional amendment to reverse the recent Supreme Court decision.

As I have been telling my constituents who express their concern and ask that I support such a constitutional amendment:

I should like to tell you why I believe it best not to take this course. The proposed amendments to the Constitution are even more restrictive than our own former Massachusetts law—in that they would prohibit the procedure in all instances whatsoever—even in the event of rape or incest, and possibly even in cases where the life of the mother is endangered by continuation of the pregnancy.

As you may know, this is a deeply personal and highly controversial area—with many sincere Americans holding strong convictions on both sides. At recent Senate hearings, leaders of our major religions testified eloquently on both sides. In such a situation, it seems to me wisest for the government not to intrude—but rather to leave the decision to the conscience of each woman and the judgment of her physician. While I do not personally like the procedure of abortion, I do not believe that I should impose my views on others—nor should they impose theirs on me.

The proper role of Congress, as I see it, should be to ensure that no coercive laws on the subject are enacted and that a new commitment in programs and funds is implemented to provide alternatives to abortion in the form of family planning, pregnancy counseling, and humane foster child and adoption programs.

You might be interested to know that I cosponsored a measure—which has since become law—to allow hospital personnel to refuse, without prejudice to their jobs, to participate in abortion procedures should their conscience so dictate.

While we may not agree entirely on this issue, I assure you that I understand and respect your point of view. I hope very much that we can all do the same for others with whom we may differ. Thank you again for sharing your thoughts—I hope you will continue to do so.

GREEN THUMB PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, discussion often arises in Congress regarding the care and needs of our senior citizens. Among the foremost considerations in searching for a solution to the problems of the aged is returning these people to a life of dignity and quality, as well as a strong sense of usefulness. This is a problem of great importance which we must face. It is no secret that for many of this Nation's elderly, retirement holds nothing more than dependence, anxiety, and loneliness.

However, the picture is not all that bleak thanks to organizations such as Green Thumb, Inc., sponsored by the National Farmers Union and funded by grants from the Labor Department. The Green Thumb program operates in 24 States, including my home State of Utah, and Puerto Rico. It is an employment project for senior citizens at the poverty-income level. All Green Thumb workers must be at least 55 years old, have a low-level income, have rural or farm background, and be in good health.

There is no age limit. The oldest Utah Green Thumb worker is 97 years old. The average age of workers in Utah is 71.9. The workers have done a tremendous amount of work for the State of Utah on a volunteer basis. Green Thumb pays them from grant money, so that workers can earn additional income for food, medical care, and other necessities.

Recently, Utah Green Thumb sent me a copy of their 1973 report. In the report was a copy of a letter from the family of the late Alden Miller, who had been a Green Thumb worker since 1968. The story related is typical of the immense benefits which Green Thumb employment has meant to many of our senior citizens. I insert this letter for the information of interested Members:

NOVEMBER 30, 1973.

Mr. JOHN ZUPKO,
Green Thumb Project,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

DEAR MR. ZUPKO: We, the family of Alden Miller, would like to take this opportunity to

express our appreciation and gratitude to you and the Green Thumb Project for the opportunities it opened up for our husband and father.

Green Thumb meant a new life to him. It gave him independence in himself that he had never been able to express before. He was so proud of his work, his men, and the job that they were doing together. He enjoyed the responsibility of his paper work and this gave him self confidence when he realized that he could do it and was doing a good job.

It was the first time in his life that his job was something special and people looked up to him for supervision. He was most proud that he was chosen to be foreman and he enjoyed working with his crew of men and they were so special to him. He was an intelligent and alert man and Green Thumb gave him a chance to prove this to himself and others.

After working with the Green Thumb Project it was the first time he had been completely out of debt. He was able to save toward fixing up their home (which they had lived in for over 40 years). He and some of his sons were able to lay cement sidewalks all around their home and this was something that they had wanted for some time. They were able to buy some nice new modern chairs for their living room and at the time of his passing plans were being made by he and his wife to carpet and wallpaper some of the rooms in their home.

Christmas of 1972 was the first time that he and his wife were able to save enough money so that they could give Christmas presents to ALL of their family. What a thrill it was for them to give five dollar bills to each of their children and their spouses (16 total), silver dollars to each grandchild (33 total), and silver dollars to each great grandchild (6 total).

December 20, 1972, our parents celebrated their 50th Wedding Anniversary. Daddy had saved the money and for Mother's anniversary gift gave her fifty dollars. How proud he was that he had been able to save this amount out of his Green Thumb earnings for his companion of 50 years.

He was able to save some from each of his checks and had a sizeable savings account for the first time in his life. He felt this was a very good insurance to have this saved for a rainy day.

It was a big load lifted from his and his wife's shoulders when they knew that there was a regular income check coming in each month. Our father was a kind and gentle man who had been poor and hard working all of his life. It was only after he started with the Green Thumb Project and had the financial load lifted that he had time to sit and visit with his friends and loved ones and enjoy life.

It made him so proud when he could go with friends or family and show them some of the accomplishments that he and his crew of Green Thumbers had accomplished. On a Sunday afternoon ride he was so proud to show you such accomplishments as the Falls Lake Improvements, Fairview Museum, Mantle Cemetery fence, Fountain Green Cemetery improvements, and many other various projects.

The Miller Family feels Green Thumb was one of the most rewarding opportunities in our Father's life. What a wonderful program for older men to work in who would otherwise think they had no meaning, place, or purpose in life. Green Thumb gives them the opportunity to prove they are important people and that they still have a useful place in life.

With grateful hearts we want to take this opportunity to thank the Green Thumb Project and especially you—Mr. Zupko, for the confidence and responsibility you placed in our husband and father—Alden Miller. Because of you and Green Thumb, in the last

years of his life he was changed to a happy, proud, and self confident person. His love and appreciation for you was certainly adequately expressed when he requested that you speak at his funeral in the event of his passing.

Again, thank you for all you did for our Husband and Father.

Sincerely,

Zella Miller and Family, Glen, Dorthella, Kenneth, Ronald, Leon, Ray, Lewis, and Gregg.

FORMER OEO ACTING DIRECTOR CRITICIZES LEGAL SERVICES

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, it is often the case that those most familiar with something are in the best position to criticize it. This is true of Howard Phillips, who was Acting Director of OEO for 6 months in 1973, and since has been the most outspoken critic of the Legal Services program launched by OEO and now the subject of heated congressional debate.

Mr. Phillips, who took the helm of OEO with the understanding that it was to be phased out and its deserving programs transferred elsewhere, was frustrated in his efforts to do that, in large part by the Legal Services attorneys, and Legal Services alumni, as it were, who filed suit after suit in Federal courts to prevent the transfer of OEO programs. When he was at OEO, Mr. Phillips was in a unique position to garner public outrage against OEO, and specifically the Legal Services program, as well as to bring to light previously down-played or hidden facts about abuses of the programs. Shortly after taking his position, when the mass media was gearing up against Phillips, letters from all over the country began pouring in to his office, commending him on his announced intentions, and adding to his already fat file of scandals, abuses, miscarriages of publicly supported justice, and so on.

In the months since being rather unceremoniously ejected from OEO, Mr. Phillips has devoted himself to combating bureaucracy wherever it rears its ugly head. Throughout the latter part of 1973, he wrote a series of articles for the conservative weekly, *Human Events*, exposing some of the problems he had come to know. While these articles bear rather catchy titles, I urge my colleagues to read the articles in full, because they are well-written, factual, and the statements of criticism contained therein are significant. I submit several different Howard Phillips articles from September through December 1973:

LEGAL SERVICES ABUSES

(By Howard Phillips)

Who would argue with the concept that America's less affluent citizens should have equal access to the nation's system of justice? Yet how many citizens realize that tax dollars appropriated under the banner of "legal aid for the poor" is in fact used to subsidize a wide-ranging liberal agenda for social change?

The fact is that present legal services activities subsidized by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and other government agencies are used to finance a nationwide network of nearly 3,000 legal services attorneys, hundreds of organizations, and additional thousands of support personnel who are almost totally free to establish their own priorities for issues to receive attention and access to legal services resources. With nearly \$80 million in support annually from OEO alone, they work full-time, using the judicial system to change public policy.

The scope and nature of the "high-impact litigation" by these dedicated activists with law degrees is regularly reflected in *Clearinghouse Review*, a publication financed by OEO through a grantee at the Northwestern University School of Law.

The August 1973 edition of the magazine is typical, with case reports on legal services activities as diverse as a class action attack on the U.S. Postal Service for refusing to hire persons with histories of illegal drug abuse, a suit against Roy Ash, the head of the Office of Management and Budget, challenging the President's impoundment of funds for environmental programs, and a U.S. Supreme Court appeal insisting on the right of an unmarried minor to obtain contraceptives.

Other recent or pending cases receiving aid through the OEO program include:

A Pennsylvania suit challenging the detention of a convicted felon accused of committing an additional crime while free on bail;

A Washington State suit in which attorneys of the Prison Legal Services Project argued that their client, imprisoned on a marijuana charge, had been subjected to cruel and unusual punishment;

A Miami case arguing that seizure of an automobile by the U.S. Bureau of Customs in connection with an allegation of illegal possession of drugs violated the plaintiff's right to due process;

A Merced, Calif., case to gain reinstatement of a high school student accused by school administrators of participating in a race riot and improperly having in his possession a bicycle chain;

A suit by the Western Center on Law and Poverty contesting a college's termination of federal aid to a student convicted of battery in connection with a campus racial melee;

New York and Hawaii suits, knocking down the requirement that government employees be citizens of the United States;

A class action demanding that an Iowa statute prohibiting the civil service employment of convicted felons to be set aside;

A successful challenge to the denial to aliens of Medicare supplemental medical insurance benefits.

A suit supporting the demand of the Eastern Kentucky Welfare Rights Organization that tax-exempt status be denied hospitals refusing to provide free services to poor people;

A Boston class action challenging the city's right to discontinue or threaten to discontinue methadone treatment without a hearing;

A suit by the National Juvenile Law Center against parents who withdrew their child from psychiatric treatment;

A San Francisco Youth Law Project challenge to the State of California's attempt to reconvict a juvenile defendant of second degree murder after his initial conviction was reduced by a juvenile court judge to manslaughter;

A Missouri suit questioning the transfer to adult court jurisdiction of a minor charged with four counts of murder;

A West Virginia case demanding that the warden of the state penitentiary show cause why a prisoner should be denied his liberty before assigning the prisoner to solitary confinement;

A Norwalk, Conn., case challenging the authority of the state welfare department to close down a local welfare office solely on the grounds of administrative efficiency.

Although the above list represents only a partial sampling of one month's reported activity, it is well to observe that many of the cases described appear to have been undertaken in clear violation of regulations and statutes governing legal services activity.

Theoretically, OEO-funded attorneys are precluded from providing representation to those who are not poor or who are voluntarily poor, and in criminal cases. Unfortunately, these prohibitions, drafted with gaping loopholes, have been broadly interpreted and weakly enforced by the national office of legal services.

This points clearly to the need for Congress to spell out with precision the uses to which it wishes legal services appropriations to be put.

Shall legal services be provided so that minor children may bring suit against their parents? Are non-citizens to be represented while needy children are turned away? Are suits on behalf of prison inmates to be allowed at the expense of the noncriminal poor? Should attorneys for the poor be concentrating on marijuana and student disorder cases?

These are just a few of the questions which the U.S. Senate should face when it takes up the proposal for a Legal Services Corporation later this month. For, while attention has focused on presidential usurpation of congressional power, legal services attorneys seem to be having a far greater impact on the course of public policy than either Richard Nixon or Carl Albert.

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DIS- CRIMINATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the 21st of March has been declared as the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

On November 20, 1963, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted unanimously a U.N. Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

I include the full text of the declaration in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point to remind all of us of the goal to which we should all commit ourselves:

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION

The General Assembly,

Considering that the Charter of the United Nations is based on the principles of the dignity and equality of all human beings and seeks, among other basic objectives, to achieve international co-operation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion,

Considering that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaims that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights and that everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set out in the Declaration, without distinction of any kind, in particular as to race, colour, or national origin,

Considering that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaims further that all are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal pro-

tection of the law and that all are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Considering that the United Nations has condemned colonialism and all practices of segregation and discrimination associated therewith, and that the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples proclaims in particular the necessity of bringing colonialism to a speedy and unconditional end,

Considering that any doctrine of racial differentiation or superiority is scientifically false, morally condemnable, socially unjust and dangerous, and that there is no justification for racial discrimination either in theory or in practice.

Taking into account the other resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the international instruments adopted by the specialized agencies, in particular the International Labour Organisation and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in the field of discrimination,

Taking into account the fact that, although international action and efforts in a number of countries have made it possible to achieve progress in that field, discrimination based on race, colour or ethnic origin in certain areas of the world none the less continues to give cause for serious concern,

Alarmed by the manifestations of racial discrimination still in evidence in some areas of the world, some of which are imposed by certain Governments by means of legislative, administrative or other measures, in the form, inter alia, of apartheid, segregation and separation, as well as by the promotion and dissemination of doctrines of racial superiority and expansionism in certain areas,

Convinced that all forms of racial discrimination and, still more so, governmental policies based on the prejudice of racial superiority or on racial hatred, besides constituting a violation of fundamental human rights, tend to jeopardize friendly relations among peoples, co-operation between nations and international peace and security,

Convinced also that racial discrimination harms not only those who are its objects but also those who practise it,

Convinced further that the building of a world society free from all forms of racial segregation and discrimination, factors which create hatred and division among men, is one of the fundamental objectives of the United Nations,

1. Solemnly affirms the necessity of speedily eliminating racial discrimination throughout the world, in all its forms and manifestations, and of securing understanding and respect for the dignity of the human person;

2. Solemnly affirms the necessity of adopting national and international measures to that end, including teaching, education and information, in order to secure the universal and effective recognition and observance of the principles set forth below;

3. Proclaims this Declaration:

ARTICLE 1

Discrimination between human beings on the grounds of race, colour or ethnic origin is an offense to human dignity and shall be condemned as a denial of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations among nations and as a fact capable of disturbing peace and security among peoples.

ARTICLE 2

1. No State, institution, group or individual shall make any discrimination whatsoever in matters of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the treatment of persons, groups of persons or institutions on the grounds of race, colour or ethnic origin.

2. No State shall encourage, advocate or

lend its support, through police action or otherwise, to any discrimination based on race, colour or ethnic origin by any group, institution or individual.

3. Special concrete measures shall be taken in appropriate circumstances in order to secure adequate development or protection of individuals belonging to certain racial groups with the object of ensuring the full enjoyment by such individuals of human rights and fundamental freedoms. These measures shall in no circumstances have as a consequence the maintenance of unequal or separate rights for different racial groups.

ARTICLE 3

1. Particular efforts shall be made to prevent discrimination based on race, colour or ethnic origin, especially in the fields of civil rights, access to citizenship, education, religion, employment, occupation and housing.

2. Everyone shall have equal access to any place or facility intended for use by the general public, without distinction as to race, colour or ethnic origin.

ARTICLE 4

All States shall take effective measures to revise governmental and other public policies and to rescind laws and regulations which have the effect of creating and perpetuating racial discrimination wherever it still exists. They should pass legislation for prohibiting such discrimination and should take all appropriate measures to combat those prejudices which lead to racial discrimination.

ARTICLE 5

An end shall be put without delay to governmental and other public policies of racial segregation and especially policies of *apartheid*, as well as all forms of racial discrimination and separation resulting from such policies.

ARTICLE 6

No discrimination by reason of race, colour or ethnic origin shall be admitted in the enjoyment by any person of political and citizenship rights in his country, in particular the right to participate in elections through universal and equal suffrage and to take part in the government. Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

ARTICLE 7

1. Everyone has the right to equality before the law and to equal justice under the law. Everyone, without distinction as to race, colour or ethnic origin, has the right to security of person and protection by the State against violence or bodily harm, whether inflicted by government officials or by any individual, group or institution.

2. Everyone shall have the right to an effective remedy and protection against any discrimination he may suffer on the ground of race, colour or ethnic origin with respect to his fundamental rights and freedoms through independent national tribunals competent to deal with such matters.

ARTICLE 8

All effective steps shall be taken immediately in the fields of teaching, education and information, with a view to eliminating racial discrimination and prejudice and promoting understanding, tolerance and friendship among nations and racial groups, as well as to propagating the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

ARTICLE 9

1. All propaganda and organizations based on ideas or theories of the superiority of one race or group of persons of one colour or ethnic origin with a view to justifying or promoting racial discrimination in any form shall be severely condemned.

2. All incitement to or acts of violence, whether by individuals or organizations, against any race or group of persons of another colour or ethnic origin shall be considered an offence against society and punishable under law.

3. In order to put into effect the purposes and principles of the present Declaration, all States shall take immediate and positive measures, including legislative and other measures, to prosecute and/or outlaw organizations which promote or incite to racial discrimination, or incite to or use violence for purposes of discrimination based on race, colour or ethnic origin.

ARTICLE 10

The United Nations, the specialized agencies, State and nongovernmental organizations shall do all in their power to promote energetic action which, by combining legal and other practical measures, will make possible the abolition of all forms of racial discrimination. They shall, in particular, study the causes of such discrimination with a view to recommending appropriate and effective measures to combat and eliminate it.

ARTICLE 11

Every State shall promote respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and shall fully and faithfully observe the provisions of the present Declaration, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

TAKE A LONG, LAST LOOK AT THE CONDOR

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the California condor, America's largest land bird, numbers less than 60 today and Hal Borland, writing in *National Wildlife*, a publication just released by the National Wildlife Federation, pinpoints this problem.

The article follows:

TAKE A LONG, LAST LOOK AT THE CONDOR
(By Hal Borland)

The Sun has been up for an hour now, and currents of warm air have begun to rise from the California canyon floors. Hopping awkwardly along a high ledge, a huge black bird with a naked gray neck and a reddish-orange head flaps its wings a few times, rides the thermal draft upward in enormous spirals and glides away to the south. You stand and watch, awed, and then look around, half expecting to see a saber-toothed cat, a woolly mammoth, a giant dire wolf or a big short-faced bear. For that soaring creature is *Gymnogyps Californianus*, the California condor, largest land bird in North America and perhaps the last remnant of the distant past that saw man's own beginnings.

Although it trails a million years or more behind it, the California condor, as a species, may be very near its end. In the past century, condors have almost vanished from the face of the earth, casualties of man's conquest of the continent. But this darkly majestic link with the Ice Age is only one of several dozen birds and animals poised, right now, on the brink of oblivion.

The Ivory-billed woodpecker, for instance, which America's first ornithologist, Alexander Wilson, called "a majestic and formidable

species," was down to only 24 known individuals in 1941. Today, a count is not even available. Some ornithologists believe it is extinct, although a very few of the birds may still survive in remote areas of Louisiana, Texas and South Carolina. The Florida panther, once common from the Keys up into the Carolinas, now can be found only in the Everglades and the latest estimate sets the number there at between 150 and 300. The brown pelican has been wiped out along the Texas coast and is vanishing from the California coast as well, a victim of pesticides that build up in the fish it eats.

Once found all along the Florida and Gulf coast, the American crocodile is now reduced to about 500, all of them in the Everglades. The legendary eastern timber wolf has all but disappeared from the East. And the black-footed ferret, once found from Texas to Canada, wherever prairie dogs were found, has been almost exterminated by the poisoning of the prairie dogs. Of all the species facing extinction today, however, none is a more poignant symbol of threatened wildlife in general than that bizarre combination of magnificence and ugliness, the California condor.

Its walk is the pigeon-toed waddle of a fat goose. Its yellowish legs and feet are those of an outside barnyard chicken, even to the almost useless claws. Its naked head with the blunt, overshot beak is often pulled down into a ruff of dark feathers, making it seem to have no neck at all. And its big reddish eyes, which have the telescopic sight of all hawks and vultures, look almost withdrawn.

In the air, though, the condor is a totally different creature, one of the most skilled soaring birds that ever lived. Its long, broad wings have a spread of nine to ten feet. On them, the bird can soar for hours at a time with no visible motion except in the finger-like feathers at the tips. Soaring—not diving, but flat soaring—it has been timed at more than 50 miles per hour. Although it is a black bird, the adult condor has large white triangular patches on the undersides of the wings. At rest, it stands four feet tall; with wings raised, it becomes a six-footer. A fully-grown adult weighs 20 to 30 pounds or more, depending on how recently it has eaten. Notwithstanding its malevolent appearance, the condor does not kill, even for food. It is a scavenger, and at times may eat almost half its own weight at a sitting. Its natural life span is 30 to 45 years, possibly more.

The California condors were well established in North America when the first men arrived over the land bridge from Siberia to Alaska. They were common all the way down the Pacific coast into Mexico and across the whole southern half of the present United States. Inevitably, west coast Indians created legends about them. The Tlingit people, for instance, said the condor made the thunder by flapping its wings and shot lightning from its eyes. Similar legends grew up among other tribes, and the condor became the coastal Indians' thunderbird, as the eagle was the thunderbird of the plains Indians. It was feared and worshiped, and eventually it became a familiar figure on the totem poles, as well as in ornamentation.

Written accounts of the condor had to wait for the white man. Father Ascension, a Carmelite friar, wrote the first report after seeing a flock of the huge birds feeding on a dead whale in Monterey Bay in 1602. Nearly 200 years later, British botanist Archibald Menzies saw condors at the same Monterey Bay and took a dead specimen back to England with him. (It can still be seen in the British Museum.) The Lewis and Clark expedition saw condors—which they called "remarkably large buzzards," 400 miles inland, in present-day Idaho. The explorers also found flocks of them feeding on dead salmon at the mouth of the Columbia in 1806. John C. Fremont saw them on his western expeditions in the early 1840's. John James Audubon never saw

a live condor (his condor picture was painted from notes and sketches made by others) but his son did, in California, in 1849.

By then, however, the condor population was waning. The early Spanish settlers in California did little to disturb the birds. In fact, their dead cattle provided more than ample food for the condors, and few of the rancheros thought there was any sport in killing them. Then came the Mexican War, discovery of nuggets at Sutter's millrace and the gold rush. Partly out of bravado, the gold-miners began to shoot condors—such big birds had to be dangerous.

Then, someone found that the quills of the condor's wing feathers made good containers for gold dust—a quill of dust was worth \$105. Empty quills sold for a dollar apiece, so condors were shot for their quills. But ammunition cost money, so someone thought of "penning" condors. Hunters built an open box, six feet square and five feet deep, and baited it with a sheep or goat carcass. A condor came, lighted in the pen to feed and, unable to spread its wings in the small space or hop over the wall, was trapped.

