

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri:

H.R. 13792. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promote to Assistant Surgeon General commissioned officers of the Public Health Service assigned to the Agency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 13793. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the credit against tax for retirement income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 13794. A bill to provide for the control and eradication of noxious weeds, and the regulation of the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of noxious weeds and potential carriers thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H.R. 13795. A bill to prohibit any State or unit of local government from imposing a property tax on any railroad right-of-way or roadbed used in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 13796. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for loans to small business concerns affected by the agency shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13797. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to authorize a grant program for research and development of alternative fuels for motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 13798. A bill to provide for disclosure of information by executive departments to committees of Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13799. A bill to provide for the receipt of testimony and information from executive agencies and bodies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 13800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income taxation for cooperative housing corporations, condominium housing associations, and certain homeowners' associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 13801. A bill to extend and improve the nation's unemployment programs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 13802. A bill to establish improved nationwide standards of mail service, require annual authorization of public service appropriations to the U.S. Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FAUNTRY, Mr. FORD, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HINSHAW, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. McSPADDEN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. Moss, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 13803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide income and payroll tax relief to low-income and moderate-income taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDD, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 13804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act to provide income and payroll tax relief to low-income and moderate-income taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 954. Resolution designating the song "America the Beautiful" the Bicentennial hymn for 1976; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 955. 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. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 956. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a single 6-year Presidential term; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 957. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week in November which includes Thanksgiving Day in each year as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

March 27, 1974

By Mr. SLACK:

H.J. Res. 958. 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. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Ms. BURKE of California, and Mr. GODE):

H.J. Res. 959. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in June of each year as "National Autistic Children's Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H. Con. Res. 451. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that for fiscal year 1975 the Administration on Aging fund long-term and short-term training programs under title IV of the Older Americans Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H. Res. 1012. Resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to the allocation of necessary energy sources to the tourism industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself and Mr. FRASER):

H. Res. 1013. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the proceedings incident to the presentation of a portrait of Hon. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H. Res. 1014. Resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to the allocation of necessary energy sources to the tourism industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. CLEVELAND, and Ms. SCHROEDER):

H. Res. 1015. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for the broadcasting of meetings, in addition to hearings, of House committees which are open to the public; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

416. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Borough Assembly, Greater Anchorage Area Borough, Alaska, relative to an urban planning study for watershed management in the Cook Inlet region of Alaska which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUPPORT FOR THE NATIONAL SUMMER YOUTH SPORTS PROGRAM

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, I introduced, with Mr. CLAY and Mr. BELL, a bill to extend the national summer youth sports program. Yesterday I was joined by 34 cosponsors in reintroducing this bill.

One of my constituents, Mr. Warren Jackson, has worked in this program and is an active supporter of the program. I am enclosing an article which he wrote and which other Members should be interested in reading.

A COMMON CAUSE FOR GOOD HELPS BRIDGE PARTY LINES

(By Warren Jackson)

A portion of what America is supposed to be about came to the nation's capital to crystallize, for the American people and its legislative leaders, how a successful federally funded program can work if it is administered properly and if those involved really and truly do "give a damn."

In the past five years, on an annual budget of \$3 million, 105 collegiate institutions have directed the National Summer Youth Sports Program (NSYSP) under the auspices of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

The program tries and has been successful in practically all instances of providing for the nation's disadvantaged the basic fundamentals of athletic instruction coupled with educational and cultural enrichment.

The portion of America I mentioned earlier came to Washington to support a new bill for

continuance of the NSYSP. Some talked and some listened. The bill is being co-sponsored by Rep. Peter Peysler (R-N.Y.), Rep. Bill Clay (D-Mo.) and Rep. Alphonzo Bell (R-Calif.).

Peysler's tenacity and bulldoggedness on NSYSP has to be admired. A year ago he filed a request for the program's continuance. It never got out of committee. This year with assistance it appears he might make it through committee and towards a possible vote.

PEYSER EMPHATIC

In his opening remarks, Peysler was emphatic in his personal endorsement. "If all federal money was spent as well as it is in this program (NSYSP), this country would be in much better shape."

Bill Clay also put things into perspective when he said, at the televised press conference with Howard Cosell, "When we speak of the disadvantaged, meaning the blacks, Spanish and the poor whites, we no longer can speak and act on strict party lines."

"When people and their futures are at stake we cannot have any permanent friends nor permanent enemies—just permanent interests."

Also sponsoring a bill for the continuance of the NSYSP under the current Office of Economic Opportunity umbrella is an interested and dedicated individual in chairman of the House Subcommittee on Equal Opportunity, Augustus Hawkins of California.

IMPRESSIVE CREW

Among those who came to talk in favor of the bill was the chairman of the administrative committee of the NSYSP, Dr. William Exum, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin and now director of athletics at Kentucky State University. Dr. Exum introduced Walter Glass, athletic director at Pepperdine College in Los Angeles, and Dr. Warren Giese, dean of the health and physical education program at the University of South Carolina. Dr. Giese is being mentioned as a possible candidate for the governorship in that state against Atty. Gen. William Westmoreland.

Also appearing and testifying were Jim Wilkinson, controller of the NCAA and director of NSYSP, yours truly and two members of the Ohio State Rose Bowl Championship, quarterback Cornelius Green and All-America defensive halfback Neal Colzie.

Exum, Wilkinson, Jackson, are black; Glass, Giese, are white. The purpose is a common cause—retention of something that works.