While the condors were thus being killed by miners, collectors were at work "saving nature." Museums and private collectors assembled displays of birds' eggs and, because they were so scarce, condor eggs became extremely valuable.

The only condors then surviving were in the rugged mountains east of Santa Barbara, but the collectors found them.

In the early 1900s, a ranch hand named Kelly Truesdale began collecting and selling condor eggs. While working on the Carrisa Plains, Truesdale had seen condors soaring overhead and vanishing into the nearby mountains. So he hacked his way through chaparral for two days to the condor roost, climbed a cliff to reach the nest and found an egg. He took it home and later sold it for \$300. Truesdale had found his bonanza. Nobody knows how many condor eggs and chicks he eventually took out. But today, there are 54 known condor eggs in existing collections and 198 stuffed condors or condor skins, and Truesdale probably sold his full share of them.

Not until the 1920s was there any great interest in the condor's plight. Then, in 1926, the famed explorer and ornithologist William Beebe, declared: "The condor's doom is near. Within a few years at most the last individual will have perished." Six years later, Alexander Wetmore of the Smithsonian Institution estimated the total condor population at ten. Finally, in 1939, the American Ornithological Union made a quick survey which indicated that there were about 50 condors still surviving. Since then a number of other surveys have been undertaken and the most recent data indicate that the total condor population remains somewhere between 40 and 60. The fact that most of those birds are adults, one expert emphasizes, suggests that "there has been no hatch during the past five or six years."

Normally, only one egg is laid each year by a female condor and it takes six weeks to hatch. If that egg is broken or stolen early, the bird may lay another to replace it, but not if the brooding time is half gone. Once hatched, the chick is dependent for at least seven months, often as long as a year. With a dependent chick the mother condor doesn't lay an egg that spring but waits another year. That averages out to one egg every other year, and the young birds do not mate until they are six or seven years old. At that production rate, it doesn't take many accidents to wipe out a whole population.

Today, man remains the condor's principal enemy. Although it is illegal to shoot the birds, a few are shot from time to time by ignorant or irresponsible gunners. Poisoned carcasses used by ranchers to kill coyotes

and other "pests" are also a constant hazard to the condor which is a scavenger. Even in the sanctuaries established specifically to save the condor from harassment, the birds are still harassed. In 1937, a small roosting and nesting area was set aside for condors in Sisquoc canyon in California's Los Padres National Forest. In 1951, a much larger area (53,000 acres) was designated as the Sespe Condor Sanctuary 50 miles farther south in Ventura County. But the problem in both places is man and his machines.

Condors are easily disturbed, often becoming moody and confused. They are cat-curious and will watch a man in their area for hours. (One was seen to perch in the same tree 22 hours, watching a condor-watcher.) If people come too near, however, or stay too long—or if loud noises persist even a mile away—the condors simply move out, deserting nest, egg or chick if necessary. Yet the U.S. Forest Service remains permissive to curiosity seekers, to livestock grazers, even to oil drillers, in the Sespe Sanctuary. The highway builders keep trying to put a thoroughway through. The dam builders want to build dams there. And somebody always has another plan for "developing" the wilderness area.

Thus far, the condors have been saved from extinction by the work of half a dozen organizations and perhaps a hundred determined individuals, backed by thousands of others. Unless the campaign is substantially broadened, though, the species' days are numbered.

Why even try to save "those forty dirty birds," as some call them? As scavengers, condors have a vitally important role to play in nature's scheme of things. Beyond that, however, the condor must be saved simply because it is a part of the great, infinitely varied stream of life. And since it is one of the last living links with man's own beginnings, the condor may well have something to tell us—if we would only pause and listen about time . . . and change . . . and enduring.

WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

HON. HAROLD B. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1974

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join in wishing our able colleague from California "God-speed" as he leaves the Congress. Our regret at his departure is tempered by the knowledge that his talents will continue to be employed in behalf of the Nation.

William S. Mailliard, more informally known as Bill, has served America well, first in the Navy and then in the U.S. House of Representatives. He was beginning his third term when I began serving in the House back in 1957. During those 17 years I have come to know him well. I respect him for his ability, his dedication, and his friendliness.

Bill has done great things on behalf of his district, his State, and his country, both as a Member of this great body and as a member of two great arms of the House—the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where he became the ranking minority member, and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Congressman Mailliard's expertise will now be utilized in a greater sphere, the

Organization of American States. I am confident that he will give as good an account of himself there as he has in the Congress.

**STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF
COMMERCE FREDERICK B. DENT**

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DORN, Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Commerce Fred Dent is a statesman whose leadership, character, and ability instills the highest confidence. In light of recent international developments, Secretary Dent's comments are especially timely and important. It is a special pleasure to call to the attention of the Congress his excellent statement on the proposed Trade Reform Act:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE FREDERICK B. DENT, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE ON H.R. 10710, MARCH 6, 1974

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Committee and to express my views on H.R. 10710, the Trade Reform Act of 1973.

As we are all aware, some rather major events have occurred since the Administration forwarded its proposed trade legislation to the Congress last spring, particularly the energy problem and oil embargo, as well as a strengthening of the dollar relative to the currencies of our trading partners. We have carefully re-evaluated the trade bill and the need for trade negotiation in the present context of events. It is my firm belief that the trade bill and trade negotiations are more necessary than ever to deal with our recent difficulties. An improved framework for trade relations will help deal more effectively with new problems as they arise.

First, the United States will need to export more to pay for what we buy. The U.S. trade position did improve in 1973 as the result of a record-setting export performance, but prospects for 1974 are not encouraging. The merchandise trade balance shifted from a deficit of \$6.4 billion in 1972 to a \$1.7 billion surplus position this year. Exports, excluding military grant-aid, expanded by 42%, three times the rate of advance recorded in 1972, to \$70 billion. Imports climbed 24%, only slightly faster than in the preceding year, to \$69 billion. Higher prices, reflecting inflation and currency revaluations, contributed heavily to the rise in U.S. foreign trade values.

Several factors accounted for the huge export gain: (1) a strong acceleration in foreign economic activity, (2) increased U.S. competitiveness due to the monetary realignments of the past two years, (3) unusually heavy demand for U.S. farm products due to shortages abroad, and (4) the attraction of high world commodity prices which made exporting of some products especially profitable in view of domestic price controls. Most of the import increase reflected higher prices. The volume of our foreign purchases was retarded by the currency shifts, which made other countries' goods more expensive, and by the slowdown in the U.S. economy as the year progressed.

The trade outlook for 1974 is extremely cloudy because of the uncertain effects of the energy crisis. It now appears that the U.S. trade balance will shift back to a deficit position. While exports are expected to advance, the import increase is likely to be much

larger due to the sharply higher cost of petroleum from abroad. Export expansion in 1974 will be substantially slower than last year's spectacular gain as economic growth in our major markets will be reduced. At the same time, however, sales of farm commodities should continue strong for some time and product shortages abroad could stimulate demand for some U.S. goods. While the anticipated rise in the petroleum import bill will swell the value of our foreign purchases, arrivals of other products from abroad may be restrained by a further slowing of the U.S. economy and the demand-dampening effects of higher foreign prices.

Consequently, we need the authority presently incorporated in the Trade Reform Act to obtain greater market access abroad for our exports.

Secondly, other countries in seeking ways to finance their greater energy costs may be tempted to restrict imports of other goods while artificially encouraging exports through subsidies or other means. Not only will the trade bill provide the legal tools for combating unfair or unreasonable trade practices, but it also will enable U.S. participation in multilateral negotiations designed to continue progress toward liberalization and reform of the international economic system. Moreover, enactment of the Trade Reform Act is necessary to give credibility and authority to our negotiators in international forums dealing with trade matters.

Certainly, we do not want to repeat the type of shortsighted, restrictive approaches of the 30's, which resulted in decreased trade and worldwide depression. But, if the trade bill is delayed, then we risk other countries' relying on unilateral measures designed to promote their own self interest rather than seeking multilateral solutions to common problems which would be beneficial to all nations.

One of the major characteristics of the world economy at present is the prevalence of tight supply-demand situations and record price levels in many of the major internationally traded basic raw materials and foodstuffs. While the present period of widespread supply difficulties will surely abate, short supplies and rising prices of some commodities can be expected intermittently. These new issues will likely cause a shift in international concern from solely an emphasis on market access to one including equitable access to supplies. While equitable market opportunities for U.S. products remains our main trade policy objective, it can be anticipated that no longer will the issue of market access be considered in international forums without concurrent consideration of equitable access to supplies.

The problems raised by short supplies impact the international economic system on several fronts. Solutions reside in international cooperation and consultations, and not through shortsighted unilateral actions. Unilateral restrictive trade or monetary actions which are taken to relieve domestic economic problems caused by short supplies will adversely affect the economies of other countries. Offsetting measures by the affected countries are likely to follow, the result of which is that every country loses. Such consequences can best be precluded if national policies are taken in concert with accepted international norms or agreed procedures.

In considering the wide range of new multilateral approaches to the problem of short supplies, including a more effective code of general principles governing short-supply situations and regularized multilateral consultation procedures, it must be kept in mind that the U.S. is both a major raw material supplier and a major consumer and any limitations we seek to impose on the export control actions of other countries in the context of an international code of conduct would affect our own freedom of action.

TARIFF AUTHORITY

Let me now turn to the trade bill itself, focusing on those features which are of special interest to the Department of Commerce. With one or two exceptions, a bill as passed by the House of Representatives has emerged as a responsive and constructive answer to the complex trade policy objectives that the U.S. should seek to achieve in the forthcoming round of new trade negotiations.

In the area of tariffs, we believe that authority to eliminate, reduce or increase duties on all products in the context of negotiated agreements is needed to deal with two main problem areas. The first is the tariff disadvantage U.S. exporters face in competing with European producers in European markets where internal tariffs on the movement of industrial products within that market are being eliminated, but continue to apply to third country suppliers. The European Community is also expanding its network of preferential arrangements with countries in the Mediterranean area, Africa and elsewhere. A major reduction of tariffs provides the most practicable approach for offsetting the erosion of the most-favored-nation keystone of the post-war trading system which until recent years protected U.S. exporters against tariff discrimination in foreign markets. The second relates to the high tariffs on some products that all of our major trading partners still maintain to varying degrees, especially those on products where our exports would have a competitive edge if high tariffs were reduced.

The tariff reduction authority contained in the bill is somewhat less than we have requested; however, it does contain sufficient negotiating authority to achieve a substantial reduction in tariff levels worldwide and to work toward greater market access for U.S. products abroad.

NONTARIFF BARRIERS

Concerted efforts will also be required to reduce or eliminate nontariff barriers to trade, commonly known as NTB's. NTB's, such as import licensing systems, discriminatory standards or procurement regulations, advertising or packaging laws, and so forth, are more effective in many ways than tariffs in barring U.S. exports from foreign markets, diminishing the benefits of reciprocal trade concessions and preventing the further development of open and nondiscriminatory trade among nations.

I believe that the multilateral approach to negotiations on NTB's will open up new opportunities for finding solutions to the very difficult question of how to deal with trade barriers that are embodied in a wide range of national laws, regulations and administrative practices. While we hope to accomplish as much as possible in this area during the period scheduled for the current negotiations, past experience tells us that negotiations on nontariff barriers must realistically be viewed in a longer time frame for maximum results.

It should be possible to negotiate and implement some important NTB agreements within the 5-year time limit imposed by the bill, such as codes on standards and licensing and government procurement practices. But we must also recognize the inherent complexity and difficulty of dealing with practices that are imbedded in complex national laws and involve important domestic constituencies. We feel, therefore, that these negotiations should be viewed as only the beginning of a continuous process. Since Section 102 insures close and continual involvement of the Congress in the negotiation and implementation of NTB agreements, it could be argued that there is no need to place a time limitation on this particular authority.

GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY CONSULTATIONS

One aspect of the forthcoming negotiations, in which I have a particularly strong

Interest, involves the establishment of a joint consultation program between government negotiators and domestic industries to assure that the views of American industry are fully considered from the early preparatory stages to the final agreements.

Ambassador Eberle and I agreed many months ago that there was a need for a closer and more effective industry-government relationship than has existed in previous negotiations. Anticipating the Congressional interest that has been reflected in Section 135, we initiated a joint three-stage program to develop an adequate mechanism for such mutual consultations. The first two stages took place between June and September 1973 and encompassed a series of 18 briefings for some 600 participants at both the policy and technical levels of U.S. industry. We solicited their views and recommendations on how to establish an effective consultative mechanism. We also asked them to nominate representatives from their industries whom they consider particularly well qualified to represent their views in the consultation process.

We are now embarking on the third stage. Formal advisory committees are being established under provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The structure we are establishing provides for one overall Policy Advisory Committee composed of chief executives from industry as policy-level advisors for American industry as a whole. In addition, there will also be some 26 Technical Advisory Committees covering the various sectors of U.S. industry. We are convinced that the experience and expertise which these industry advisors will bring to government decision-making will greatly assist our negotiators in their efforts to obtain maximum benefits for the U.S. in the negotiating process.

Of course, these industry advisory committees constitute only one aspect of the extensive public input which we will be seeking prior to entering into trade negotiations. The bill, as passed by the House, contains provisions for an overall public advisory committee, Tariff Commission advice based on public hearings and public hearings before an agency or interagency committee designated by the President.

IMPORT RELIEF AND SAFEGUARD MEASURES

Another important feature of this bill is the significant relaxation of the relatively stringent domestic eligibility criteria for import relief. Under the existing TEA rules of eligibility for "escape clause" relief, almost two-thirds of the petitioning industries have failed to meet the qualifying test. I think we can all agree that the present TEA import relief measures are inadequate to deal with those disruptions to certain American manufacturers which are caused by injurious increases of imports resulting from changing patterns of international trade. More realistic eligibility criteria for safeguard relief are necessary under present conditions, and of course will be needed even more perhaps to meet the new conditions of competition following completion of the proposed trade negotiations.

While the new round of negotiations and further trade liberalization will undoubtedly bring benefits for American exporters, producers, and consumers, it is also important to recognize that some industries may encounter individual hardships in making timely adjustment to the increased import competition that may arise in certain sectors as the liberalization procedures take effect. I consider that the easier access to the escape clause provided by the TRA is vital if we are to provide assurances to U.S. industry that they will be safeguarded against unforeseen disruptions from imports as trade barriers are reduced.

In addition to the need for a more effective domestic procedure to guard against disruptions

caused by changing patterns of international trade, it is also important that new arrangements be developed at the international level to deal with such problems. As part of the upcoming trade negotiations, we will seek better international rules to cope with rapid changes in foreign trade patterns and sudden inflows of particular products from abroad. It is generally recognized by the nations of the world that we need to develop a multilateral safeguard system—one that would operate in a more equitable manner.

ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

In view of the fact that an integral part of import relief is the adjustment of our domestic industries, I would like to comment briefly on the program of assistance to firms included in Chapter III, Title II. I believe that the new provisions provide for a sound program of aid to import-impacted American manufacturers. Those provisions should eliminate the main problems which have hampered accomplishment of similar objectives under current law. The simple and more objective qualifying criteria will make it easier to identify immediate problems and to apply sound measures that will help industrial firms improve their operations. It should be understood that we intend to provide quick assistance to firms whose difficulties clearly stem from import competition and that we do not intend that firms experiencing declining sales and production as a consequence of seasonal and cyclical forces or because of changing domestic competition should receive trade adjustment assistance. In addition to this program, the President proposed on February 19 the Economic Adjustment Act of 1974 which will provide, among other benefits, further federal assistance to help industries adjust to foreign competition.

TRADE WITH NONMARKET ECONOMY COUNTRIES

As you know, the bill as originally drafted would have made it possible to expand significantly our trade with nonmarket economy countries.

There are two basic economic advantages to the United States in extending nondiscriminatory treatment to imports from nonmarket economy countries. First, it will normalize our commercial relations with these countries. We have strong reasons to believe that once normal commercial relations are established, the nonmarket economy countries will increase their purchases from the U.S., thus maintaining the large contribution which this trade has already made to our balance of payments, and creating new jobs for Americans as new exports are developed.

Secondly, we anticipate extending nondiscriminatory tariff treatment in the context of trade agreements or trade protocols. These agreements would benefit U.S. firms engaged in East-West trade through measures for the improvement of U.S. Government commercial representation in the local country and provision for reciprocal credits, arbitration, patent and copyright protection, and business facilities. Also, these agreements would resolve other barriers to trade such as outstanding financial claims and bond obligations.

With regard to restrictions on credit, I would point out that most other western industrial countries have found normal export credit policies necessary for expanding their trade with non-market economy countries in view of the foreign exchange shortage in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European countries. Credits have been used to encourage such trade because these countries have continually seen their exports to the East exceed imports.

Denial of U.S. credit for the purchase of eligible items will be less harmful to the non-market economy countries (who can get similar goods elsewhere) than to the U.S., which stands to lose significant sales to foreign

competitors. The result, of course, would mean that potential American jobs would go to other countries willing and able to finance exports to the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European countries. The extension of U.S. Government supported credits for East-West trade, on the other hand, would allow U.S. businessmen to sell, at interest rates which are competitive with those offered elsewhere in the West.

In summary, improved economic and commercial relations with the non-market economy countries can contribute to our balance of trade, given their strong desire to import U.S.-made manufactured goods. Such U.S. exports are, of course, subject to controls on items involving our national security. Furthermore, increased East-West trade could provide new sources of energy and other raw materials, as well as more employment opportunity for American labor. I would urge therefore that this Committee eliminate the restrictions placed on the authority of Title IV by the House of Representatives that would reduce rather than expand trade with non-market economy countries.

T. G. REEVES

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the death of a longtime and good friend is always a particularly sad time for all of us. Just last week in my hometown of Columbus, Ga., one of the most highly respected members of our community, Mr. T. G. Reeves, passed away. T. G. Reeves was in the truest sense "a man for all seasons"—many great and noble things could well be said of and about him.

At this time, I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Mr. Maynard R. Ashworth, president of the Columbus Ledger-Enquirer newspapers, which is a touching tribute to a great man—written by a great man in his own right.

The article reads:

T. G. REEVES, A GREAT LEADER, A FINE FRIEND

(NOTE.—The following is a tribute to the late T. G. Reeves, written by Maynard R. Ashworth, a long-time personal friend and associate, and president of the Ledger-Enquirer newspapers.)

T.G. is dead.

This is hard to believe—it just can't be—but he is gone.

I have known T.G. since 1927—47 years. I've known T.G. in business, I've known him in political campaigns, in political office—when he managed his father-in-law's campaign for governor of the state—and during the eighteen years he was on the Board of County Commissioners of Muscogee County, his many ramifications in politics in Muscogee County, his interest in all political offices of the state as well as at the local level. His opinion was always asked—his influence sought, felt mandatory to election—by political candidates.

I knew him in baseball, when he headed the local minor league baseball club affiliated with the St. Louis Cardinals. He was Mr. Baseball. Branch Rickey was his friend. He palled with the great baseball.

I have known him in his many years of effective work with the Army, I've associated with him on many occasions involving the

military. We've made many trips together to Washington regarding civilian-Army relations—we have been together so often at Fort Benning it was like home. We've known many at all military levels. His opinion was asked on many occasions reference the military. And he was loyal always, intensely loyal to the Army. And the Army was loyal to him. They respected him for his support, for his innate integrity. T.G. was a sergeant major of the old school—he had the rank of sergeant major in World War I. He knew Army language, he knew the characteristics of those who served in the Army, he understood the Army.

I have been with T.G. on many social functions, at his farm, at state capitols, fishing. Always it has been exciting and challenging, the unusual, to know T.G. in all of his activities, to be a friend and to have him as a friend. He was a close friend, one who stood by when the going was rough. He was not a fair weather friend.

He loved pointed banter, repartee of a poignant and spirited nature—cutting—slashing—so much so people listening thought "this is a fight," but no, it was always "for fun." And he and I were continuously at it—he loved it—so did I.

I shall miss him, I shall miss him sorely because I have come down the long road of life with this friend and his passing will not be taken in stride. It will be profoundly sad and there will be a lonesomeness which cannot be overcome—only T.G. filled his vigorous life as no other, in his way—no one could be like him.

Finally, T.G. was a deeply religious man. He always said, "the Old Master, He knows best. Whatever He tells me to do that I try to do." So the "Old Master" has decided that it is time for T.G. to leave his life and the rest of us must accept His decision.

I shall miss him.

So, T.G. —30—

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, modern surface mining methods with large-scale machinery allow removal of surface earth and rock, extraction of the coal and restoration of surface to its original, or a better, use. This cycle from grass to grass seldom misses as many as two growing seasons, and frequently only one.

Today's modern, highly technical surface mining industry would be harassed and victimized by H.R. 11500 for something that happened before it was created.

In the old laissez faire days along the Appalachian Chain, coal seams outcropping the mountainsides were stripped with obvious disregard for the environmental aftermath. This was done mostly by small operators using crude technology. Large areas of the countryside show the environmental scars of their unconcern.

The old quick and dirty strip mining methods are as different as day from night from today's modern surface mines run by environmentally responsible operators.

H.R. 11500 takes no account of this difference. It is as unrealistic as trying to grow bananas on Pike's Peak.

GUARANTEED RIGHTS OF PRIVACY TO INDIVIDUALS

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able and deeply committed privacy proponents is former Congressman Jackson E. Betts. He led a campaign to reform the decennial census which had support from all parts of America. As a Member of Congress for 22 years, Jack Betts saw the growth of the Federal bureaucracy gradually probe deeper and deeper into individual lives. He is currently most interested in congressional activity for restoring the rights to privacy.

The congressional program for privacy is on the move, Mr. Speaker, as we will dramatically demonstrate next Tuesday, April 4, when a 2-hour special order, "The Congressional Commitment for Privacy" is scheduled.

From this expression of support to make the 93d Congress the "Privacy Congress," we will have our national battle plan for success.

Mr. Speaker, I request a letter I have received from Mr. Betts of Ohio be included with my remarks:

JACKSON E. BETTS,

Findlay, Ohio, March 21, 1974.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER, Jr.,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BARRY: Those of us who have been pressing for legislation to guarantee rights of privacy to individuals whose personal records are now vastly more sensitive in computerized form should wholeheartedly welcome President Nixon's recent State of the Union announcement. The Pledge of Executive level attention to develop proper standards for collection and use of facts about individuals supports the demands for strong action made by Members of Congress for nearly a decade.

Few can dispute the importance or urgency for a policy level review of government record-keeping practices. Nevertheless, studying the situation may be time consuming and in any event the course of action is already charted in legislation currently before Congress. Your bills, like many reforms introduced in earlier years, can serve as the basis of a presidential reform program.

My thinking on the subject centers on the largest and most comprehensive collection of personal facts; the census. I evaluated the 1970 decennial census plans in 1967 and found them overly involved and threatening every citizen with a jail sentence if he failed to comply. Despite the lively controversy which followed on my proposal to limit mandatory census questions, I still believe the census reflects a basic issue in bringing into balance national information requirements against the citizen's right to retain certain facts about himself, his home and personal life. This dispute still must be resolved.

A variety of criticisms of present Federal information practices have been raised in the last ten years in addition to the conduct of the census. Creation of a national data center, selling mailing lists, releasing Federal personal income tax returns, building central files for the unemployed, welfare recipients, children of migrant children, and adopted children, maintaining and distributing investigative and arrest files in the hands of law enforcement organizations and the role of

credit reporting agencies, have come under congressional scrutiny. Each has its own merits and priority for Congress. Information collection is but the first stage in the process of record-keeping, applications of data and transfers of information held in Federal computers.

I was delighted that a broad, comprehensive solution to the dilemma of privacy versus government information handling has come to the forefront in your bill to create a Code of Fair Information Practices. This concept together with enforcement through the Department of Justice and the Courts is a great advance over earlier piecemeal approaches. The American people are calling for high standards, clearly defined and strongly upheld by all public agencies. I hope with hearings and support from the press and public, it will be passed in the House as the model of national action.

These are times when confidence in our system of government and our leaders in Washington are waning. Surely an important element of trust and support for the government lies in maintaining high respect for individual privacy in the collection of personal information. Proposals such as issuing Americans identification numbers only intensifies the problem of assuring rights of individual identity and personality. The President's willingness to open an intensive Cabinet-level review of Federal information practices is an important recognition that basic human needs are involved.

As a veteran of the battles to assure citizen rights to personal privacy in the computer age, I wish you overwhelming success in approval of a Code of Fair Information Practices. You can be certain of my continued commitment to resolve this issue.

Sincerely,

JACK BETTS.

CITIZEN LIFESAVERS

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, too often the heroic deeds of private citizens go unnoticed—lost in headlines of political and social turmoil that are so prevalent in our time. Therefore, I want to take this opportunity to commend the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and its correspondent, Marge Van Iseghem, for their article on seven citizen lifesavers. To be congratulated even more, however, are the citizens themselves who, in many cases, disregarded their own health and safety to come to the aid of their fellow man.

The article, in the February 27 edition of the Democrat and Chronicle, follows:

CITIZEN LIFESAVERS

CANANDAIGUA.—Seven life-saving awards were presented last night during the 12th Canandaigua Safety Council.

Also honored was a Reed Corners truck driver who has driven one million accident-free miles.

The safety patrols at Canandaigua Elementary School and Saint Mary's Parochial schools received awards for dedicated service to fellow students.

Robert H. Haight, a city patrolman, presented the safety awards as chairman of the recipient selection committee.

Life-saving commendations went to:

Barbara Olds, of Canandaigua town, credited with saving the life of a swimmer

in England last May. Miss Olds swam about 40 yards in 100-foot deep waters of a stream to rescue a man who encountered problems while practicing long-distance swimming.

Jerry R. Moore, Crystal Beach volunteer fireman, credited with saving a driver from a burning car last July 13.

Joseph J. Veto, of Manchester, manual arts therapy assistant at the local Veterans Administration Hospital, who provided artificial respiration aid for a patient discovered overcome on the hospital lawn Sept. 12.

David Weatherspoon, of Geneva, who works in building maintenance at the Veterans Hospital. On Dec. 6 he acted quickly to remove a burning jacket from a patient and the patient suffered few consequences from the emergency.

Robert Stetzenmeyer, a member of the Canandaigua Mutual Hook and Ladder Co., who saved the lives of two persons trapped in the second story of a burning home outside Shortsville last June. Stetzenmeyer called firemen and enlisted aid of four construction workers, who helped him steady a ladder while he rescued the occupants.

Gary S. Fritz of Naples, is Ontario County Planning Administrator, credited with giving emergency aid to a patient while on a call with the Naples Fire Ambulance. Fritz's efforts last Dec. 23 saved the patient's life, doctors said.

Anthony Cardulla of Victor, who helped save a co-worker on a building project. The worker suffered electrical shock when he fell from a ladder. Cardulla tugged a tool free from the victim's hand by the cord and applied mouth to mouth resuscitation to save the man's life.

The occupational award went to Jerome F. Carroll of Reed Corners. Carroll, a maintenance truck driver for the New York State Department of Transportation, has logged one million accident-free miles while on the job.

County Judge George A. Reed of Canandaigua was the Master of Ceremonies at the safety council program, attended by 150 at the Sheraton Inn.

Outgoing council chairman Daniel Mergenthaler turned the 1974 reins over to Ella Dunham.

Mrs. Dunham said council work will center on training workshops for business people about occupational safety and health law and on more programs for senior citizens and young persons who serve as baby sitters.

ADVERSARY JOURNALISM

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time in recent months, Mr. C. L. Dancy, editor of the Peoria Journal Star has expressed his concern over the activities of some of his colleagues who, in Mr. Dancy's view, were abandoning the role of reporters of events but instead were taking an adversary role in reporting the news.

In his most recent editorial, entitled "Adversary Journalism" Mr. Dancy sets forth some thoughts which I know will be of interest to my colleagues and also to our friends in the press galleries.

I insert the text of the editorial in the RECORD as follows:

ADVERSARY JOURNALISM

A couple of years ago there was a lot of whoop-de-do in professional circles about the glories and virtues of "advocacy journalism".

We said at the time that the trouble with it is that it soon becomes "adversary journalism".

Well, lo and behold, comes 1974 and the Columbia University Journalism Review, and the gang who regard themselves as the eastern aristocracy of journalism have quietly switched words—and are now propounding a self-serving philosophy to justify what they now openly call "adversary journalism."

It is curious that some folks who have been defending themselves and their conduct by proclaiming they were only doing their jobs are now apparently admitting that they have adopted an adversary role—and are trying to justify it (after the fact) with philosophical ingenuity.

There is one thing wrong with "adversary journalism" for starters. Journalists ought not pre-empt the role of the political opposition.

In our system, there is an "adversary" already, and they are supposed to do the fighting—and we are supposed to referee to some extent as the inevitable middle-man many of the times between the claimants and the public.

The combined role of referee, scorekeeper, and player isn't a viable one.

Likewise, if we believe the junk we are now putting out, we would always be on the side of the "outs" attacking the "ins" and that pre-determines an unfair situation . . . for no good reason.

In pursuit of doctrines to justify some of the things done in the past year, apparently, we are also pushing "professionalism" dangerously far—if the Columbia Journalism Review is really representative.

In the Review there emerges the persistent assumption that we "professionals" have now staked out a kind of private jurisdiction of our own in the field of expression and information, and freedom of expression by others is properly subject to our censorship or reconstruction.

Now, most of the time it is subject to our summarization and further study and the pursuit of information beyond that offered. But that is simply a practical, functional necessity because everything in this world is limited, including time and space. It is not some kind of "right" either professional or God-given!

Freedom of expression belongs to everybody to the extent that he can make himself heard.

The cacaphony is such and the means of mass communication limited so that some cannot—but it does not follow that any official is somehow cheating and per se dishonest because he finds ways to exercise that freedom without going through a transformation handled by us.

The manifest frustration shown by some of our best known broadcasters and writers when any official escapes them by going directly to the people, or by releasing information on a schedule where there is "no time to check" strongly suggests that they are not only "adversary journalists" but think that somehow the rules of the game require others to hand over the ball of free expression to them on every occasion . . . so they can practice their "professionalism" on his words!

Professionalism to the point of narcissism is not attractive, and the notion in those "highest" of professional circles that second-hand news is better than first-hand news—providing, of course, that it is our hands it passes through—is not an attitude likely to be shared by the people, generally.

They may accept second-hand news as a functional necessity, but in areas of prime interest they would like to get it first-hand when possible. They don't take kindly to the attitude that first-hand news ought to be outlawed—or that all freedom of expression is properly subject to "professional analysis," before publication.

It is somewhat shocking to hear prominent journalists complaining bitterly that they

sometimes do not get to practice pre-censorship on official or political pronouncements!

Our real job is to report such things faithfully and as faithfully report the responses made by the political opposition.

Yet, too much of the dialogue in the Review presumes a kind of sacred right to pre-censorship by us on the one hand—and then to pre-empt the proper opposition and act as adversary, ourselves, in the very process of reporting such events!

We are deluding ourselves with manipulative rationales.

If we talk ourselves into this level of professional arrogance, we are going to get ourselves into a lot of trouble with the people we are supposed to communicate with smoothly.

What is worse—we will deserve it!

The role of King-Maker destroys the role of communicator. It also corrupts the democratic process.

We can afford to do neither.

And the modern centralization of the handling of instant news and its instant dissemination among a very few in New York City doesn't bestow on them such a right. It only bestows such an opportunity. True professionalism requires that it be rejected—not exploited.

C. L. DANCEY.

SURVEY OF REQUIRED COLLEGE TEXTS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, recently Young Americans for Freedom published an article detailing the results of a survey of 10 colleges and universities in various parts of the country. This survey dealt with the required texts for courses in the departments of political science, sociology, economics, and political philosophy. I found the results interesting and a commentary on the basic direction of many of our Nation's institutions of higher education.

At this point I include in the RECORD the article "Readings from the Left" from a recent issue of New Guard, the magazine of Young Americans for Freedom:

READINGS FROM THE LEFT

(By Ron Robinson)

In 1951 William F. Buckley, Jr., attacked Yale University for its unadmitted orthodoxy in God and Man at Yale, claiming that the university's values included an agnostic and "interventionist" mentality. Thinking the question of intellectual bias on the campus to be a central problem of the time, he wrote, "I consider this battle of educational theory important and worth time and thought even in the context of a world-situation that seems to render totally irrelevant any fight except the power struggle against Communism." Buckley called for the alumni to rally behind him to reform Yale. But, as the late Professor Willmoore Kendall pointed out, "Buckley took a licking . . . and Yale became, even more unabashedly, the kind of university Buckley had accused it of being."

Many times since then, young conservatives or moderates have found their own campuses to be dominated by a liberal or left wing orthodoxy. Often, without reflection on Buckley's work of a score of years ago, they bemoan the "exceptional" bias of their school, which is usually void of any conservative perspective within the faculty's ranks.

This Spring, YAF's Campus Affairs Committee undertook a study of ten major campuses to see exactly how often conservative texts did appear in the classroom structure. It was felt that the text was indeed an important tool of the teacher and usually an integral part of a course. We recognized readings alone do not indicate the exact outlook of any given course. However, we did assume that unless the teacher spent much of his classroom time repudiating readings he assigned, we would be able to gain some insight into the course's message by reviewing the texts.

The value of this approach was affirmed by Buckley in *God and Man at Yale* and was essentially confirmed by our own undergraduate experiences. We did not intend to make an overall evaluation of the courses involved, but we did look for any indication of materials offered that might lead a college student to conservative or libertarian principles.

We gathered together the list of all required texts for courses in the Political Science, Sociology, Economics and Political Philosophy departments. These departments are vital in the formulation of political and economic opinions of most undergraduates interested in those fields. These four departments dominated the social sciences in the liberal arts campuses we researched.

We compiled the lists from the following campuses: George Washington University (D.C.), Boston College (Massachusetts), Marquette (Wisconsin), San Francisco State College (California), Duke University (North Carolina), Queens College (New York), University of South Carolina at Columbia, Towson State College (Maryland), University of Maine at Orono and Louisiana State University (L.S.U.) at Baton Rouge.

When the information was collected, we had the lists of textbooks of forty geographically dispersed departments for the Spring semester. We found that a student on those campuses had even less reason to be optimistic than Buckley had at Yale.

Buckley complained that such authors as "Jewkes, F. A. Hayek, Ropke, Anderson, Watt and von Mises" were treated superficially at Yale. Now these authors apparently aren't treated at all! Henry Hazlitt, Leonard Read, John Chamberlain and a number of other free market advocates join the list of totally ignored authors in assigned readings. Adam Smith appears once, and only Milton Friedman manages to join the Samuelson-Galbraith crowd of frequently assigned economists.

Samuelson, Buckley's foremost target, still remains the most popular economist with college professors. His interventionist Economics appears in fourteen courses; two courses at Boston College, and San Francisco State College, one each at Marquette, Duke, University of South Carolina and Towson State. It is assigned reading in six courses at Queens College.

Galbraith is the second most popular author. He appears in two courses at George Washington, two at San Francisco State College and one at Duke, Queens College, University of South Carolina and University of Maine.

Milton Friedman, the most frequent conservative to appear on these lists, comes up six times. He is assigned in an economic course at Boston College, San Francisco State College, Towson State and George Washington. He is also assigned in one Sociology course at Queens College.

Samuelson and Galbraith are assigned more than three times as often as Friedman and the collectivist-interventionist position receives virtually a complete monopoly among lesser known authors. The Economics Departments have seen fit to allow only one advocate of the American free enterprise system to reach their students at these campuses. Despite this, it is fair to say, based on

the evaluation of assigned readings, the conservative viewpoint receives a better hearing in the Economics Departments than in Political Science, Sociology or Political Philosophy.

There are a number of notable conservative political scientists. Among them are the late Willmoore Kendall, George Carey, Eric Voegelin and Gerhart Niemeyer. Additional authors who could show up in political science courses from a conservative viewpoint might include William Buckley, Russell Kirk, Barry Goldwater and the late Frank Meyer. None of these authors appear.

In fact it is fair to say only five authors represent what can be called "conservatism" in these courses. They are Edward Banfield (*The Unheavenly City*, and not his earlier writings), de Tocqueville, Edmund Burke and Kevin Phillips. Leo Strauss, one of the nation's foremost political theorists, also appears but only once. The Federalist papers is assigned in four courses (see below). Ayn Rand is in one.

It is not that these courses are lacking in a particular political point of view. Representing the left wing are, among many others, the following: Marx, Lenin, Marcuse, Debray, Mao, Guevara; also Tugwell, Royko, Sorensen, Scheisinger, Galbraith, B. F. Skinner, Stokely Carmichael, G. William Domhoff, Gabriel Kolko, Jerome Skolnick, Charles Reich, Norman Mailer, Saul Alinsky, Malcolm X and Betty Freidan.

When we focus in on particular courses, the institutionalized bias appears to increase. Courses on the presidency feature works solely by liberal or Democratic authors. Reedy, Sorensen, Tugwell and Scheisinger are all assigned authors who were officials in Democratic Administrations.

The books that analyze Richard Nixon are also from the left wings. Gary Wills' *Nixon Agonistes* is used more than all other volumes combined. Second in popularity is McGinnis' *Selling of the President*. The most favorable treatment of the Nixon Administration comes in Evan's *Nixon in the White House*. There is no conservative work on Nixon in all the courses even though Richard Whalen and other conservative authors had volumes available.

Urban Politics is another course that is widely offered. Here we find great popularity for Chicago columnist Royki's critique of Mayor Richard Daley, Boss. This volume is used more often to explain urban politics than Edward Banfield's *The Unheavenly City*. This is true despite the fact that Banfield is a widely accepted authority on urban affairs and Royko is merely a Chicago columnist.

Courses dealing with power in America are dominated by texts extolling the vices of an all-powerful ruling elite more often than presenting a pluralistic version of society. G. William Domhoff, who writes as though the CIA and Big Business both own and have agents under every bed, is used in more courses than the respected liberal pluralist Robert Dahl. C. Wright Mills and Gabriel Kolko are among other "elitist theorists" who are called upon more often than the total number of conservative and liberal "pluralists" combined.

Constitutionally related courses also have some interesting aspects. Gideon's Trumpet by Anthony Lewis is used nearly twice as often as the Federalist Papers to help explain the Constitution. Lewis' book is a story of Clarence Earl Gideon's fight to gain counsel in the Supreme court case *Gideon v. Wainwright*. It is an interesting and moving book, but I can not believe it offers more to the understanding of the American Constitution than a reading of the Federalist. Gideon's Trumpet is used at courses at Boston College, L.S.U., Marquette, Duke, Towson State, George Washington and the University of Maine at Orono. The Federalist was assigned at Boston College, Marquette and Queens.

One L.S.U. course requires the reading of Federalist Papers No. 10 and No. 51.

The lack of conservative readings in proportion to either those of the radical left or from a liberal position is blatant. When one reviews the totals, they are staggering. For example, Marx's books are used twenty times and Herbert Marcuse's are used ten times. These two authors alone have more of their books assigned than all clearly conservative authors combined. John Chamberlain wrote that at Buckley's Yale the ratio of texts for collectivism over individualism was roughly 4 to 1. If he was to visit the above campuses last Spring, he would have found that Yale's 1951 ratio would be an improvement over the current one.

The bias against conservatism that is felt in Economics and is blatant in Political Science becomes even worse in Sociology. Galbraith, Marx, Marcuse and other leftists featured prominently in Economics and Political Science, are joined by others. B. F. Skinner's *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* and Walden Two are used in a half dozen courses. Max Weber's *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* is as popular as Marcuse. Harrington's *The Other America* joins the socialist list of feature selections. The list of left-wingers grows while conservatives are almost shut out. As mentioned above, Friedman is used in one course at Queens College, and both Jane Jacobs (*The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, *The Economy of Cities*) and Banfield are assigned. But these conservative authors represent only a small fraction of the total number of books assigned to undergraduate students at the above campuses.

Courses in Political Philosophy surprisingly showed less bias. These courses were dominated by classical texts. Plato's *Republic*, More's *Utopia*, Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, or similar works, may well be oriented toward collectivism, but they remain respected works. Often Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, St. Thomas Aquinas' works and St. Augustine's *City of God* offer a conservative balance to the previously mentioned classics. There certainly are courses that have questionable leftist tilt, but they are in the minority. Yet, courses in Political Philosophy only number about one-sixth as many as in the previous three departments, and it is worth pointing out that courses on the Philosophy of Communism are offered in greater number than any other single topic.

The evidence compiled from these ten colleges and universities rather conclusively shows a left-wing bias in assigned reading last Spring. It would not be fair to condemn these institutions if in offering these courses they do not use works of a contemporary political context. It would be understandable if few "conservative" authors are utilized if the texts used were neither conservative nor liberal. Yet it is not fair or understandable to have wide and accepted use of contemporary leftist advocates while conservative authors are virtually ignored. When Charles Reich, John Kenneth Galbraith, Gary Wills, Herbert Marcuse and Saul Alinsky can all find their books in frequent use in these courses, there can be only one reason why conservatives like Ernest van den Haag, Russel Kirk, James Burnham, M. Stanton Evans and William F. Buckley, Jr., are totally ignored. The reason is the intolerant attitude college professors have towards conservatism.

Lewis F. Powell, Jr. convincingly expressed the problem before he became a Supreme Court Justice. Powell wrote:

"Social science faculties (the political scientists, economist, sociologist and many of the historians) tend to be liberally oriented, even when leftists are not present. This is not a criticism per se, as the need for liberal thought is essential to a balanced viewpoint. The difficulty is that 'balance' is

conspicuous by its absence on many campuses, with relatively few members being of conservative or moderate persuasion."

Young conservatives know this. They recognize it when they attend classes and usually hear rhetoric that would, if believed, deny those basic assumptions they know to be true. They recognize the intellectual bias as a central problem of our times.

Due to the circumstances prevailing on the majority of campuses, the young conservative looks elsewhere for a furthering of his own education. However, for the average student, who has not fully formulated his own views towards society, there is little chance that he will receive a "balanced" view on campus.

Willmoore Kendall accurately assesses this problem in his article on "Academic Freedom" in *Contra Mundum*. He rejects the theory that the American university's present imbalance to the left is from card-staking or conspiracy. He writes, "the reason the universities are staffed mainly with left-wing scholars is, quite simply, that today most American scholars are left-wingers." Kendall concluded that only with the production, through the funding of the studies of conservative scholars, will this imbalance be reversed or halted.

Regardless of the number of conservative teachers on campus, there still should be more accurate accounting of the conservative position. We would not defend a conservative professor who simply offered Kirk's *Conservative Mind* and Leo Strauss' *What is Political Philosophy?* in a course on Political Philosophy. We could be certain that liberal and radical students and alumni would demand a more representative selection. So too must we call for fair selection of both courses offerings and texts. Political Philosophy courses with only Marx and Marcuse or Marx and Weber (as was done in some courses at the above schools) must be opposed.

William Buckley asked twenty years ago the question that must be answered now regarding the situation on campus:

How long are [we] willing to wait before a decorous opportunity presents itself for exposing the steady drive in the direction of collectivism that has gathered so much momentum...?

COMDR. BARRY CARLE, U.S. NAVY

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I join the citizens of Boston and the South Shore in paying tribute to Comdr. Barry Carle who dedicated his life to the service of his country and the U.S. Navy. Commander Carle, awarded the Legion of Merit on behalf of the President of the United States, served his country with distinction in the Canal Zone, Vietnam, and at home. Commander Carle was responsible for the planning and negotiations with the National Park Service in the creation of the U.S.S. Constitution and Boston Navy Yard National Historic Site. Because of his outstanding leadership, professional competence, and inspiring devotion to the Navy and to his country, he will long be remembered by those who lived and worked with him, as well as by those who will follow him. It is difficult for us to understand why the life of such a fine man has been cut so short, but Com-

CXX—527—Part 6

mander Carle's caliber and devotion will certainly be missed by all.

At this time I would like to submit the following eulogy which was delivered in memory of Comdr. Barry Carle which illustrates his lifelong devotion to the service of his country:

BARRY CARLE

Barry Carle was born in Boston, Mass., on October 26, 1933, a son of Richard F. Carle and Marjorie E. Carle (Graham). He enlisted in the U.S. Navy on July 20, 1956 and in August 1956 entered Officer Candidate School, Newport, R.I. He was graduated in December 1956, and was commissioned an Ensign.

Following Officer Candidate School, he reported on board the USS C.R. WARE (DD-865) for duty as the Engineering Officer. Over the next several years, Commander Carle served at various commands such as the Civil Engineer Corps Officers' School at Port Huene, Calif., where he became a Civil Engineering Officer; the Naval Base, Newport, R.I.; the Rodman Naval Station in the Canal Zone and the Mare Island Shipyard, California.

Following duty with the Twelfth Naval District in 1964 to 1966, he departed the United States for the Republic of Vietnam. He served as the Resident Officer in Charge of Construction in Vietnam for one year at Newport, and Longbinh, Republic of Vietnam.

In May 1967, he reported as the Industrial Services Officer at the Annapolis Division, Naval Ship Research and Development Center in Annapolis, Maryland. It was here that he was promoted to the rank of Commander.

In June 1969, he returned to the Boston area as Head of the Acquisition Department of the Northeast Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command. In July 1970 he became the Deputy District Civil Engineer in the First Naval District.

While in this position, he received the Legion of Merit presented on behalf of the President of the United States. The citation states that the Navy's fifth highest award was received, "Because of his unusual tact and diplomacy in dealing with state, local, and Department of Defense representatives, Commander Carle was responsible for the effectiveness in implementing the Shore Establishment Realignment Program in the District, including the planning for and negotiations with the National Park Service for the creation of the USS Constitution and Boston Navy Yard National Historic Site."

The citation further states that "By his outstanding leadership, professional competence, and inspiring devotion to duty, Commander Carle upheld the highest traditions of the United States Naval Service."

In addition to the Legion of Merit, Commander Carle has the Navy Commendation, Meritorious Unit Commendation, National Defense Medal, Vietnam Campaign Medal, and the Vietnam Service Medal with two stars.

He is survived by his wife, Rose M. (Fiore); his sons Barry L. and Jeffrey A.; his daughter, Susan A.; his parents, Richard F. and Marjorie E. Carle of Milton; a brother, Richard E., Jr., of Quincy and a brother, Russell A. of Milton; a sister, Jacqueline F. Melkonian of North Largo, Florida.

BYELORUSSIAN PEOPLE

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, the Byelo-

ussian Republic was declared the culmination of the dreams of the great Byelorussian people.

Unhappily, Mr. Speaker, the forces of the Bolsheviks overcame the infant republic and Byelorussia was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet empire.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I join the friends of freedom everywhere in observing the 56th anniversary of Byelorussian independence with the hope that one day this ancient people will again know the blessings of liberty and self determination.

JIMMY BIVINS FOUGHT 'EM ALL, IN WRONG PLACE, WRONG TIME

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, Cleveland, Ohio, has contributed many famous boxers to the boxing profession. Jimmy Bivins is one of the more famous. He is a friend of mine. He is an interesting man. He has always been controversial, but younger men such as my brother, Carl, and I, admired him as we grew up. Jimmy Bivins did all his fighting in the ring. Outside the ring he was a perfect gentleman. The Cleveland Plain Dealer has written a recent article about Jimmy Bivins. I commend this article to my colleagues:

JIMMY BIVINS FOUGHT 'EM ALL, IN WRONG PLACE, WRONG TIME

(By Allen Wiggins)

If you go to a prizefight in the Arena, whether professional or amateur, you will see Jimmy Bivins. He will be one of the judges sitting at ringside. But unless you have been a boxing fan for a long time, you may not know that Bivins was one of the two or three best fighters this city ever had, possibly the best.

Jimmy Reeves, Joey Maxim and Jimmy Bivins, Cleveland's finest. And Bivins was a heavyweight.

"What I can't see," Bivins said recently, "is everybody comes up to me and says, 'We don't see your name in there with Joe Louis and all them guys.' Well, I wasn't the champ."

"That's all, I wasn't the champ. It's what they say, 'We don't see your name with the Joe Louises and the Ezzard Charleses.' You know, they've got a list of all those former champions and they don't mention me."

"And I say, 'Well, I was just another fighter.'"

The talk is modest in the extreme, but it is typical of Bivins, a gentle and generous man.

It is not true that Bivins' name is missing from the book. The book is Nat Fleischer's Ring Magazine Boxing Encyclopedia and record book, which has been coming out in a new edition every year since Fleischer founded it in 1942. Fleischer died in 1972 and since then it has been published by his son-in-law, Nat Loubet.

Bivins' name is in the book. It is listed under the fighting records of the champions he fought.

There are 25 fights, against 11 champions—three heavyweights, six light heavyweights and two middleweights. Of the heavyweights, he beat one, Ezzard Charles, once. Of the light heavyweights, he beat five of the six at one time or another. He beat both middleweights. But he never had a title fight. Is there another fighter who beat more men

that were about to become or had been champions?

But a fighter's fate is made up of many measures. Hard times, for instance, tend to produce good fighters. Bivins grew up during the Depression, when hard times were general, and when he turned professional in 1940 he faced a generation of good fighters.

Physically, too, his fate put him in the worst ranks. He stood 5 feet 9, and his natural fighting weight was 174, right on the margin of the heavyweights.

It was a time of many such—Billy Conn, and Archie Moore the most famous of them. Conn resigned his belt as light heavyweight champion to fight Joe Louis in 1941, and never fought Bivins. The first time Bivins fought Moore, in 1945, he knocked Moore out.

Finally, Bivins' fate collided with World War II. The high point of his career came in 1943. Joe Louis, the heavyweight champion, and Billy Conn, the top ranked contender, were both in the service, fighting only exhibitions. Bivins fought Tami Mauriello, who like Bivins, was among the top five, and beat him. It happened that night that Louis was at ringside, and after the fight he stepped in the ring.

"He came into the ring and put a crown on my head and said, 'You're the champ while I'm gone,'" Bivins recalls.

It was a very unofficial title, not recognized by any of the boxing commissions, but at least in the Cleveland newspapers the title stuck, and he was mentioned as the "duration champion."

Bivins went into the service himself in late 1943, and when he emerged in 1946, he weighed nearly 200. It was too much to throw around. So that year Joe Louis fought Conn the second time and knocked him out, then met Mauriello.

Bivins remembers that fight. "I had beaten Tami Mauriello twice, and he nearly beat Joe Louis that night. Tami came near knocking him out. Joe's knees buckled and Tami stood there looking at him. He stood there looking at the great Joe Louis when Joe hit the ropes and bounced off."

Mauriello's respect for Louis and his awe at seeing the great one fold turned out to be expensive. Louis came back and knocked him out later in that same first round.

Bivins trained himself gradually back to his own fighting weight, but he never regained the status he held in 1943.

Immediately out of the service, he fought Jersey Joe Walcott, Lee Q. Murray and Ezzard Charles, all ranked under him, and lost to all three.

He quit fighting in 1955 at the age of 35.

In his 15 years as a professional Bivins had beaten heavyweight champion Charles; light heavyweight champions Mello Bettina, Anton Christoforidis, Gus Lesnevich, Joey Maxim and Archie Moore, and middleweight champs Teddy Yarosz and Billy Soose. But with one exception, he didn't beat them when they were champions.

"Everybody said, 'Why'd you quit?' I quit before I was all beat up. I quit while I was ahead, that's what I tell them.

"You know, you walk into a gym in New York and it's a house of horrors. The old guys walk in and they can't talk straight. You just hear 'yabber yabber.' Big ears, big eyes, stumbling around. It was terrible. I wasn't going to let guys beat me up like that."

His biggest purse had come in 1951, a 10-round match with Joe Louis, then trying to make a comeback. Bivins' share was \$40,000. Bivins says he thinks he won the fight, but the decision went to Louis. Two months later, Rocky Marciano knocked Louis out.

Bivins doesn't remember exactly how much money he made in the golden days, but in the first years, in the early '40s, it must have

been plenty. In one six-month period, he said he made \$100,000 in Cleveland alone.

He considers himself lucky to have had Claude Shane for a manager. Shane helped him with his investments after his retirement. There wasn't so much money left, on account of Bivins' first wife, who claimed huge gobs of it. Bivins doesn't care to talk about that.

He says only that his finances during the period of his marriage and divorce from Dollree Mapp (yes, the notorious Mapp of Mapp vs. the State of Ohio) "suffered severe matrimonial reversals."

He has since remarried and has a daughter, Josette, 5, by his current wife. His son, Jim Junior, was killed in an accident while serving in the Air Force in 1968.

Bivins says Shane supervised his investments after retirement and "after we got some investments going, he told me, Get a job making \$150 or \$200 a week and you won't ever have to worry."

He got a job driving a truck for the Laub Baking Co., a job he held for 18 years, until the company folded last December. Now he drives for the Dan-Dee Pretzel and Potato Chip Co.

It is now nearly 20 years since Jimmy Bivins quit boxing. He walks into a room. There is one immediate physical sign that he is a boxer—when he talks, his hands tend to form fists, and then you notice the first knuckles are huge, and the plane formed by the front of his fist is almost perfectly flat. The hands are accentuated by his long arms. He has the reach of a man six feet tall. Later, you might notice a very slight scar that runs along his left eyebrow. Other than that he is unmarked.

More than that, he is trim and hard. He works out three times a week at the Old Angle Gym on W. 25th St., which he owns with two other men, and twice a week he runs 5½ miles. He weighs 185.

The physical training and maintenance a boxer goes through is regarded as the most grueling in all of sports, and few fighters maintain the regimen after retirement.

But the work and the pain must be part of Bivins' character. He says of himself that he feels terrible if he doesn't work out on his regular schedule.

And Wilfred (Whiz Bang) Carter, who was his first manager and trainer, until they parted company in 1946, recalls that his main problem in dealing with Bivins was keeping him out the gym. Carter was recalling the old days, sitting in the gym he now runs at 1756 E. 55th St.

This goes back to 1940 and 1941, right after Bivins turned pro and was winning all his fights. "I used to come up here," Carter said, "and find Bivins in the gym when I advised him not to do any training. I'd come up here, and here he was, working. I'd say, What the heck you doing? And he'd have some phony excuse, that he was trying to get loosened up or something. I'd have to run him out, because he would go stale. Over-training is worse than not being trained enough. Everything goes stale, you see things and can't move. Your body just can't take it. Jimmy's a conscientious worker, a hard worker. But he's ornery as hell.

The ornerness is the kernel of the story, probably apocryphal and anyhow filtered through 40 years of nostalgia, about how Bivins got started fighting.

Here is Carter's version: "He was smart, almost valedictorian, and these guys sitting next to him in school would ask him, 'Jimmy, what's the answer,' and he'd tell them such and such. He'd give them the wrong answer. Then after school, he'd have to run home, they were always chasing him. He had to learn how to fight."

Bivins adds the tag line: "I finally just got tired of running."

Carter has another favorite example of what he calls Bivins' ornerness. Because it was notorious at the time and led a lot of boxing fans to draw some wrong conclusions about what Bivins was up to, it is worth repeating.

Bivins and Charles, the Cincinnati fighter who would become heavyweight champion after Louis, turned pro the same spring. Charles was two years younger.

They first fought each other professionally here in Cleveland, in January 1943. Both fighters had spectacular records. Bivins had knocked Charles all over the ring for 10 rounds, but never put him out. He won a unanimous decision, but the sports writers laced into him for being lazy and only fighting as hard as he had to. Most of the fans apparently came to the same conclusion.

"He beat the hell out of Ezzard Charles," Carter remembers. "The first thing after the fight I said to him, 'Jimmy why didn't you knock him out? That would have been better than to disgrace him.' And you know what he told me? 'He was a close friend of mine.' He disgraced hell out of Charles, but it would have been better and quicker to knock him out. Jimmy gave him everything that night, and they thought it was the end of Ezzard Charles, because he went into the Coast Guard right after that."

Bivins explains the friendship. "We were in the Golden Gloves finals together in San Francisco, and he used to come up to Cleveland from Cincinnati when we were still kids, and we went around together. We were buddies."

The anecdote recalls, too, the fact that although Bivins was almost singlehandedly responsible for the birth of Cleveland as a boxing center in the 1940s, and was always a great drawing card, he was greatly disliked, and talked about in the sport pages as "nastily regal."

There is a piece from the old Cleveland News in 1948, by the boxing writer Herman Goldstein, saying that Bivins' poor fortunes after World War II, "including missing out on the world's heavyweight title with the likely million dollar cash-in" were no more than he deserved and "couldn't have happened to a more deserving fellow."

Several stories written the day after Bivins' victories recorded the crowd booing the decision. This was in his hometown.

One of the things old Cleveland fans remember is a red-mouthed Bivins snarl, and Bivins seeming to fight only as hard as he had to.

Here is the source of the snarl. Bivins couldn't breathe through the openings in a regular mouthpiece and had one created by a dentist. It happened to be made out of red rubber.

Of the laziness, Bivins blames the average observer, "People always thought I was slow, and just touching the guys, but I was knocking their blocks off. They just didn't understand."

Finally, this must be cited, from another conversation with Bivins: Somebody asked him if he ever has trouble about getting in fights in bars. No, he said, he doesn't go into bars, but when a guy approaches him in the street, "they'll come up to me and say something like, 'I bet you ain't so good,' and I always say, 'You're right, man you're the best,' and let them go on."

Goldstein's phrase was "nastily regal." "Nastily" may be chalked up to racism, conscious or not, but "regal" is believable. Bivins is clearly a man of private intelligence. Talking to a stranger who isn't a boxer, after a time Bivins gives off the feeling that he just doesn't feel there is something he can say, you wouldn't understand. He is a man prepared to live with his own pain as part of his character, his fate, and it is not to share.

This is an example, out of Whiz Bang Carter. It was one of Bivins' fights with Lee

Q. Murray, a plodding, stodgy but good heavyweight. It was the seventh round and Murray had ripped open a cut along Bivins' left eyebrow:

"He's a free bleeder, and the blood was whipping from one eye across to the other and he was totally blind," Carter remembers "I wanted to stop the fight, but he said no, and I said, 'Well, then, look, you go out there and fight by feel, go out and get your hands up there and when you hear him stomping, then you swing."

"And that god dog dumb Lee Q., all he had to do was stick a long left hand out and touch Bivins' head and move around on the axle, throwing punches. But Jimmy had earned his respect, he'd beat the slop out of him up until that time and Lee Q. didn't make his move."

"Then this handler from New York came over to me between rounds and said, 'I'll stop it, (the bleeding). I said OK, if you don't use Monsel Solution (Monsel salt, a ferric subsulfate used as a styptic to close wounds; it was banned in boxing because it caused infections, and in the eyes, could cause blindness). He said, 'I'll stop it.'"

"When the bell rang, he said, 'Put this towel around his eyes.' He took care of it, all right. He used that god dog Monsel solution. As soon as the air hits it, it turns hard as a rock."

"Jimmy won the fight but the next day I had to take him to a doctor and watch as he cut the oxide out and the flesh with it. It turned my stomach."

That first fight when Bivins beat Charles wasn't the end of Charles, but it must have been the end of the friendship, or if it wasn't Charles didn't feel the same compunctions towards Bivins. They fought again in 1946. Charles beat Bivins in 10 rounds. Again in 1947. Charles knocked Bivins out in the fourth. In 1948, Charles beat Bivins in 10. In 1952, after Charles had won the heavyweight championship vacated by Joe Louis and then lost it to Jersey Joe Walcott, he fought Bivins again and beat him in 10.

Asked how he could be beaten so consistently by Charles after winning so handily in their first fight—a pattern repeated with Moore, whom Bivins knocked out the first time they met, and who then proceeded to beat Bivins four times in a row, including three knockouts—Bivins' answer doesn't satisfy much. He says that after the war, Charles and Moore were about the only major fighters who would fight him.

"You keep fighting the same guy so many times, he's going to catch up with you," Bivins explained.

That was about as explanatory as Bivins' description of his fighting style.

A younger man who had never seen Bivins fight was trying to find out what kind of style he had. The younger man had heard that Bivins had a fine left hook, the most difficult of all punches to master, and had heard him described as a "mechanic," and a "good technician." He asked Bivins himself to describe his approach to the art of milling.

"When the bell said 'ding' I came out fighting," he explained.

Jackie Keough, who followed Bivins by a few years through the Golden Gloves championships here and who used to hang around his father's Old Angle Gym when Bivins worked out there in the 1940s, remembers Bivins as "a very good all-around fighter and a very nice man."

Bivins is indeed a nice man. He made headlines recently when he offered to work with a young man who held him up while he was driving his bakery truck. Judge Roy F. McMahon put the 19-year-old on three years' probation on condition that he work with Bivins at his youth club in the Old Angle Gym.

Bivins had offered to try to bring the aspiring hoodlum around. That was in Janu-

ary. But when asked about the young man two months later, Bivins had to say disappointedly that he had only been at the gym once to work out.

It's that old generation gap again. Here is a man who defends boxing against its critics by saying, "It makes you live a clean life," a man who grew up hard and embraced the grueling, tortured hours of training, a man who never drinks or smokes, trying to understand an age of punks.

"These kids have it too easy today," he says, not just of the young man who robbed him but of a lot of the young men who want to win Golden Gloves championships and work out in small gymnasiums like his and Carter's. "They show up here a few months before the Gloves and then when it's over they disappear. You don't win like that. When I was fighting those first few years I stayed in such good shape I was ready to fight on a week's notice."

A reporter was curious to know Bivins' estimate of the professional fighters of today. Was the first fight between Muhammad Ali and Joe Frazier really the fight of the century? How good is the current champ, George Foreman?

These questions, like an angler's estimate of a fish he didn't quite land, have no answers. But the reporter had listened to a number of former fighters in Cleveland talk about the old days and how Ali could never have stayed in the same ring with Louis in his prime.

But these former fighters had been white, and one thing you can be very aware of if you take the trouble is the racism that has always pervaded boxing. From the days of the search for a Great White Hope to beat Jack Johnson, the first black heavyweight champion, through the 1940s when newspaper stories of interviews with a fighter like Bivins would reproduce his speech as a form of Amos 'n 'Andy dialog, up to today, when stories about Ali in Ring Magazine still relentlessly call him Cassius Clay after the first reference, it is there. And the reporter could not help but feel that it influenced the estimates of those fighters.

So he asked Bivins about Ali, Frazier and Foreman.

"Anybody in the top 20 when I was fighting could have beaten them," he said. Ali, he said, "would have done nothing to Joe Louis."

Bivins talked about Ali's old showoff habit of calling the round in which he would knock out his opponent. "Joe Louis didn't call rounds. I fought a long time and I never called rounds. And I don't think any fighter can do it."

The fates of fighters are made up of many measures. It should be stated here that Bivins once fought a champion when he was the champion.

On March 11, 1942, Bivins fought Gus Lesnevich, then the light heavyweight champion of the world. Lesnevich's manager agreed to let the two men fight, but he was afraid that if Bivins beat Lesnevich, he would lay claim to the title. All titles had been frozen for the duration of the war, but Lesnevich's manager was afraid of a claim filed at war's end.

"We had a heck of a time," Carter remembers. "Bivins weighed 174, but they wouldn't accept that, because he'd have a legitimate claim to the title. We were supposed to come in overweight."

"So we tried some tricks. We put some lead around his waist under his trunks when he got on the scales. They wouldn't go for that. We put rolls of coins in his hands, and they wouldn't go for that."

"So finally, I made him drink quarts and quarts of water. And after the weighing in, I had him walk all the way from Public Hall to the Arena to get some of that out of him. You know, that's a heck of a thing, it makes you lazy and slow. But he beat the slop out of Lesnevich."

The fight went 10 rounds. Lesnevich saw little that night but the front of a dark red, eight-ounce left glove. Bivins took the purse, but no belt.

Like justice, professional boxing is both blind to its consequences and perfectly balanced. What it eats up in pain on one side, it spits out as memory on the other.

WHALEN COMMENTS ON IDA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday our colleague from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in behalf of the legislation authorizing the United States share of the Fourth Replenishment for the International Development Association.

In his remarks, Congressman WHALEN emphasized the deterrents to the interests of the United States which would result from congressional rejection of this legislation, and he succinctly rebutted most of the arguments raised against the bill during House debate. I believe his statements are very persuasive, and our colleagues should have an opportunity to review them in detail. Perhaps then it will be possible to reverse the negative vote taken by the House in January.

Therefore, I am inserting the entire text of his testimony in the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON S. 2665 (AUTHORIZING THE U.S. PAYMENT TO THE FOURTH REPLENISHMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION)

(By Congressman CHARLES W. WHALEN, Jr.)

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, it is with some embarrassment that I appear before your Committee this morning. My purpose in being here today is to ask that you rectify what I conceive to be a serious mistake made by my colleagues in the other body. The House of Representatives' rejection last January of H.R. 11354 has had regrettable world-wide consequences. It is my hope, therefore, that the Senate will authorize funding of the United States' latest pledge to the International Development Association (IDA). This not only will help restore American credibility in the international community but also will give the House of Representatives an opportunity to reverse its earlier action.

A. THE ROLE OF IDA

IDA, of course, is the "soft loan" or concessional arm of the World Bank Group. It was established in 1960, largely at the initiative of Congress, to provide "credits" to those developing countries unable to pay the Bank's conventional rates of interest on its ordinary loans. These credits carry no interest charge at all, except for an annual service fee of 0.75%. These loans are extended only to those poor countries (currently 43) with an average per capita income of less than \$375 a year. In actual practice, more than 80% of IDA's credits go to countries with a per capita annual income of less than \$200 (about 55 cents per day). The great majority of those states are located in Africa and Asia. These include the recently drought-stricken Sahel Zone of West Africa and such other famine-ridden nations as Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan. All of

these countries have been caught in a terrifying nature-man squeeze stemming from below-normal rainfall teaming up with a three fold price increase of imported food grains. Mass starvation has been the result.

B. CHANGING FOCUS OF IDA

In FY 73, \$1,218,000,000, or 90 percent of its funds, were targeted toward these "poorest of the poor" nations as IDA continued to fulfill its role as a principal source of assistance to the populations of these least developed countries. In its attempts to reach the people whom World Bank President Robert McNamara has termed "victims of absolute poverty," IDA in recent years has been focusing a greater portion of its loans on the development of human resources. Thus, between 1967-1973, the amount of lending to education programs tripled, and agricultural proposals benefitted from a four-fold increase. Moreover, during the next five years (1974-1978) there are plans to expand overall lending by 8 percent. In this period a total of \$22 billion will be committed to nearly 1,000 different undertakings—programs which increasingly reflect social and income distribution concerns.

This manifests a significant change in IDA's thrust. As recently as 1966 power and transportation projects received nearly 65% of IDA's monies. In FY 1973 these areas received only 29% of the credits. The emphasis now is on the human resource sectors of education, agriculture, urbanization, population control, small-scale industries, and tourism. In FY 73, for example, \$551 million, or 41% of IDA's funds, went to Agriculture and Education projects. The avowed goal over the FY 74-78 period is to attack directly the problem of absolute poverty among the poorest 40% of the people in developing countries. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, these are precisely the same areas toward which we in the Congress have re-directed our newly defined bilateral aid program.

II. EFFECTS OF IDA'S REJECTION

The House of Representatives' decision to reject authorization for America's modest share of IDA's Fourth Replenishment has unwittingly placed in jeopardy all of the aforementioned efforts designed to sustain human life in the earth's most poverty-stricken pockets. What are the possible consequences if this vote is sustained?

First, IDA lending could cease on June 30, 1974. This would terminate the principal source of multinational loans for the world's poorest economies, thereby casting hundreds of millions of people into the most desperate circumstances.

Second, the new concentration on the development of human resources would wither and die. The implementation of this principle, so strongly advocated by the World Bank, developmental economists, and the Congress, itself (in the passage of the Mutual Development and Cooperation Act of 1973), is seriously dependent upon contributions to IDA's Fourth Replenishment. The agreement negotiated in Nairobi in September, 1973, stipulates that no nation need pay its share if any other country, party to this agreement, fails to make its contribution.

Third, the development of a self-sustaining economic capability in the world's poorest economies would be seriously impaired since failure of the United States to participate in this replenishment may cause the previously described chain reaction among the other industrialized nations. This would leave the poorest countries, which are unable to borrow in ordinary capital markets, in the untenable position of having no access to funds critical to their self-survival. By depriving these nations of IDA's resources, we thus perpetuate their dependence upon bilateral assistance.

Fourth, Congressional refusal to refund IDA would ill-serve America's economic self-interests by impeding the development of

potentially rich overseas markets. In 1972, for instance, developing nations provided a \$14.6 billion outlet for United States—produced goods and services. By helping to raise the national income of these countries, IDA expands their ability to purchase American exports.

Perhaps even more important in this age of resource scarcities, our failure to support IDA would undermine reliable and sorely needed supplies of raw materials, energy, and minerals which our own economy will require in the near future. By 1985 the United States will be dependent upon external suppliers, principally the developing countries, for ten of the fifteen minerals most essential to industrialized societies. By the year 2000 this will increase to thirteen of those fifteen minerals. In order to meet this growing mineral demand, the world's less developed nations must obtain capital in sufficient quantities to achieve the required expansion of output. These realities mean, as Brookings economist C. Fred Bergsten has noted, that greater cooperation with the developing countries is essential for the well being of the United States. Access to reliable supplies of required resources, the ability to construct a more viable international monetary order, and the adjustment of global investment and trade policies to changing world patterns all require participation of the poorest nations.

Fifth, Mr. Chairman, our rejection of IDA would tarnish the position of the United States as an international leader. Today, our government spokesmen are actively striving for international cooperation in the fields of trade, investment, and monetary policy. Concurrently, they have been denigrating all "go-it-alone" tactics as detrimental to a stable world order. Congressional refusal to participate in IDA refunding would cast serious doubt upon the sincerity of these efforts. Further, Congressional abandonment of IDA not only would indicate an absence of a will to lead, but would reflect an insensitivity to the plight of the great majority of the world's population.

III. IDA'S RELATIONSHIP TO OIL PRICES

Mr. Chairman, perhaps even more disturbing than the outcome of the House vote were some of the arguments advanced during the IDA debate. Let me cite one in particular—the contention that IDA credits will end up in the pockets of the oil producers as some sort of indirect subsidy.

First, this is technically impossible. IDA funds may be used only for the capital costs of specific development projects, many of which are purchased in the United States and all of which are carefully scrutinized before the monies are disbursed. Thus, while the oil price increases do confront the developing countries with a staggering \$10 billion annual increase in their already severely strained budgets, IDA funds will not pay this bill. Indeed, IDA credits are critical for projects whose implementation will increase the abilities of the poor countries to meet their mounting oil costs.

Second, it is not true that the oil producers have done nothing to contribute to international economic development. Earlier this month, Iran announced its intentions to establish a \$2 billion program for developing countries. During the past five years, as former World Bank President Eugene Black has noted, the World Bank has borrowed nearly \$1 billion from Kuwait, Lebanon, and Libya. In the past two years alone the Bank has received more from Kuwait than it has from the United States. Also, the oil exporting states have set-up development banks and have pledged \$200 million in 1% loans for African nations through which they can meet general price increases. The continuation of these efforts depends upon an atmosphere that supports greater social justice throughout the world. American rejection of IDA would not contribute to this increasingly vital international climate of concern.

Third, if the oil producing states became the sole sources for development funds, would this promote international economic and political stability? Clearly, it would not. Admitting that the Middle East oil producers now have an estimated \$20-30 billion to grant, lend, or invest (and this figure may rise to \$80 billion by 1980), the availability of these capital funds may be "tied" to political support for the Arab states. I cannot believe that it is prudent for the United States to encourage this politico-economic scenario by withdrawing the leverage our IDA assistance provides and by forfeiting this extremely important region of the world to the oil producers.

Fourth, we must ask ourselves this fundamental question: "Why punish the poor for higher oil prices?" Certainly it is not the fault of the developing countries that the oil producers have raised their prices more than fourfold. Yet, by refusing to fund IDA, we penalize the poor nations for a situation not of their making. As James Reston aptly characterized this response, we seem to be saying that because we find the Arabs guilty of price gouging, we, therefore, are justified in turning around and kicking the poor. Not only is this unreasonable, Mr. Chairman, it is unworthy of our great country.

IV. COSTS OF IDA TO THE UNITED STATES

I would like to comment upon the cost to the United States of our IDA contribution and upon our ability to afford it.

First, our \$1.5 billion assessment represents a significant decrease in the United States' share, from 40% to 33% of the total replenishment. In dollar terms, this is a \$300 million reduction. Further, we may divide our payments over four years instead of the usual three—thereby cutting our annual installments to \$375 million, or \$11 millions less than our present yearly IDA contribution. These savings, in part, have been made possible by a tripling of the Japanese and a doubling of the West German quotas. This, incidentally, clearly demonstrates that other developed countries are bearing a more equitable burden of developmental costs.

Second, a study released only last week by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs reveals that, contrary to widespread assumptions, American participation in multilateral development banks has resulted in a net U.S. Balance of Payment surplus of \$2.7 billion. Since the World Bank's inception in 1945, the United States has realized from the organization and its subsidiaries a positive Balance of Payments in excess of \$3.5 billion. Nearly \$2.6 billion of this total has been acquired since FY 1965. The fact that the United States receives direct financial benefits from its participation in international lending institutions is, in itself, a sound argument for our continuing to fund programs like IDA.

Third, our remarkable trade recovery in 1973 and the present strength of the dollar abroad make the IDA request of \$1.5 billion economically manageable, even with the negative impact of the energy crisis. Other industrialized nations are far more adversely affected by the oil shortage than is the United States. They, nevertheless, are still maintaining their support of IDA.

Fourth, Mr. Chairman, the example of the United States reneging upon its commitments made at the Nairobi Conference could lead to the complete unraveling of the replenishment agreement. To the poor economies of the world, this would only illustrate once again the validity of that somber law of economics: "the poor come last." This archaic attitude must fall to the demands of international cooperation if our planet is to survive.

V. CONCLUSION

There is an ineluctable movement toward a greater world interdependence with its con-

comitant need for more cooperation among all countries, large and small, rich and poor. The United States' role in the international economy, if it is to be meaningful, must recognize this contemporary global reality. There is no better way for Congress to express this awareness than by honoring the commitments made to IDA last September.

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that I hope your Committee, and eventually the Senate, itself, will act favorably upon S. 2665. Bolstered by your example, the House of Representatives, I am confident, will once again reaffirm its long-standing support of the International Development Association.

AMERICAN INDIAN HEALTH CARE EDUCATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Federal Government's relationship with the American Indian is a sad tale of empty promises, broken treaties, and neglected needs.

Nowhere is this more glaringly evident than in the health care of our Indian citizens. The incidence of tuberculosis among Indians is eight times as high as that of the rest of the Nation. Infant deaths are 1.4 times higher among Indians. Alcoholism related deaths are 6.5 times as high as in the general population. Between 1962 and 1971, the incidence of otitis media, a disease of the middle ear which can lead to fatal meningitis or brain abscess, increased 183 percent among Indians. The gastroenteric death rate among Indians is four times higher than the national average.

In recent years, the Indian Health Service has made marked progress toward improving the quality of health care for American Indians. But with all due credit to the Service, its hands have been tied.

Of the 51 Indian Health Service hospitals currently in operation, only 21 are accredited and 39 fail to meet national fire and safety codes. Almost two-thirds of the Service hospitals, four-fifths of the Service hospital outpatient clinics and one-half of the Service health clinics meet only 80 percent staffing standards for their respective services. The present Service doctor patient ratio is one physician for 1,080 Indians compared with a national average of one physician for every 720 persons. The pharmacists population ratio among Indians is 33 pharmacists to every 100,000 persons compared with the recommended ratio of 65 pharmacists to every 100,000 individuals. At the present rate of four surgeries per week, it would take 30 years to treat the backlog of otitis media cases at the Gallup Indian Medical Center, provided no new cases occur.

These shocking statistics speak for themselves. There is no need to elaborate further on the necessity of immediate remedial action as well as long range preventative planning.

To meet these needs I introduced last week the American Indian Health Care Education and Improvement Act, H.R. 13596.

Briefly stated, this measure would:

Provide funds for reducing the backlog of Service cases and upgrading Service facilities.

Provide scholarship assistance to students in a wide range of health and sanitation related fields at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional level in return for a commitment to serve the Indian community upon graduation.

Provide grants to both Health Service and nonservice personnel currently serving the Indian community in health and sanitation professions who wish to upgrade or formalize their education in return for a commitment for further service to the Indian community.

Direct the National Science Foundation to grant funds for research in a wide range of Indian health care related fields. The results of these studies would be reported to Congress on an annual basis along with recommendations for appropriate legislative action.

Make direct medicare and medicaid payments to Indian Health hospitals instead of to the general treasury in order to give Indians greater access to benefits from social welfare programs currently available to all Americans.

Provide assistance to rural Indian communities in the planning and implementation of health care transportation and communication systems.

This measure builds on the foundations presented in S. 2938, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, introduced by Senator JACKSON of Washington and sponsored in the House by my distinguished colleague, Mrs. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN.

I feel H.R. 13596 goes further than S. 2938 in getting at the root of American Indian health care problems and establishing a solid foundation for consistent quality health care for future generations.

Beyond the Government's legal historic obligation to the American Indian, we have an obligation to all Americans to insure that they can get the kind of health care they need when they need it. This bill goes a long way toward meeting that obligation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this vital legislation.

NEED TO PUT EFFORTS OF ANTI- ABORTION LOBBYISTS IN PROPER PERSPECTIVE

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it has always been particularly disheartening, and ultimately frightening, to think that a well-organized lobby could influence Congress to enact a law that only a minority of the American people consider

to be fair. Too often, however, this has been the case.

As the following article from the March 1974 issue of Harper's points out, Congress now faces such a lobbying effort by antiabortion forces. Although numerous polls, many of them reprinted in the RECORD, reveal that a majority of the American people support the Supreme Court decision on abortion, mounting lobbyist efforts have raised the possibility of Congress passing an anti-abortion constitutional amendment. The mere chance that such legislation will pass Congress is undoubtedly a major source of our constituents' discouragement with their Government, of their increasingly inalterable assumption that their Government is essentially an unresponsive, unapproachable institution that decides issues on the basis of political expediency, in response to powerful interest groups, and thus not in answer to the opinions of the people of this country.

I strongly urge my colleagues to read Marion K. Sanders' article and to carefully consider the important points that it raises. It is essential that Congress recognize these lobbyist efforts as representing a minority of the American people that is attempting to force its moral beliefs on the American people as a whole.

The article follows:

ENEMIES OF ABORTION

(By Marion K. Sanders)

(The Catholic hierarchy rejects a woman's right to govern her own body—and it won't rest until that right is abolished.)

People who regard divorce, birth control, eating pork—or whatever—as sinful have a clear right to live by their own tenets, provided they don't force their views of morality on citizens of other faiths or none. That, in theory, is the American proposition, as conveyed in the spirit of the Constitution—and yet, as we all know, the theory has seldom achieved reality. Throughout U.S. history, various religious groups (notably Baptists and Catholics) have acquired sufficient political power to impose their moralistic attitudes on almost everyone else. The leading example is, of course, the American Catholic Church, which, for decades, succeeded in keeping archaic divorce and anticontraception laws on the books in state after state across the country.

Vast cultural changes have now eroded the Catholic hierarchy's relentless efforts. Since the 1960s, under the liberalizing influence of Vatican II, the Catholic divorce rate has climbed. And millions of Catholic women have been using birth-control pills (of which Catholic Dr. John Rock was codiscoverer and an ardent advocate).

Reluctantly conceding major setbacks on two fronts, the hierarchy has made opposition to abortion the new rallying cry. It has proved a highly emotional issue which can be dramatically exploited by means of inflammatory rhetoric, lurid propaganda, and outright political blackmail. These techniques, which the Catholic-supported Right to Life movement has used to score impressive local victories, are now being tested on a national scale. Week after week, the faithful are reminded from the pulpit, in newsletters, and in full-page newspaper ads, that abortion is "murder" and that Catholics are subject to automatic excommunication if they participate in, or encourage the deliberate termination of, pregnancy for any reason. They are also instructed that they have a

sacred duty to sign and circulate petitions, march in street demonstrations, and raise funds for the Right to Life movement, which is passionately concerned with the rights of unborn embryos but which, in accordance with Catholic tradition, has minimum concern for the rights of women.

Far from being discouraged, the campaign has gained momentum since last January, when the U.S. Supreme Court in effect invalidated all restrictive state antiabortion laws. Seven justices, including the only Catholic on the bench, William J. Brennan, concurred in the opinion, which held that the right of privacy "is broad enough to encompass a woman's decision whether or not to terminate a pregnancy." Two publications of the Catholic far right, *The Wanderer* and *Triumph*, called for Justice Brennan's excommunication. Archbishop Francis J. Furey of Texas characterized the authors of the ruling as "fetal muggers." In more elegant but equally apocalyptic terms, the president of the National Catholic Conference, John Cardinal Krol, accused the Court of opening the doors "to the greatest slaughter of innocent life in the history of mankind."

The current goal of the Church is reversal of the Supreme Court ruling by constitutional amendment. If it should succeed, the result would be a real "slaughter of innocent life"—the butchery of American women once again condemned to the perils of illegal, criminal abortion. For there is evident, at all economic and social levels and among all ethnic groups, a clear determination to limit the number of one's offspring; and in the present state of the art of contraception, abortion is an essential last-resort method of birth control.

The high command of the anti-abortion drive is the National Catholic Conference of Bishops, based in Washington. The shock troops are a network of grass-roots organizations coordinated by a national Right to Life Committee. Its chairman is Edward J. Golden, a construction foreman and father of six who lives near Troy, New York. Golden won his spurs in his native state where, in 1970, the country's most liberal abortion law was unexpectedly enacted. Perceiving that the Church's traditional tactics—low-key persuasion and gentle arm-twisting—no longer worked, in short order he built the New York Right to Life Committee into a formidable political lobby. Its strategy was simple: to attack and defeat any legislator—no matter what his stance on other issues—who had voted for the liberal bill or failed to support the move to repeal it. By mounting effective campaigns in the home districts of his targets, Golden demonstrated that this was no idle threat: three legislators went down to defeat in 1971, and others found themselves in close contests.

His program moved into high gear in January 1972, when busloads of antiabortionists began rolling into Albany, heavily laden with sensational literature. Terence Cardinal Cooke sounded the call to arms by denouncing the liberal law as "an outrage against humanity." He received a powerful assist from Richard Nixon. In a well-publicized letter, the President repudiated the findings of his own Population Council and endorsed the Cardinal's views. On April 16, which His Eminence had designated as "Right to Life" Sunday, priests throughout the state read his proclamation to their congregations. In New York City, parochial-school bands, Knights of Columbus units, and legions of the faithful from distant points converged for a march down Fifth Avenue.

Lawrence Lader, who, as an author and militant agitator, has been one of the most intrepid advocates of legal abortion, had assembled a small group for a counter-demonstration. A few carried signs identifying themselves as "Catholics for Legal Abortion." Though he has often been in the eye

of the storm as a debater and lecturer, he recalls the occasion as one of the most unnerving of his career.

"The busloads unloading on nearby streets streamed by," he said. "They were mainly middle-aged people, prim and determined in blue serge suits and flowered Sunday dresses. When they saw our signs they screamed only one word, like a small explosion. 'Murderer! Murderer!' We were faced with a religious crusade."

In early May 1972, reversing its 1970 stand, the legislature repealed the liberal law. It was a triumph for Golden's one-issue politics. Although Governor Rockefeller vetoed the repeal bill, the Right to Life movement had demonstrated the impact of what the governor called "extremes of personal vilification and political coercion brought to bear on members of the legislature."

Six months later, in Michigan, the movement showed its muscle in even more striking fashion when the abortion question was put to a popular vote. At issue was a proposal—Proposition B—to repeal the state's 126-year-old abortion law. Three weeks before Election Day, polls showed 56 percent in favor, 33 percent against, and 11 percent undecided. Yet, on November 7, Proposition B was defeated by more than 61 percent of the vote. Credit for this feat goes to an organization calling itself Voice of the Unborn, which mobilized some eight thousand volunteers for door-to-door canvassing and retained an enterprising young advertising firm, Maywood & Hammer, to mastermind a media blitz. As a recurring motif they used a simulated fetal heartbeat in a saturation program of radio spots. Professional actors were hired to perform in staged "man-in-the-street" TV interviews. Bumper stickers carried such tasteful slogans as "Bring 'Em Out Alive." Highway billboards pictured Christ admonishing passersby, "Stop Abortion Now. Thou Shalt Not Kill. Don't Take a Life That I Have Given. Vote No in November."

One active supporter of the proposition was Dr. Jack Stack, whose advocacy of legal abortion dates back to his internship, when he watched a woman die after a criminal abortion. "It was an insidious thing," Dr. Stack said of the Michigan campaign. "At first the fear was a creeping force. It got to be paranoia in some quarters until logic faded and scare tactics were screaming in our faces." Feeling became so intense that another liberal physician, Dr. George La Croix, had his life threatened. In Lansing, a priest in full clerical dress accosted a pro-abortion legislator, called him a "foul murderer," and tried to push him down the capitol steps. "I don't think a day passed that there wasn't some antiabortion pamphlet under our door," the mother of two adolescent daughters said. "It was horrible, sickening stuff. It really frightened the kids."

The literature in question was paid for through collections in Catholic churches or sales of pamphlets at church doors. Most of it was purchased or adapted from the output of Dr. J. C. Willke, a dapper and articulate Cincinnati general practitioner. He and his handsome wife are veterans of the antiabortion wars, and their materials—available in French, German, Spanish, and Italian—are the staple ammunition of the movement throughout the world. Among the best-selling items is a \$1.25 Handbook on Abortion. It is illustrated with color photographs of disintegrating fetuses and is packed with misinformation. One example:

Isn't abortion safer than childbirth?

No, in the late stages it is far more dangerous. Even in the first three months at least twice as many mothers die from legal abortions as from childbirth.

Actually, according to statistics compiled by the Population Council, legal abortions

in the U.S. have a death rate of eight per 100,000 compared to the pregnancy and childbirth death rate of twenty deaths per 100,000 for white women and forty to sixty for black women.

Dr. Willke's bloody embryos sometimes appear on postcards. Others are used in a pamphlet titled "Four Ways to Kill a Baby." This series includes a grisly color photo of a dismembered ten-week-old fetus, actually two inches long but enlarged to appear exactly the same size as a nine-week-old infant shown on the same page. Dr. Willke has also added his own hair-raising sound track to a teaching film originally made to instruct doctors in the techniques of suction abortion. His slide lectures and films are major attractions at Right to Life meetings. At their convention in Detroit last June, Dr. Willke explained how to get maximum mileage from his materials. The description that follows is excerpted from the notes of a women's rights advocate who attended the gathering incognito.

Dr. Willke emphasized that you should never use the word "fetus" or "embryo"; always say "baby." Always use the word "kill." The first set of slides is about the development of the embryo, but it must be shown in reverse order. Always start with the slide of a live baby, moving backward at two-week intervals, and ask, "Is it still human?" If you start at the other end, the ovum, they will see it as a glob, not a baby from the beginning.

The next set is about abortions—bloody and bloodcurdling. This is followed by a view of a garbage pail filled with dead "babies." Finally there is a German concentration-camp scene showing a truckload of dead Jews en route to the incinerator.

The analogy with Hitler's extermination program and human experimentation has proved potent propaganda. The implication is that legal abortion is only a first step toward compulsory abortion for "undesirables," raising the specter of genocide for black people. Similarly, old folk are persuaded that their lives are menaced by compulsory euthanasia, supposedly next on the agenda of the population planners.

In their first national exercise in confrontation politics, Right to Lifers swarmed into Washington on January 22, the anniversary of the Supreme Court decision, to rally support for the constitutional amendment introduced by Rep. Lawrence J. Hogan of Maryland, which is before the House Judiciary Committee. The strategy is to bypass committee hearings by collecting 218 signatures on a discharge petition. Thereafter a two-thirds majority of both houses would be needed to send the measure to the states for a final vote.

Hogan's bill provides that "neither the United States nor any state shall deprive a human being, from the moment of conception, of life without due process of law; nor deny to any human being, from the moment of conception, within its jurisdiction, the equal protection of its laws."

Constitutional lawyers point out that this concept of the fetus as a person would create legal chaos. Nonetheless, this is the doctrine of the Church, stubbornly defended by its legal scholars.

In addition to Hogan's proposal, scores of other antiabortion proposals are in the hopers of both houses. Some follow the pattern set by Rep. G. William Whitehurst of Virginia, who would simply return the abortion question to the individual states. Doctrinaire Right to Lifers are less than enthusiastic about the measure introduced by Conservative Sen. James Buckley of New York. It provides protection for the fetus "from the time a biologically identifiable human being comes into existence." This ambiguity is unacceptable to True Believers, as is the humane proviso that "this article shall not apply in an emergency when a reasonable

medical certainty exists that continuation of the pregnancy will cause the death of the mother."

The Buckley bill has acquired several Protestant cosponsors, a factor of some importance in relieving the movement of its all-Catholic coloration. Mr. Golden recently estimated that perhaps 15 percent of his followers were of other faiths. They include members of some fundamentalist Christian sects, the Church of Latter-Day Saints, the Missouri Synod—the most conservative branch of the Lutheran Church—and a handful of orthodox Jewish rabbis. The movement has also attracted a scattering of one-time Vietnam war protesters who have been persuaded that abortion is a form of "violence."

Spokesman of the last group is Thomas J. Mooney, the twenty-eight-year-old leader of the National Youth Pro-Life Coalition. Mooney insists that his organization is not "a collection of priest-ridden Catholic fanatics." He describes himself as a leftist-liberal ex-Catholic, and is a former vice-president of the National Student Association who worked in the McGovern campaign. Mooney assured me that the plight of a woman burdened with an unwanted pregnancy could best be eased by working for a world "in which no child is unwanted." He feels no qualms in trying to engineer the political demise of a fine legislator whose record he applauds on every question but abortion. "We'll just have to find someone equally liberal on our side," he said. He conceded that one-issue politics might present some problems if he found himself forced to support a second term for Senator Buckley, with whom he is in agreement only on the subject of abortion.

Mooney's troops are organized on a precinct-by-precinct basis. On visits to their representatives, he emphasized, "we remind them the '74 elections are less than nine months away, and if they won't speak up for life we're going to get them."

Elected officials take such threats seriously, especially when they are backed by a continuous torrent of mail running at least nine to one against the Supreme Court decision. The legislators are impressed, too, with the political clout of an organization which last summer pressured forty CBS affiliates into not rebroadcasting an episode of the television program *Maude* in which the heroine decided to have an abortion. A well-organized boycott induced all but one of the show's commercial sponsors to withdraw.

Of the countervailing forces, only the National Association for Repeal of Abortion Laws, headed by Lawrence Lader, has attempted to match the militant tactics of the antiabortion groups. NARAL has fought aggressively and effectively on the state level but commands limited resources and is the only organization devoted to the single purpose of supporting legal abortion. Since there are many other items on the agenda of feminist groups and the American Civil Liberties Union, neither can mount a massive letter-writing campaign on the one issue of abortion. The matter is of even more direct concern to Planned Parenthood and the Association for the Study of Abortion. But these organizations, conscious of their tax-exempt status (which does not inhibit the Catholic Conference), limit their activities to citing the record. They have an impressive case.

In New York City, for example, maternal deaths declined from thirty-five per 100,000 in 1970, the year the abortion law was liberalized, to twenty-seven per 100,000 in 1972. Admissions to Harlem Hospital for "botched abortions" dropped from 1,054 in 1965 to 292 in 1971; at many other municipal hospitals, cases of septic abortion—formerly commonplace—are rare. The general birthrate in the city declined 12 percent from 1970 to 1971, and 30 percent among welfare recipients. A

fifteen-year steady increase in illegitimate births was reversed in 1971 with a 12 percent drop. Enrollment in public maternity centers fell by 53 percent, and five were closed. The number of children placed in foster care declined by 41 percent.

One consequence has been an acute shortage of babies available for adoption. To counter this trend, the Church has set up an organization called Birthright which offers counseling to unmarried mothers as an alternative to what Birthright calls "the tragedy of abortion." "It seems to me they are really seeing women as brood mares," one Catholic friend of mine commented. And certainly for the approximately 200,000 women who in the past year had safe, legal abortions in New York—80 percent in the first trimester—the far greater tragedy was the prospect of having to bear an unwanted child.

"I have yet to hear an intelligent sermon against abortion," said another devout Catholic woman who lives in Brooklyn and is actively involved in the affairs of a racially and economically mixed community. "I feel like shouting at the priest, 'Who are you to tell women they have to have babies?' They talk about 'respect for life.' But they have no idea what life is like for most people. It's all a suburban, white, middle-class movement. They're just talking to empty air, not to people with real problems."

This woman doubts that she would ever have an abortion. But she feels the decision is a matter of personal choice, as do 56 percent of U.S. Catholics, according to a 1972 Gallup poll. She profoundly deplores the effort of her church to deprive American women of that choice. There has not, however, been any effective demonstration of political concern by those who agree.

As a result, a number of restrictive measures have been quietly enacted by Congressmen and Senators who—as one of them put it—"just want to get those people off our backs." "Those people" are the lobbyists in clerical dress and the indefatigable letter writers of the Right to Life movement. Some of the new laws would deny the use of federal funds to family-planning programs here and abroad that include abortion or research in abortifacients. The most ominous is a rider to the Social Security Act, introduced by Senator Buckley and passed by the Senate in December, which would ban Medicaid payments for abortions. If enacted, this law would mean the end of the low-cost abortion clinics which have been largely financed by Medicaid funds. The effect would be to make safe, legal abortion once again the prerogative of the rich.

These Right to Life victories are milestones on the long road before a constitutional amendment can be enacted. Those who doubt that this feat is possible should recall the achievement of another one-issue minority lobby—the Women's Christian Temperance Union—which foisted the Volstead Act on the nation in 1919. Indeed, unless the Right to Life movement is recognized for the threat that it is, American women may find, in the not too distant future, that they have lost a war because they did not even realize it was being fought.

THE REFUGE IS THEIR FORTRESS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is not enough merely to love wilderness. It is necessary to nourish it as well. The Na-

tion's 356 wildlife refuges have helped whooping cranes, pelicans, manatees, and other endangered animals to survive. Biologists are experimenting with concepts that might give many threatened species a new lease on existence. And important new laws have been passed. But the ultimate question is, "What can I do to help?" In National Wildlife's special endangered species issues, here are some of the problems and answers:

THE REFUGE IS THEIR FORTRESS

(By Bob Strohm)

Drifting languidly over the waves near the little town of Sebastian, midway down Florida's eastern coast, the huge flocks of brown pelicans presented excellent targets for even the clumsiest marksmen back in the early 1900s. And so, from the boats and yachts that sailed past a three-acre island where the pelicans nested, vacationers and plume hunters alike casually picked off the birds by the thousands. Whenever Paul Kroegel—a special guard hired by a conservation group—saw the vessels headed toward the island, he raced out in his little boat to turn them away. But Kroegel had no real authority, except a 10-gauge shotgun, and not until President Theodore Roosevelt set aside Pelican Island as a "preserve and breeding ground for native birds" did the slaughter finally stop. Then, fittingly enough, the man appointed to serve as the preserve's first federal warden was Paul Kroegel.

From that modest beginning 71 years ago, the National Wildlife Refuge System has grown into 356 havens, totaling 30 million acres and sustaining almost every kind of wildlife in the United States. Today, there is no doubt that these refuges played an essential role in preventing the extinction of a number of animals, from the trumpeter swan and the bison to pronghorn antelope, desert bighorn sheep, muskox and the American alligator.

Incorporating six different types of areas, the system is not only the largest network of managed wildlife sanctuaries in the world but also the most diversified. More than 270 migratory waterfowl refuges occupy 4 million acres. Another 61 acres protect nesting colonies of herons, egrets and seabird species on a total of four million acres. Fifteen big game areas protect a broad spectrum of wildlife on 5 million acres. Four national game ranges cover 2.5 million acres. National Wildlife ranges cover nearly 14 million acres. And 114 units of wetlands, totaling more than 1 million acres, have been set aside for waterfowl nesting areas in the north central states.

Largest of all the units is the 9-million-acre Arctic National Wildlife Range in Alaska, home of caribou, polar bears, grizzly bears, gray wolves, arctic foxes, waterfowl and shorebirds. The smallest, the Mille Lacs Refuge in Minnesota, consists of two small islands making up only six-tenths of an acre—still a safe haven for gulls, terns and purple martins.

Each year, as civilization continues expanding into formerly undisturbed areas, the refuge system becomes more vital. Within the last ten years, 74 refuges totaling nearly 700,000 acres have been added. Money for the acquisition of refuges comes from the sale of Migratory Bird Hunting Stamps, which netted over \$10 million last year (up from \$7.2 million in 1971). Some refuges have been created by Congressional action taking land out of the public domain. And some have been donated by private groups, such as the Union Camp Corp., which recently gave a big portion (49,000 acres) of Virginia's unique Dismal Swamp to the refuge system.

Endangered species are found on 82 of the 356 refuges, and they include 8 mammals, 16 birds and the American alligator. The en-

dangered Florida manatee is now relatively secure in nearly 2,000 acres of water habitat on the Ding Darling and Chassahowitzka refuges off southwest Florida. A large population of brown pelicans is thriving on the Pelican Island Refuge, now expanded to 756 acres. The key deer, all but wiped out in the 1940s, was brought back from a population low of 30 to over 600 on the National Key Deer Refuge in the Florida Keys. The American alligator occurs on 25 refuges. And the entire population of the Everglades kite, now estimated at 30 birds, lives on or near Florida's Loxahatchee Refuge.

Though sometimes a refuge is acquired primarily to protect one species, many other species eventually benefit from the protection and resources it offers. For instance, some of the other animals besides the endangered brown pelican at South Carolina's 34,000-acre Cape Romaine National Wildlife Refuge include geese, ducks, turkeys, bald eagles, rails, terns, deer, sea turtles and alligators.

Of course, the National Wildlife Refuges aren't the only havens for wildlife. Millions of additional acres are managed for wildlife's benefit by the states, private groups and other federal agencies. The U.S. Forest Service has set aside 4,000 acres of land for the endangered Kirtland's warbler in Michigan. The Bureau of Land Management safeguards Nevada's School Spring, home of the endangered warm spring pupfish. The National Park Service protects the endangered eastern timber wolf on the 540,000-acre Isle Royale in Michigan's north woods.

Protection of endangered species has actually become an important function of the refuge system. In 1909, refuges were established for the American bison, followed by areas for pronghorn antelope, desert bighorns and whooping cranes. Over the years, its primary objective has been to protect migratory waterfowl, for which the federal government assumed responsibility in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918. But periodically, competing philosophies have shifted the management emphasis. Originally, for example, the refuges were sanctuaries where hunting was prohibited. But since 1924, regulated hunting has become more widespread on the refuges. In 1973, nearly 800,000 visitors to the refuges—four percent—were hunters.

When the refuge system was smaller, management policy and directives emanated from the Interior Department in Washington, D.C. Then, for several decades, there was a period of decentralization, with increased policy-making on the regional and local level. But many problems arose. Some refuge managers equated development with improvement. Based on the erroneous notion that "more is better," for example, they would sometimes flood as much land as possible to create lakes for fishermen, making inadequate provisions for waterfowl and amphibians dependent on swamps and other forms of wetland. At the other extreme, too little management was sometimes exercised. When Wisconsin's Necedah Refuge was added to the federal system, it had excellent prairie chicken and sharp-tail grouse range. But little effort was exercised to maintain the necessary open spaces prairie birds need, and the area became a thicket of little value to them.

During the past decade, there has been a movement once again to centralize policy decisions in Washington, increasingly safeguarding and restoring wildlife values at refuges, and downplaying general public recreation such as swimming, camping, picnicking, motorboating, horseback riding and target shooting. But wildlife refuges still do far more than set aside land where animals won't be disturbed by the nation's burgeoning population. Whether the system's 20 million annual visitors walk high in the mountains, deep in the forests, through vast agricultural areas or alongside frenetic urban centers, they come away spiritually revital-

ized. Henry David Thoreau might have been speaking of the National Wildlife Refuge System when he said: "A community is saved not so much by the righteous men in it but by the woods and swamps that surround it."

CONGRESSMEN ASK NIXON TO MEET MIA FAMILIES

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, 82 of my colleagues in the House and Senate have joined the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. EARL F. LANDGREBE, and me in a letter asking President Nixon to meet personally with representatives of the families of our missing servicemen.

Because of the great importance of this issue, and the anguish and anxiety that accompany each day in their lives, we are again appealing to the President to meet personally with these MIA families.

We believe the President, more than anyone else, can marshal world opinion to compel the North Vietnamese to meet their humanitarian obligations in co-operating in a full accounting for our missing American servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the full text and signers of this letter be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

MARCH 20, 1974.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The recent observance of the first anniversary of the cease-fire in Southeast Asia has focused attention on numerous unanswered questions concerning the possibility of American citizens remaining in Communist captivity.

We again appeal to you to meet personally with members of the families of our MIA's to amplify the humanitarian concerns of all Americans and to discuss our Government's efforts and plans to resolve the unanswered questions of the fate of the 1,156 unaccounted for men.

While we recognize that the recalcitrance of the North Vietnamese has repeatedly frustrated our search missions, we believe that you, more than anyone else, can marshal world opinion to the humanitarian principles to which free nations subscribe.

We look forward to your early reply.

Respectfully,

LIST OF SIGNERS

SENATORS

Birch Bayh (IN), James Buckley (NY), William Brock (TN), Robert Dole (KS), Pete Domenici (NM), Edward J. Gurney (FL), James Pearson (KS), Robert Packwood (OR), William Proxmire (WI), and John Tower (TX).

REPRESENTATIVES

Bella S. Abzug (NY), Joseph P. Addabbo (NY), John B. Anderson (IL), Bill Archer (TX), L. A. (Skip) Bafalis (FL), Robert Bauman (MD), Lindy (Mrs. Hale) Boggs (LA), William Bray (IN), James Broyhill (NC), Joel T. Broyhill (VA), John B. Buchanan (AL), James A. Burke (MS), Bill Chappell, Jr. (FL), Donald Clancy (OH), Don H. Clausen (CA), Lawrence Coughlin (PA), W. C. Daniel (VA), George Danielson (CA), Mendel

Davis (SC), Joshua Ellberg (PA), Marvin Esch (MI), Bill Frenzel (MN), Richard H. Fulton (TN), and Don Fuqua (FL).

Benjamin A. Gilman (NY), Tennyson Guyer (OH), Lee Hamilton (IN), Margaret M. Heckler (MS), Henry Helstoski (NJ), Marjorie S. Holt (MD), Frank Horton (NY), Robert Huber (MI), William Hudnut (IN), John E. Hunt (NJ), Jack Kemp (NY), William M. Ketchum (CA), Earl F. Landgrebe (IN), Norman F. Lent (NY), Clarence D. Long (MD), James R. Mann (SC), Spark M. Matsunaga (HA), Romano L. Mazzoli (KY), Donald J. Mitchell (NM), G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery (AL), John M. Murphy (NY), John P. Murtha (PA), George O'Brien (IL), and Claude Pepper (FL).

Peter A. Peyser (NY), Bertram L. Podell (NY), Albert H. Quie (MN), John Rarick (LA), Howard W. Robison (NY), Robert A. Roe (NJ), Angelo Roncallo (NY), Benjamin Rosenthal (NY), John Rousselot (CA), Ronald Sarasin (CT), Dick Shoup (MT), Garner F. Shriver (KS), Robert L. F. Sikes (FL), Henry P. Smith III (NY), David Towell (NV), William F. Walsh (NY), G. William Whitehurst (VA), Bob Wilson (CA), Larry Winn, Jr. (KS), Antonio Borja Won Pat (GUAM), John W. Wylder (NY), Gus Yatron (PA), Roger Zion (IN), and John M. Zwach (MN).

SOUTH PATTERNS END WITH CLASS L CROWN

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, South Catholic High School, of my hometown of Hartford, has just won their second State basketball championship in less than 5 years in the recently completed Connecticut Interscholastic Athletic Conference Class L Tournament.

The South Catholic "Rebels" combined talent and determination to win a 71-57 victory over Naugatuck High School in the final game and a 22-3 record on the season. The enthusiastic school spirit of the students at South Catholic must have played a major role in their fine season, as the turnout at the championship game set a new State attendance record. I am very proud to congratulate the entire student body and their great basketball team; I know that this year will be a lasting memory for the students at South Catholic and their families.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I enclose the below article from the Hartford Times of March 16, 1974 which gives well-deserved recognition to the accomplishments of this fine team in their championship victory:

SOUTH PATTERNS END WITH CLASS L CROWN
(By Don Conkey)

NEW HAVEN.—As Joe Kelly stood amid the evergrowing multitude of writers, players, and well wishers, someone handed him a teary-eyed little boy. Joe, consoling the youngster, explained that Joe Jr.'s moist eyelids stemmed from a trip that all little boys have to make, sooner or later.

Those were the only tears seen around South Catholic's locker room Friday night.

The Rebels made melancholy a non-existent term at New Haven's Coliseum Friday with a 71-57 success story over Naugatuck, annexing the second Connecticut Interscholastic Athletic Conference Class L title

in the school's 10-year history. The largest single crowd in CIAC Finals history, 6,479, was around to see South relentlessly wear down the scrapping but outmanned Greyhounds to duplicate 1970's championship achievement against East Catholic.

South followed a pattern that might as well be patented: for the fourth straight game, the Rebels took a one point halftime advantage, blew its opponent out in the third quarter, and defended its victory away in the finale.

That halftime score, 32-31, got there mainly on center Ted Mauro's and forward Bill Eller's yeomen work inside. Both had 12 points in the opening 16 minutes, offsetting some big rebounding and scoring efforts by Naugatuck's 6-2 junior forward Joe Healy (3 points).

Eller, recipient of the Eddie Reilly trophy as Class L Most Valuable Player, sparked South to a third period lead that held up for the distance. His six third-quarter points, consistent rebounding, and continual clogging of both defensive and offensive lanes pushed the Rebels to a 46-39 cushion entering Class L's 1973-74 departure.

Naugatuck got as close as five points in the fourth period, 57-52 around the four-minute mark, but South's off-utilized passing process effectively stalled any Naugatuck comeback hopes for the game's remainder.

"They were only one of three teams (Weaver and Xavier) to play us man-to-man all season, Reilly told. "I thought they might try man-to-man, but it took us a long time to get used to it. We have always seen the zone."

"We had eight or nine guys who gave us a good ballgame. I was really happy to see those eight or nine play as much as they did. And defensively, I think that wore Naugatuck down near the end."

The eight's big two were Eller and Mauro, who scored 23 and 12 points respectively.

Eller also contributed 12 rebounds, nudging Healy by one in that department. Healy led all Greyhounds in scoring with 17 marker, center John Palmer and guard Gary Churchill garnering 11 apiece.

Naugatuck, considered the Class L cinderella team by many via its 16-8 record entering Friday's competition, did much to cost itself a midnight deadline with turnovers. The Greyhounds committed 15, while South lost possession just eight times.

"No, I didn't think that we played our best game tonight," losing mentor Bob Sullivan lamented. "Not to take anything away from South. They're a great team."

Sullivan seemed surprised when told that only three teams, including his, had played the Rebels man-to-man, "but I'd play man-to-man again if we met. To me, that's the only way to play defense."

Reilly admitted that his Rebels "played a better game against New London, and South Windsor. But Naugatuck, especially Churchill impressed me. They told me that Churchill was slow—he's not slow."

Thus South Catholic caps a clean Hartford County Conference sweep for the night while raising its season-ending record to 22-3. St. Paul of Bristol took home Class M honors in the evening's first contest.

Material stats had South trailing in rebounds, 38-34, while hitting on 32 of 59 field goals as compared to Naugatuck's 24-55.

But the material matters little today to Reilly and his Rebels, who have fled away in memory's posterity the fact that Warren Hardin's Class L reign was just a one-year stopover.

Oh, yes, Reilly, who cautiously refused throughout the tournament to even venture a remark suggesting that his team might be better than its next opponent, appropriately seemed to sum up the night's full feeling:

"We are the best team."

THE GREAT PROTEIN ROBBERY: NO. 22—THE STUDDS-MAGNUSON 200-MILE FISH BILL

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, while fish prices continue to rise, the fish stocks continue to be depleted causing a never-ending cycle that harms both the consumer and our domestic fishing industry. We must begin now to reverse the years of neglect that have surrounded our commercial fishing industry. The best solution to the rising fish prices caused by dwindling fish stocks is the immediate enactment of the Studts-Magnuson 200-mile fish conservation zone which would permit the United States to regulate all fishing within 200 miles of our coastline.

The United States must also take the lead in developing and utilizing fish species that are not now widely associated with the dinner table. Not only must we diversify our domestic fishing efforts but we must improve our technological ability to utilize more of the flesh—leaving little or no waste. For the further information of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the March 25, 1974, Newsweek magazine that addresses itself to this very need:

SOMETHING FISHY

As meat prices skyrocket, both housewives and food scientists are searching diligently for new, nutritive and inexpensive substitutes. One major prospect: unusual varieties of fish, at present often neglected because of their poor taste or poor public image. Within the next few years it seems likely that Americans will routinely be sitting down at mealtimes to such dishes as squid rings, minced-carp patties and even fish-reinforced hamburgers and hot dogs.

Squid has long been featured on the menus of Oriental and Mediterranean restaurants, but most Americans think of it as a slithery horror rather than a table delicacy. Scientists say squid has enormous advantages as a food: it is boneless, almost entirely edible and a nearly pure source of protein.

One major problem is the difficulty of preparing squid for the table. Gutting squid by hand without breaking its delicate ink sac is a tedious and prohibitively expensive process. Recently, however, a group at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology devised equipment—rather like an old-style wringer-type washing machine—that performs the task to perfection. "It simply eviscerates the squid and takes the skin off, leaving an absolutely white fillet that can be used right away," explains Ernest R. Pariser, one of the project scientists. Having solved the mechanical problem, the MIT group then developed a number of squid dishes tailored to the American palate. These include squid chowder, fried squid rings and a squid cocktail that is similar to oysters. Tasters rate the dishes so highly that Pariser and his colleagues are now working on a large-scale prototype of their machine for industrial use. And one Cape Cod businessman is negotiating with the MIT group for the right to build some of the machines to provide fodder for a chain of squid-food restaurants he plans to open in the area.

Another piece of machinery, developed principally by the Japanese, is being used by scientists of the National Marine Fisheries

Service to salvage parts of the flesh close to the bones of such species as cod and haddock, and to obtain flesh from other fish such as carp and whiting that are too small or too bony to fillet normally. This machine, which consists of a rotating drum with holes in it and a rotating belt that runs outside the drum, is a kind of ichthyological cotton gin. With the application of appropriate pressure, the fish flesh is pressed through the holes in the drum, ending up in minced form, while the bones are left behind. The device can salvage up to 15 per cent more flesh than conventional fish-filleting processes produce.

Some of the minced fish obtained in this way is already on the market in the form of fish sticks. But because the raw product often has such undesirable characteristics as grayish coloration and overly strong flavor, fisheries experts have had to use considerable ingenuity to turn it into acceptable food. At the service's Pacific Fishery Products Technology Center in Seattle, for example, a team headed by David Miyauchi has developed a number of tasty spreads, pastes and patties, using species such as carp and Alaskan pollock, which have previously been regarded as nuisances by sport fishermen. According to Miyauchi, minced-fish products from these previously undesirable species could sell for 10 to 20 cents less per pound than conventional filleted fish, even though their protein content is identical.

Minced fish will probably never beat beef, but it may join it. Food technologists at the Atlantic Fishery Products Technology Center in Gloucester, Mass., have recently incorporated minced fish into hot dogs and hamburgers. So far the "fish dog" have failed to come up to scratch because the moisture added to the fish causes them to shrivel up too much, but hamburgers of "beefish" have proved a great hit among volunteers who have tasted them. In one test, students at Virginia Polytechnic Institute actually preferred hamburgers made with 25 per cent minced fish to regular hamburgers—a finding that makes VPI food scientist George J. Flick lick his lips. "People like their hamburgers to be meat, and we thought that consumers would be willing to pay a higher price for meat," he noted last week. "Now, I'm not so sure. With hamburger at \$1.29 a pound, the consumer may finally be willing to accept a little fish in his beef."

REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP SUPPORTS CONTINUATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Committees has reported to the floor a major reorganization of the standing committees of the House. The recommendations of the select committee will, of course, be the subject of careful consideration by Members before it is considered on the floor and opened for amendment.

One of the most controversial recommendations in the select committee's Reorganization proposal is the abolition of the House Committee on Internal Security, which first as the House Committee on Un-American Activities and subsequently as the House Committee on Internal Security has rendered valuable service to the House and to the Nation for decades.

The Committee on Internal Security exists because there is a need for it, and there will be a need for it as long as this House wishes to address the crucial questions surrounding subversion of our form of government. Yet, the proposal of the select committee would transfer, in its entirety, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Internal Security to the Committee on the Judiciary, presumably assigning such jurisdiction to a subcommittee.

I oppose the select committee's proposal, in this regard, for several reasons.

First, it would subvert the Committee on Internal Security's responsibilities to a Committee which has many other important responsibilities. I think I can say for sure, that such a transfer would result in the diminution of this body's attention to problems of internal security.

Second, such a proposal implies the Committee on Internal Security has not done an adequate job of fulfilling its responsibilities. This, too, is not the case.

The committee's work is a matter of public record. Its annual report is now available and shows the extent of its work, certainly not all of which is bill-related but as certainly all of which is important to this House. In 1973 alone, the committee investigated revolutionary agitation in our prisons; attempts to infiltrate trade unions; the use of the Communist Party, USA, to defend Soviet anti-Semitic policies of hate toward the Jews; and other matters relating to Communist theory and practice, particularly in the Soviet Union, Red China, and Chile.

Third, there have been several disturbing and distressing items in the RECORD of late on the way in which our Government's internal security and intelligence gathering activities are operating at less than full effectiveness. Several Members have proposed measures to redefine and bolster our capacity for internal security related intelligence gathering. Undoubtedly, some of these measures will be in legislative form. They should certainly be considered by the committee whose expertise is outstanding in this field. I refer, of course, to the Committee on Internal Security.

Ever since the select committee's proposals were made public, I have been much impressed with the widespread public reaction against them. These are not the shrill voices of emotional anti-Communism. They are, in the main, the reasoned voices of intelligent debate.

A number of columnists and editors have raised too their voices and pens in protest of the select committee's proposals. One of the most recent is a column by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief of the Hearst Newspapers.

The column follows:

WATCHDOG COMMITTEE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW YORK.—Since truth consists of provable facts, it is hardly surprising that students of Democratic freedom keep coming up with the same two fundamental observations. One is that liberty has more to fear from internal enemies than from those outside. The other is that liberty can be maintained only by keeping a constant protective vigil

against the forces which would like to limit or destroy it.

The twin truisms have been expressed in various words by many different people. The U.S. philosopher William James, for example, said that "the deadliest of enemies are not foreign foes; they always dwell within." Its classic corollary is credited to an Irish judge, John Philpot Curran, who said in a 1790 speech: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Now you might think just about everybody would agree automatically with these principles. After all, U.S. history is full of disruptions which result whenever groups of our own people start believing that their personal convictions are more important than the freedom of their neighbors. And it certainly stands to reason that a constant, close watch be maintained if the subversive activities of such groups are to be kept at a minimum.

That's what you might think. And that's why it seems important today to tell you what is being plotted in Congress by a small but willful band of lawmakers who have somewhat different ideas. The object of their plotting is the House Internal Security Committee, which until 1969 was titled the House Un-American Activities Committee. Why and how they have made it a target confirms the warnings of William James and John Philpot Curran.

No agency of Congress has had a more stormy history. For more than 40 years the HUAC—and now the HISC—has been exhaustively and effectively probing all manner of subversive activity in this country. For the same length of time, significantly, it has been strongly resisted and regularly condemned as excessive by the usual loud chorus of liberals and left-wing Communist sympathizers.

They accused the committee of having a pathological fear of Communism, of making scarlet mountains out of pale pink molehills, of persecuting harmless political theorists and using the tactics of a bully to do it. They soft-pedaled the simple reality of why the Communists and their many subversive activities got so much attention.

The Communists and their various offshoots, from the labor agitators to organizers of student violence, got most of the committee headlines only because such radicals of the left far outnumbered such radicals of the right as members of the KKK, the German-American Bund and other neo-Fascist organizations. Yet all of the latter were as thoroughly explored as their leftist counterparts, with the same painstaking documentation of leadership, interlinkage, secret plans and actual operations.

The only difference was that the rightists did not have a clique of influential sympathizers to assail the committee and disparage its work.

These attacks have never ceased, nor are they likely to do so. The left never lets up on anything or anybody considered injurious to its efforts, nor do the people who troop along with the idea that it is smarter to be called liberal than patriotic. Patriotism, indeed, is widely considered a bad word today—which is a tribute to the sinister appeal which Communism in its many guises has for certain types of politically and socially-minded persons.

In the case of HUAC, and its less clumsily named successor, the most serious attacks have been the many congressional attempts at downright abolition. It makes no difference to its foes in Congress that the committee is acclaimed by our law enforcement officials everywhere as an invaluable source of continually updated information on radical groups of all description, left and right alike. The committee must go.

Such has always been the rallying cry of its determined enemies in Congress. And it is being sounded again right now.

Emphasizing the persistence of these people is important. It was their concerted attempt to abolish HUAC which resulted in its 1969 name change. And according to the Washington newsweekly Human Events—to which much of this column is indebted—in the 92d Congress alone a total of 37 resolutions to dissolve the committee were introduced with the backing of 67 members. None was acted upon.

Having so repeatedly failed to torpedo the committee by other means, its congressional foes now have invented a new approach—and its a crafty one. Largely unnoticed by the press, it seems that the House Select Committee on committees headed by liberal Missouri Democrat Richard Bolling has been working on a master plan to reorganize and streamline such bodies. The plan now has been submitted and you can imagine what it includes.

Sure enough, one of the recommendations would abolish the HISC, this time by transferring its legislative jurisdiction to the House Judiciary Committee. Columnist Joseph Alsop, one of the most astute observers of the Washington political scene, recently described this grab-bag committee as "a kind of dumping ground for left-wing Democrats of the more far-out type."

The all-important point is that if the Bolling committee recommendation is adopted, it will almost certainly finish the kind of vigorous continuing probe of subversive activity for which the HUAC-HISC has been noted. Sixteen of the 21 Democrats on the Judiciary Committee have voted against appropriations for HISC in the past. The chairmen of six of its seven subcommittees have done the same. You can imagine the zeal with which they would continue the HISC work.

The legislative ploy aimed at killing the HISC, furthermore, involves an equally devious method of presentation. The recommendation for abolition is all but buried in a mass of other recommendations supported by over 2,000 pages of testimony and analysis. The liberals' hope is that many firm HISC supporters will go along with the generally good blunderbuss reorganization program lest they be accused of blocking progress toward a better and more effective Congress.

The plot could work—unless an enlightened public and a wide-awake House of Representatives flag it down before some kind of pressure vote is forced later in this session. And if the anti-HISC minority bloc gets away with the trickery, it will be another really major step in the steady eroding and downgrading of national security in recent years. As noted by Human Events in its issue of March 2:

"Long before Watergate, Sen. Sam Ervin (D.-N.C.), former Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark, the American Civil Liberties Union, Sen. William Proxmire (D.-Wis.) and Sen. George McGovern (D.-S.D.) were waging open warfare against wiretapping, accumulation of data on subversives, police surveillance of potential terrorists and other security practices.

"In the wake of these campaigns, FBI and military surveillance operations, both here and abroad, have been drastically reduced. The Subversive Activities Control Board has been abolished and the administration has unwisely eliminated the Justice Department Internal Security Division.

"This has created a 'climate of freedom' for all types of subversives. They believe no one is watching them closely—and their natural tendency is to go to even greater extremes in their efforts to undermine the U.S."

If you don't believe this, consider the two political kidnappings featured in all the news media during the past few weeks.

Many years ago my father wrote the following words in his newspaper column:

"The American people have been liberal to the point of lunacy. We have allowed our

patriotic altars to be polluted by dirty and desecrating hands . . . by forces which would destroy us with their subversive teachings. And we can hardly blame the alien and hostile agencies and influences for having taken advantage of such public laxness and indifference."

In another column Pop said this:

"In light of history it would certainly seem that liberty is the most precious possession of mankind. We Americans possessing liberty must exert the eternal vigilance which is necessary to preserve it."

The House Internal Security Committee has long since proven its great value as one of the most effective instruments for government vigilance.

This watchdog committee must not be lost to us now—and you can help save it from the destruction plotted and hoped for by the Bolling committee.

Write your congressman and tell him how you feel. Make it strong and brief and do it right away.

If you don't know the name of the congressman supposedly representing you, call the city desk of this newspaper for the information.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for this committee has not disappeared. Contrarywise, it is as manifest today as ever. Until that reason does disappear and détente becomes more than just a hollow word on the part of the Soviet Union and other Communist nations, we still need this committee, and I support its continuation.

CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 13

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD several articles which appeared in the Washington Post on March 24, calling to the public's attention the tremendous growth of offshore drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and the possibility of drilling off the Alaskan and Atlantic coasts.

The Council on Environmental Quality is scheduled within the month to complete a preliminary impact statement on potential oil and gas development off the Atlantic coast. Though its statement may be hedged with qualifications, CEQ is likely to give the green light to initial exploration of the area, and at that point, the major oil companies will kick off their drive to control the entire situation.

I have substantial misgivings about the broad question of developing the Outer Continental Shelf's energy deposits. In Massachusetts, for example, the tourist and fishing industries might well suffer harm, and in the absence of any comprehensive study of our Nation's energy needs and the alternatives for satisfying them, going forward with any one of these options seems ill-advised.

However, if the CEQ report is sympathetic to development and if the Supreme Court rules in its upcoming case that the Federal Government, rather than the individual States, shall retain control over coastal waters beyond the first 3 miles, then the oil companies

ought to be prevented from extending control over the activity which will take place off the Atlantic coast. The Federal Oil and Gas Corporation Act, which I have introduced with other Members of Congress, is designed to "head the major oil companies off at the pass," and provide for public ownership and participation in energy development. The Corporation approach is applicable, though by no means limited, to the Atlantic coast situation.

The articles follow:

THE OFFSHORE OIL RUSH

(By George C. Wilson)

NEW ORLEANS.—Like homesteaders rushing out for virgin land, oil men, at President Nixon's urging, are sailing forth in ever growing numbers these days to work claims in the Gulf of Mexico.

They are going out for the oil and gas that lies under the unbroken land. So many rigs are out on the water that the gulf in some places today looks like the staging area for a strangely shaped invasion force—barges with steeple-like oil derricks on top.

If government and industry geologists are anywhere near right, this same invasion force will be standing off such East Coast cities as Jacksonville, Baltimore and Boston within a decade, mining under the sea for oil and gas. Yet another fleet may dig into the sea bottom under the Gulf of Alaska.

The stepped-up activity in the Gulf of Mexico is just the beginning of a whole new era in exploiting the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States. And the impact—especially for the East Coast—will confront Americans with a whole new set of difficult choices in their life-styles and landscape.

Critics complain that the federal government is ordering this era into being without considering the consequences. One such critic—the Environmental Policy Center, a lobby group—contends that the Nixon administration should file a formal environmental impact statement on its policy decision to lease out vast areas of the ocean to oil companies.

"No one in the federal government knows what the national interest is in the coastal zone because no attempt has been made to reconcile the multiple uses of the ocean environment with a view to the long-term productivity of the seas," complains Barbara Heller, an ocean resources specialist for the Environmental Policy Center.

"If we are really facing any kind of shortage," she contends, "this argues in favor of caution in development rather than haste while we search for the most efficient ways to develop, transport, refine, distribute and utilize oil and other energy resources for the long term."

President Nixon's Council on Environmental Quality—in theory his chief adviser for such decisions as accelerating the leasing of land offshore—was not consulted on the administration decision to increase leasing tenfold, according to administration sources.

But such political opponents as President Nixon and Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) agree that offshore is the best place to go for relief of domestic oil shortages. They stress that drilling offshore, with today's technology, can and will be done with minimum risk to the environment.

Even though the argument will not be settled for years, the rush to mine the wealth of the sea is on, with the government's full blessing.

Further proof of this will come here Thursday when the Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management will offer oil companies the right to drill for oil and gas in 920,000 acres of sea bottom from 3 to 140 miles off the Louisiana coast.

This acreage is the biggest amount offered

in seven years and further reverses the downward trend in offshore leasing which followed the Santa Barbara oil spill on Jan. 28, 1969. Mr. Nixon gave the rationale for the stepped-up effort in his energy message of Jan. 23, 1974: "The undiscovered oil and gas beneath our Outer Continental Shelf can provide a significant portion of the energy to make us self-sufficient."

"Today," he continued, "I am directing the Secretary of Interior to increase the acreage leased on the Outer Continental Shelf to 10 million acres beginning in 1975, more than tripling what had originally been planned."

He added that leases for Atlantic and Gulf of Alaska sea bottom would not be offered until after the Council on Environmental Quality finished a study on what offshore drilling would do to those areas. But several geologists interviewed said those two areas would have to be opened up to achieve the stated goal of leasing 10 million acres of promising oil and gas beds offshore.

Ten million acres is almost twice the total area of Massachusetts and 1½ times the size of Maryland. Also, it is 10 times the amount of offshore territory leased last year and almost 100 times the 114,282 acres leased in 1969—the year of the Santa Barbara spill.

"The oil industry doesn't have enough equipment to work 10 million acres," warns one government geologist. "We're really not ready for this big jump."

But the Cabinet officer in charge of the program to get that much offshore territory leased, Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton, counters that the effort must be made—but perhaps under different arrangements to reduce the risk and concentrate available equipment on the most productive oil and gas beds under the sea.

"If you really had to hang your hat on an increase in oil of something in the neighborhood of 3 million to 3½ million barrels a day," Morton said in an interview in Washington, "and I'm not talking about the Arctic now because that's a delivery problem, you're looking at the Outer Continental Shelf. There isn't any question in my mind about it."

To maximize the chance of getting the most oil offshore with a minimum of protest, Morton, under what he calls a "two-tier system," would like to do more preparation of the sharply expanded leasing program.

Besides the technical evaluations of oil companies about offshore seabeds, Morton said, "I would like to have the environmentalists try to draw some comparisons from an environmental point of view. Where is the worst place from their point of view? It might well be the Atlantic. It might be the Gulf of Alaska because of climatic problems and wave action and all those things."

With such inputs, Morton said, the government could draw the boundaries of the most desirable offshore leasing areas and then go into the "second-tier" step of letting oil companies formally request the right to drill specific tracts within the selected area.

In the bidding process itself—like the one coming up Thursday in New Orleans—oil companies agree to pay a bonus to the federal government for the right to develop specific tracts offshore and then give the government one-sixth of the oil produced.

With the high price of oil, bidding for this offshore territory has reached unprecedented heights. Last December the federal government got \$1.49 billion in bid money—called bonus payments—from oil companies for the right to drill for oil and gas on 485,396 acres under the Gulf of Mexico off the shores of Mississippi, Alabama and Florida. A single tract of 5,760 acres 45 miles southeast of Fort Walton, Fla., brought \$211,997,600—a record amount.

Because offshore leasing brings billions into the treasuries of federal and state governments, Morton said, "a money-oriented program" has evolved rather than one designed to manage the oil and gas resources intelligently.

To move "from a money-oriented program to an oil-oriented program," Morton said, "we've got to consider the proposition of exploration as sort of a separate phase from development." He said he has not worked out the details, however, and did not want the government itself to get into the exploration business.

The oil industry does not consider it practical to separate exploration and production, and is expected to fight any such formal administration effort. But Sen. Jackson and other lawmakers are putting pressure on the administration to give the government a larger exploration role on the Outer Continental Shelf and to change the present bidding system.

Jackson does agree on the need for stepped-up mining of the sea—declaring last Monday that the Interior Department should make "available for leasing by 1985 all Outer Continental Shelf lands favorable for oil and gas development without environmental damage."

At the 1973 level of U.S. consumption of 6 billion barrels of oil and 23 trillion cubic feet of gas, Jackson said, the oil and gas believed to be under the Outer Continental Shelf could supply the United States with those fuels for 35 years.

But there is considerable disagreement over how much oil and gas are under those offshore lands. The U.S. coastline is 12,000 miles long, with a continental shelf—going from the low tide mark down to a depth of 600 feet—of 650,000 square miles. It varies in width—120 miles in the far northern part of the Atlantic down to 20 miles off Cape Hatteras—as well as in depth and richness.

The latest government estimates of the total oil and gas reserves under the sea were released Friday in a Council on Environmental Quality study on the impact of offshore drilling. Here are the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)—including oil and gas already extracted—in the report along with those made by the oil industry's National Petroleum Council (NPC):

Billions of barrels			
Offshore oil:	USGS	NPC	
Gulf of Mexico.....	30-50	19	
Pacific.....	10-20	17	
Atlantic.....	10-20	6	
Alaska.....	30-60	29	
Total.....	80-150	71	
Trillions cubic feet			
Offshore Gas:	USGS	NPC	
Gulf of Mexico.....	250-425	220	
Pacific.....	15-25	25	
Atlantic.....	55-110	60	
Alaska.....	170-340	185	
Total.....	490-900	490	

The Geological Survey estimates for the oil and gas potential of the Atlantic seabed are way under the survey's former estimates of 48 billion barrels of oil and 220 trillion cubic feet of gas.

Lower estimates or not, the combination of President Nixon's orders to go after whatever oil and gas does lie offshore, plus the high prices industry can now get for it, assures no slowdown in this new rush for riches under the sea.

BOOM TIMES IN THE ALL-OUT DRIVE FOR OFFSHORE OIL

(By Richard Harwood)

NEW ORLEANS, LA.—Carl Sandberg wrote poetry a generation ago about the heroic crudities of industrial America: "hog-butcher for the world, tool-maker, stacker of wheat . . . stormy, husky, brawling."

The spirit lives. It builds 1,200 automobiles every hour of every day. Its armaments and crops and technology pour out to every continent on the globe. Its machines sent men to the moon and today they are conquering the oceans for oil, profits and the greater glory of man.

Here on the Gulf Coast the oil industry has assembled for that conquest an armada of ships and planes and 60,000 men. Already they have taken more than 4 million acres of the ocean floor. They have drilled more than 18,000 wells, laid more than 6,000 miles of pipeline and pumped out more than 3 billion barrels of oil and 19 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

That is only the beginning. At least 50 million acres—from Texas to the Florida coastline—await exploitation in the Gulf of Mexico alone. Then the armadas will move into the Atlantic and other oceans of the world.

The scale of the effort has some of the flavor of a great wartime enterprise, or of the mad rushes for land and money that dot the American past.

Millions of tons of steel and concrete are being consumed. Shipyards are straining to meet the demand for cargo vessels, barges and drilling rigs. Mammoth cranes and engines and meters and exotic tools flow in from industrial centers all across the land. Helicopters dart through the sky on ferrying missions to the 1,600 production platforms that rise up from the ocean like enormous mushrooms. And there is the constant flow of men—roustabouts, pilots, mechanics, gang pushers, drillers—from Arkansas, Texas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Alabama. Occasionally there is a woman among them, lured, like the men and the multibillion-dollar corporations, by the prospect of money; lured, too, by the indefinable air of adventure that hangs over this enterprise.

No one knows how much wealth is out there in the ocean. No one knows what the ultimate environmental effects of this exploitation will be. No one knows what federal policies ought to be applied to protect the public interest in these undersea lands controlled by the government in Washington.

Still, the exploration and development of the gulf goes on. The oil companies are pouring billions of dollars into the effort, with the support of the incredible production and engineering capacity of the American industrial machine. They are hell-bent on it. Questions can wait.

Out there in the gulf, 30 miles off Grand Isle, the crews on the "A" platform in the West Delta 73 leasing block spend little time philosophizing.

The crews have driven enormous steel pilings deep into the ocean floor to provide a foundation for the oil factory. They have drilled 85 wells to depths of more than 10,000 feet. They have built on this single ocean installation pumps, compressors, generators, pipelines, living quarters, a helicopter pad. And they have built it to withstand 59-foot waves and hurricane winds of 125 miles per hour. It's the size of two or three football fields and it has pumped more than 100 million barrels of crude oil in the past 12 years. Seven or eight years from now the oil will run out, the platform will be dismantled and the men will move on further out into the ocean for new adventure, new money, new conquest.

"Out here," says Lloyd Barre, a 26-year-old roustabout, "the atmosphere is better. I don't have somebody standing over me all the time, like I did on my old job at the post office. Everything out here is hazardous but you get used to it. You got to watch yourself all the time. . . . When I'm out there at night, I can just hear by the noises when something is wrong."

Harold Sanders, a middle-aged man with rough hands who has graduated in his working life from roustabout to field superintendent, has been living on the ocean for 12 years—7 days on, 7 days off.

"I like it better than the beach," he says, and, like most of these men, launches into a statistical poem on the achievement of the industry.

They work for Exxon and they are loyal company men. They worry about profits and

prices. They laugh at environmental critics and boast of the good fishing off the side of the rigs. They are single-minded. Their only concern is getting the last barrel of oil, the last cubic foot of gas.

Production in the West Delta 73 leasing block has dropped in recent years from 55,000 to 23,000 barrels a day. To keep it at that level, Sanders is now supervising the installation of a \$2.5 million complex that will pump water into the formations deep under the ocean to increase the pressure that forces up the oil. As a side enterprise, he will build a water desalting plant, fueled by the heat from the water pumps.

The economics of all this is murky. The oil companies' profit-and-loss statements are internal secrets. They drill the oil, sell it to their own pipelines which sell it to their own refineries, which sell it to their own marketing divisions and service stations. Who gets what is unknown.

Warren Marshall, who runs all the Gulf of Mexico operations for Shell Oil, claims that the industry has invested more than \$13 billion (exclusive of operating costs) into the Gulf and is \$5 billion in the red. "We've lost that much," he says, "while the federal government has made \$6 billion" in lease and royalty payments.

Perhaps. But there is no slowing down. This week the oil companies may bid more than \$2 billion for the right to exploit an additional 1 million acres in the Gulf. The crews are eager. The industrial suppliers, the shipyards, the steel mills and drillers are ready.

Harold Sanders, the rig superintendent on the "A" platform, is ready, too. He rubs his hands and smiles: "It'll be good. It'll be like boom times again."

HERE TODAY—GONE TOMORROW?

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, writing in the National Wildlife Federation's magazine just published on endangered species, Harry A. Goodwin chronicles the current listing of extinct, endangered, and threatened species which I believe merits close reading.

The article follows:

HERE TODAY . . . GONE TOMORROW?

(By Harry A. Goodwin)

Writing in *The New York Times* not long ago, an environmental journalist complained that "the facts concerning the endangered timber wolf have become distorted." The number of timber wolves afoot in Minnesota's Superior National Forest area today, the writer emphasized, could well be double the official 1971 state estimate of 750 to 800. And he called for an effort to "curtail the wolves' number in his (sic) last domicile."

That same week, interestingly enough, the state of Michigan filed suit against a clothing store in Lansing to stop the sale of coats trimmed with wolf fur. At the same time, state Attorney General Frank Kelley warned that the animal "is on the very edge of extinction."

The two contradictory views of the timber wolf should surface almost simultaneously is not as remarkable as it seems. Indeed, it is altogether possible that both views are eminently correct. For the only generalization that can safely be made about the timber wolf is that it is classified as an "endangered species" by the U.S. government.

Far from being peculiar to the timber wolf, such ambiguity is characteristic of many if not most animals considered endangered today. Officially, the U.S. Interior Depart-

ment's Fish and Wildlife Service designates species in danger of extinction with a list published periodically in the Federal Register. From time to time, the department provides additional data on these and other threatened species in a voluminous publication known as the "redbook." Unfortunately, this material is plagued by a cloud of semantic and statistical confusion.

For example, the 1966 redbook was entitled *Rare and Endangered Wildlife of the U.S.* and the 1973 edition was called *Threatened Wildlife of the United States*. The earlier edition listed 78 "endangered" species. Last year's redbook listed 188 "threatened" species. And the latest revision of the official list published in the Federal Register contains 109 "endangered" species and subspecies.

There are no clear-cut criteria for making these distinctions. Fortunately, however, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) does offer several working definitions.

"Endangered" species—"in immediate danger of extinction."

"Vulnerable" or "threatened" species—"still abundant but depleted and/or under threat."

"Rare" species—one with a small population that is neither endangered nor vulnerable, but is subject to some risk.

A fourth category, contained in the latest edition of the U.S. redbook, embraces "peripheral" species as being endangered in the United States—but not in their range as a whole.

The record of extinction in the United States and Puerto Rico since 1600 is downright appalling. Scientists can record the disappearance of only two mammals and three birds during the period 1600-1850. But during the period 1850-1973, 17 mammals, 28 birds and 12 fishes have been added to that necrology.

These ominous trends are starkly documented in the accompanying lists of extinct, endangered and threatened species prepared by the Interior Department. Whether they will ultimately result in the tragic situation forecast by the maps on the following pages remains to be seen. But one thing is certain: the grim situation can be reversed only if those who care—hunters and preservationists alike—join together in common cause.

EXTINCT SPECIES

Until the 17th century, the 62 animals listed below flourished in the United States and Puerto Rico. Now, they are extinct—and most disappeared in the 20th century.

Mammals

Bat, Leaf-Nosed, *Monophyllus frater*.
Bighorn, Badlands, *Ovis canadensis auduboni*.
Elk, Eastern, *Cervus canadensis canadensis*.
Elk, Merriam's, *Cervus canadensis merriami*.
Fox, Northern Swift, *Vulpes velox hebes*.
Fox, S. California Kit, *Vulpes macrotis macrotis*.
Isolobodon, Puerto Rican, *Isolobodon portoricensis*.
Mink, Sea, *Mustela macrodon*.
Nesophontes, Puerto Rican, *Nesophontes ethiops*.
Sea Cow, Steller's, *Hydrodamalis stelleri*.
Vole, Gull Island, *Microtus nesophilus*.
Whale, Atlantic Gray, *Eschrichtius gibbosus*.
Wolf, Buffalo, *Canis lupus nubilus*.
Wolf, Cascade Mountain, *Canis lupus fuscus*.
Wolf, Eastern Red, *Canis rufus floridanus*.
Wolf, Mogollon Mountain, *Canis lupus mogollonensis*.
Wolf, S. Rocky Mountain, *Canis lupus youngi*.
Wolf, Texas gray, *Canis lupus monstrabilis*.

Birds

Akepa, Oahu, *Loxops coccinea rufa*.
Akialoa, Hawaii, *Hemignathus obscurus obscurus*.

Akloa, Lani, *Hemignathus obscurus lanensis*.

Akialoa, Oahu, *Hemignathus obscurus licensteinii*.

Alauwahio, Lanai, *Loxops maculata montana*.

Amikihi, Greater, *Loxops sagittirostris*.
Apapane, Laysan, *Himatione sanguinea freethii*.

Finch, Grosbeak, *Psittirostra kona*.
Hen, Heath, *Tympanuchus cupido cupido*.

Kioea, *Chaetoptila angustipluma*.
Koafinch, Greater, *Psittirostra palmeri*.

Koafinch, Lesser, *Psittirostra flaviceps*.
Mamo, Black, *Drepanis funerea*.

Mamo, Hawaii, *Drepanis pacifica*.
Millerbird, Laysan, *Acrocephalus familiaris familiaris*.

Nukupuu, Oahu, *Hemignathus lucidus lucidus*.

OO, Hawaii, *Moho nobilis*.
OO, Molokai, *Moho bishopi*.

OO, Oahu, *Moho apicalis*.
Parakeet, Carolina, *Conuropsis carolinensis carolinensis*.

Parakeet, Louisiana, *Conuropsis carolinensis ludoviciana*.

Parakeet, Mauge's, *Aratinga choloptera maugei*.

Parrot, Culebra P. R., *Amazona vitata grallipes*.

Pigeon, Passenger, *Ectopistes migratorius*.
Rail, Laysan, *Porzana palmeri*.

Rail, Sandwich, *Pennula sandwichensis*.
Thrush, Lanai, *Phaeornis obscurus lanensis*.

Thrush, Oahu, *Phaeornis obscurus oahensis*.

Ula-Ai-Hawane, *Clidops anna*.

Fishes

Chub, Thicktail, *Gila crassicauda*.
Killifish, Pahump Ranch, E. I. *pahump*.

Pupfish, Leon Springs, *Cyprinodon bovinus*.
Sculpin, Utah Lake, *Cottus echinatus*.

Spinedace, Big Spring, *Lepidomeda mollispinis pratensis*.

Spinedace, Pahranagat, *Lepidomeda altivels*.

Springfish, Ash Meadows, E. *merriami*.
Springfish, Raycraft Ranch, *Empetrichthys latos concavus*.

Sucker, Harelip, *Lagochila lacera*.

ENDANGERED SPECIES

No less than 109 mammals, birds, fishes, reptiles and amphibians are threatened with extinction in the United States.

Mammals

Bat, Hawaiian Hoary, *Lasius cinereus semotus*.

Bat, Indiana, *Myotis sodalis*.
Cougar, Eastern, *Felis concolor cougar*.

Deer, Columbian W. Tailed, *Odocoileus virginianus leucurus*.

Deer, Key, *Odocoileus virginianus clavium*.
Ferret, Black-footed, *Mustela nigripes*.

Fox, San Joaquin Kit, *Vulpes macrotis mutica*.

Manatee, Florida, *Trichechus manatus latirostris*.

Mouse, Salt Marsh Harvest, *Reithrodontomys raviventris*.

Panther, Florida, *Felis concolor coryi*.
Prairie Dog, Utah, *Cynomys parvidens*.

Pronghorn, Sonoran, *Antilocapra americana sonoriensis*.

Rat, Morro Bay Kangaroo, *Dipodomys heermanni morroensis*.

Squirrel, Delmarva Fox, *Sciurus niger cinereus*.

Whale, Blue,¹ *Balaenoptera musculus*.
Whale,¹ Bowhead, *Balaena mystaetus*.

Whale, Finback,¹ *Balaenoptera physalus*.
Whale, Gray,¹ *Eschrichtius robustus*.

Whale, Humpback,¹ *Megaptera novaeangliae*.

Whale, Right,¹ *Eubalaena glacialis*.
Whale, Sei,¹ *Balaenoptera borealis*.

Whale, Sperm,¹ *Physeter catodon*.

¹ Listed as endangered on the U.S. World List

Wolf, Eastern Timber, *Canis lupus lycaon*.
Wolf, N. Rocky Mountain, *Canis lupus irremotus*.

Wolf, Red, *Canis rufus*.

Birds

Akepa, Hawaii, *Loxops coccinea coccinea*.
Akepa, Maui, *Loxops coccinea ochracea*.

Akialoa, Kauai, *Hemignathus procerus*.
Akiapolaau, *Hemignathus wilsoni*.

Bobwhite, Masked, *Colinus virginianus ridgwayi*.

Condor, California, *Gymnogyps californianus*.

Coot, Hawaiian, *Fulica americana alai*.
Crane, Mississippi Sandhill, *Grus canadensis pulla*.

Crane, Whooping, *Grus americana*.
Crow, Hawaiian, *Corvus tropicalis*.

Creep, Molokai, *Loxops maculata flammea*.

Creep, Oahu, *Loxops maculata maculata*.
Curlew, Eskimo,² *Numenius borealis*.

Duck, Hawaiian, *Anas wyvilliana*.
Duck, Laysan, *Anas laysanensis*.

Duck, Mexican, *Anas diazi*.
Eagle, Southern Bald, *Haliaeetus leucocephalus leucocephalus*.

Falcon, Am. Peregrine, *Falco peregrinus anatum*.

Falcon, Arctic Peregrine, *Falco peregrinus tundrius*.

Finches, Laysan and Nihoa, *Psittirostra cantans*.

Gallinule, Hawaiian, *Gallinula chloropus sandvicensis*.

Goose, Aleutian Canada, *Branta canadensis leucopareia*.

Goose, Hawaiian (nene), *Branta sandvicensis*.

Hawk, Hawaiian (io), *Buteo solitarius*.
Kite, Florida Everglade, *Rosthamus sociabilis plumbeus*.

Honeycreeper, Crested, *Palmeria dolei*.
Millerbird, Nihoa, *Acrocephalus kingi*.

Nukupuu, Kauai and Maui, *Hemignathus lucidus*.

Oo, Kauai (oo aa), *Moho braccatus*.
Ou, *Psittirostra psittacea*.

Pallia, *Psittirostra bailliei*.
Parrot, Puerto Rican, *Amazona vittata*.

Parrotbill, Maui, *Pseudonestor xanthophrys*.

Pelican, Brown, *Pelecanus occidentalis*.
Petrel, Hawaiian, Dark-rumped *Pterodroma phaeopygia sandwichensis*.

Pigeon, Puerto Rican Plain, *Columba inornata wetmorei*.

Prairie Chicken, Attwater's Greater *Tympanuchus cupido attwateri*.

Rail, California Clapper, *Rallus longirostris obsoletus*.

Rail, Light-footed Clapper, *Rallus longirostris levipes*.

Rail, Yuma Clapper, *Rallus longirostris yumanensis*.

Sparrow, Cape Sable, *Ammodramus mirabilis*.
Sparrow, Dusky Seaside, *Ammodramus nigrescens*.

Sparrow, Santa Barbara, Song *Melospiza melodia graminea*.

Stilt, Hawaiian, *Himantopus himantopus knudseni*.

Tern, California Least, *Sterna albobrunnea*.

Thrush, Large Kauai, *Phaeornis obscurus myadestina*.

Thrush, Molokai,² *Phaeornis obscurus rutha*.

Thrush, Small Kauai, *Phaeornis palmeri*.
Warbler, Bachman's, *Vermivora bachmanii*.

Warbler, Kirtland's, *Dendroica kirtlandii*.
Whip-Poor-Will, P.R., *Caprimulgus noctitherus*.

Woodpecker, Ivory-Billed,² *Campephilus principalis*.

Woodpecker, Red-Cockaded, *Dendrocopos borealis*.

Fishes
Bonytail, Pahranagat, *Gila robusta jordani*.

² May be extinct

Chub, Humpback, *Gila cypha*.
 Chub, Mohave, *Gila siphateles mohavensis*.
 Cisco, Longjaw, *Coregonus alpenae*.
 Cui-U, Chasmistes *cujus*.
 Dace, Kendall Warm Springs, *Rhinichthys osculus thermalis*.
 Dace, Moapa, *Moapa coriacea*.
 Darter, Fountain, *Etheostoma fonticola*.
 Darter, Maryland, *Etheostoma sellare*.
 Darter, Okaloosa, *Etheostoma okaloosae*.
 Darter, Watercress, *Etheostoma nuchale*.
 Gambusia, Big Bend, *Gambusia galiei*.
 Gambusia, Clear Creek, *Gambusia heterochir*.

Gambusia, Pecos, *Gambusia nobilis*.
 Killifish, Fahrump, *Empetrichthys latos*.
 Pike, Blue, *Stizostedion vitreum glaucum*.
 Pupfish, Comanche Springs, *Cyprinodon elegans*.
 Pupfish, Devils Hole, *Cyprinodon disbolis*.
 Pupfish, Owens River, *Cyprinodon radiosus*.
 Pupfish, Tecopa, *Cyprinodon nevadensis calidae*.
 Pupfish, Warm Spring, *Cyprinodon nevadensis pectoralis*.
 Squawfish, Colorado River, *Ptychocheilus lucius*.

Stickleback, Unarmored Threespine, *Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni*.
 Sturgeon, Shortnose, *Acipenser brevirostrum*.
 Topminnow, Gila, *Poeciliopsis occidentalis occidentalis*.
 Trout, Arizona (Apache), *Salmo sp.*
 Trout, Gila, *Salmo gilae*.
 Trout, Greenback Cutthroat, *Salmo clarki stomias*.
 Trout, Lahontan Cutthroat, *Salmo clarki henshawi*.
 Trout, Paiute Cutthroat, *Salmo clarki selenis*.
 Woundfin, *Plagopterus argentissimus*.

Reptiles and amphibians

Alligator, American, *Alligator mississippiensis*.
 Boa, Puerto Rican, *Epicrates inornatus*.
 Lizard, Blunt-Nosed Leopard, *Crotaphytus silus*.
 Salamander, Desert Slender, *Batrachoseps aridus*.
 Salamander, Santa Cruz Long-Toed, *Ambystoma macrodactylum croceum*.
 Salamander, Texas Blind, *Typhlomolge rathbuni*.
 Snake, San Francisco Garter, *Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*.
 Toad, Houston, *Bufo houstonensis*.

THREATENED SPECIES

Though not in immediate danger of extinction, some species of animals have been depleted or are decreasing at an alarming rate. These species are classified as "threatened."

Mammals

Bat, Ozark Big-Eared, *Plecotus townsendii ingens*.
 Bat, Spotted, *Euderma maculatum*.
 Bat, Virginia Big-Eared, *Plecotus townsendii virginianus*.
 Bear, Glacier, *Ursus americanus emmonsii*.
 Bear, Grizzly, *Ursus arctos horribilis*.
 Bighorn, California, *Ovis canadensis californiana*.
 Bighorn, Peninsular, *Ovis canadensis cremnobates*.
 Elk, Tule, *Cervus nannodes*.
 Rat, Key Largo Wood, *Neotoma floridana smalli*.
 Seal, Caribbean Monk, *Monachus tropicalis*.
 Seal, Guadalupe Fur, *Arctocephalus philippi townsendi*.
 Seal, Hawaiian Monk, *Monachus schauinslandi*.
 Seal, Ribbon, *Histiophoca fasciata*.
 Sea Otter, Southern, *Enhydra lutris nereis*.
 Squirrel, Everglades Fox, *Sciurus niger avicennia*.
 Squirrel, Kalb, *Sciurus kalbabsensis*.
 Vole, Beach Meadow, *Microtus breweri*.
 Vole, Block Island Meadow, *Microtus pennsylvanicus proventus*.
 Wolf, Mexican, *Canis lupus baileyi*.

Birds

Crane, Florida Sandhill, *Grus canadensis pratensis*.
 Falcon, Prairie, *Falco mexicanus*.
 Finch, Wallowa, Gray-Crowned Rosy, *Leucosticte tephrocotis wallowa*.
 Goose, Tule White-Fronted, *Anser albifrons gambelli*.
 Hawk, P. R. Sharp-Shinned, *Accipiter striatus venator*.
 Heron, Florida Great White, *Ardea o. occidentalis*.
 Owl, Newton's Puerto Rican Screech, *Otus nupipes newtoni*.
 Owl, Spotted, *Strix occidentalis*.
 Prairie Chicken, Lesser, *Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*.
 Prairie Chicken, Northern Greater, *Tympanuchus cupido pinnatus*.
 Rail, California Black, *Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*.
 Shearwater, Newell's Manx, *Pettinus puffinus newelli*.
 Sparrow, Elfin Woods, *Dendroica angelae*.
 Warbler, Golden-cheeked, *Dendroica chrysoparia*.

Fishes

Bass, Roanoke, *Ambloplites cavitrans*.
 Bass, Suwannee, *Micropterus notius*.
 Cavefish, Czark, *Amblyopsis rosea*.
 Cisco, Blackfin, *Coregonus n. nigripinnis*.
 Cisco, Deepwater, *Coregonus johanna*.
 Dace, Desert, *Eremichthys acros*.
 Darter, Niangua, *Etheostoma nianguae*.
 Darter, Sharphead, *Etheostoma acuticeps*.
 Darter, Trispot, *Etheostoma trisella*.
 Darter, Tuscumbia, *Etheostoma tuscumbia*.
 Gambusia, San Marcos, *Gambusia georgei*.
 Grayling, Arctic, *Thymallus arcticus*.
 Mudminnow, Olympic, *Novumbra hubbsi*.
 Pupfish, Nevada, *Cyprinodon nevadensis mionectes*.
 Sculpin, Pygmy, *Cottus pygmaeus*.
 Spinedace, Little Colorado, *Lepidomeda vittata*.
 Sturgeon, Lake, *Acipenser tulvescens*.
 Sucker, Modoc, *Catostomus microps*.
 Sucker, White River, *Catostomus clarki intermedius*.
 Trout, Blueback, *Salvelinus alpinus oquassa*.
 Trout, Humboldt Cutthroat, *Salmo clarki*.
 Trout, Little Kern Golden, *Salmo aquabonita gilberti*.
 Trout, Rio Grande Cutthroat, *Salmo clarki virginalis*.
 Trout, Sunapee, *Salvelinus aureolus*.

Reptiles and amphibians

Crocodile, American, *Crocodylus acutus*.
 Frog, Pine Barrens Tree, *Hyla andersoni*.
 Frog, Vegas Valley Leopard, *Rana pipiens fisheri*.
 Lizard, St. Croix Ground, *Ameiva polops*.
 Salamander, Jemez Mountain, *Plethodon neomexicanus*.
 Salamander, Limestone, *Hydromantes brunus*.
 Salamander, Shasta, *Hydromantes shastae*.
 Salamander, Tehachapi Slender, *Batrachoseps stebbinsi*.
 Toad, Black, *Bufo exilis*.
 Turtle, Bog, *Clemmys muhlenbergi*.
 Turtle, Green, *Chelonia mydas*.

WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Con-

gressman William S. Mailliard who has announced his resignation to accept a post as Ambassador to the Organization of American States. His years of dedication and distinguished service to his constituency, and to the Nation, are a testament to his desire to benefit the American people.

The career of Bill Mailliard is not, however, confined to the realm of the House of Representatives. As a lieutenant in the Navy during World War II, he was instrumental in American successes in the Pacific. This service was acknowledged when our country awarded him the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, and the Bronze Star. Following the conclusion of the war, he remained active in the Naval Reserve, having achieved the rank of rear admiral.

Upon his election to Congress in 1952, Representative Mailliard served on the Foreign Affairs Committee and on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

As ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he has been a strong supporter of mutual security measures, particularly foreign aid. He has recommended expanding the responsibilities on the Foreign Affairs Committee to the extent of permitting the proposal of long-range suggestions on foreign economic policy to the Congress and executive departments.

As chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, Congressman Mailliard participated in investigations of American foreign aid programs in Latin America and sponsored legislation designed to strengthen congressional controls on aid to international organizations. He has also participated in several international conferences involving United States relations with Japan, Great Britain, Israel, and the Council of Europe.

Congressman Mailliard is also largely responsible for the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. This measure was the first major piece of legislation dealing with the merchant marines to be passed in over 30 years. He has also sponsored several environmental measures, specifically, legislation providing for the creation of Point Reyes National Seashore and the San Francisco Bay Wildlife Refuge.

As the United States-Latin American relations are in a period of transition, the selection of Bill Mailliard to serve as the U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States is particularly appropriate. I feel that the American people are most fortunate to have a man of his caliber serving in this most important position.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that I am honored to know Bill Mailliard as a friend as well as a fellow Republican colleague. In my dealings with Bill, I have found him a most open-minded individual who seeks to insure that all views are recognized. He stands as one who has never tried to elevate his own interests, nor has he shirked the responsibility of asserting himself when the situation so warranted. I wish Congressman Mailliard all the best as Ambassador and hope that his tenure will be a most fruitful one.