Facts and figures don't lie. Five years of the program has seen 208,000 kids, who might not have had any place to go during the summer, go through it. Five years of this program has seen 13,500 jobs provided for many who would not have been employed. In a given year, over a six-week period, 792,000 hot meals are given to kids whose only meal could be those, and 40,000 kids get medications—for some it's their first introduction to a doctor or a dentist.

To really bring it home, Green and Colzie were asked about the program. Both had been invited because they have participated as members and/or instructors in the program.

COLZIE HITS HOME

Colzie, speaking to the panel of congressmen that included Reps. Shirley Chisholm, Harley Staggers, Jamie Benitas, Clay, Hawkins, and Feyser, made the same kind of impact he does on a runaway halfback or when he snares an errant pass from a rival quarterback. "I didn't know anything about white folks when I left junior high school, except what some people had told us, 'You meet them in an alley and you beat 'em up'."

"It was different for me. It touched me (the program) when I needed help. I met a white guy who got to know me and I got to know him. We went together to the program each day, not he in an El Dorado and me walking. I learned by exposure to these white kids on my level what some of it was about. It's a fresh start outside of the family life," he said.

Cornelius Green was just as candid and impressive. "I was one of the deprived, I grew up in the Dunbar area of Washington, D. C. If I and kids of today, didn't have the program, I and they would have been looking for trouble . . . trouble, 'cause there was nothing else."

"This program is needed because it stops trouble—troubles in narcotics, drugs, and a lot of other stuff—I don't see how it can be stopped."

Amen . . .

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ESTABLISHMENT OF A MILITARY INSTALLATION CLOSING COMMISSION

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Management and Budget has directed each branch of the military to conduct a study showing the impact of contracting out 10 percent, 20 percent, and 30 percent of the jobs currently being performed by civilians. If these jobs are contracted out it could end up costing the American taxpayers millions of dollars and cause severe hardships for the workers and their families.

The study was directed with the view of adopting such a plan ostensibly as a cost-saving measure. However, I am skeptical of the OMB's concern for saving money. After all, this is the same agency and the same Mr. Ash that have submitted to the Congress a \$300 billion Federal budget. In addition, the General Accounting Office has in the past found that such a move would result in a net increase in the cost of doing the work, not a savings.

It is time that the Congress take more than a rubber-stamp role in these very important decisions. These actions will have an enormous disruptive effect on the local economies and on the persons concerned. In Florida alone there are 27,284 civilians holding jobs at military installations. The contracting out of 30 percent of these jobs would affect nearly 8,200 workers. When the families of these individuals are considered the figure swells to 32,000 affected persons.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I am today introducing legislation to establish a Commission to review the proposed closing of any military installation, the termination of any military activity, or the reduction of the military or civilian complement of an installation by more than 20 percent. The Commission will be composed of 17 members: the Secretary of Defense or his designee; the Secretary of the Army or his designee; the Secretary of the Navy or his designee; the Secretary of the Air Force or his designee; the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and three other Members of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, one of whom shall be from the minority party; the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives and three other Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House, one of whom shall be from the minority party; the Secretary of Labor or his designee; the Comptroller General of the United States or his designee; and three members from private life appointed by the President.

Any substantial alteration of military operations has many and varied ramifications for the local communities. The establishment of this Commission will allow for a far more open discussion of these proposed changes and will more

accurately reflect the many concerns involved.

COST OVERRUNS

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, Litton Industries is seeking an extra \$350 million, excluding inflation, to cover cost overruns on its new program to build 30 destroyers for the Navy.

Available evidence indicates that the Navy will totally cave in to Litton's demands.

According to the Navy's latest report to the Congress the Pentagon has already conceded \$200 million to Litton in calculating its current estimate. A letter accompanying the report from Deputy Defense Secretary William P. Clements, Jr. says:

Anticipated contract increases . . . will be in excess of \$350 million.

The total cost of the 30-ship program will now be \$3.227 billion or \$107.6 million per ship. I should emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the \$350 million increase does not include any allowance for inflation, but only the fruits of Litton's mismanagement and waste at its new Pascagoula, Miss. shipyard. Mr. Speaker, this disclosure is new evidence that Litton has completely fouled up this new shipyard.

The problem is that rather than the stockholders paying for Litton's blunder, the taxpayers are being asked to pick up a mighty hefty tab.

The \$350 million technically represents the difference between the "target" and "ceiling" of Litton's contract. The report to Congress concedes that Litton's proposal is at "about ceiling prices."

Last October 29 Litton asked for the change in the contract known as the reset proposal which amounts to an automatic contract price increase. The contract allows Litton to ask for such a price increase on a one-time basis.

Mr. Speaker, I am urging the Navy to get tough with Litton and not to give them an extra dime. Big corporations like Litton must be punished, not rewarded for their mistakes.

I have also learned, Mr. Speaker, that the delivery of some of the ships could now be up to 5 months late. The report to Congress says that work on four ships is behind schedule because of "Litton's inability to hire enough new people to support the planned manning for ship construction and the virtual elimination of overtime work to allow workers to use mass transit and car pools during the energy crisis."

Cost overruns on the program now total \$646.6 million—\$296.1 million of which has been caused by inflation. The cost per ship has grown from \$86 million to \$107 million per vessel.

This huge increase and delay so early in the program should be a signal to the Navy that big trouble lies ahead.

Rather than knuckle under to Litton's

demands, the Navy should get tough. If Litton loses money on the contract, it will be a good lesson on the practice of free enterprise—poor performance is rewarded by losses.

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT
AMENDMENTS SUPPORTED**

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the House passed our bill, H.R. 12471, that would make a number of highly important amendments to the original Freedom of Information Act of 1966 (5 U.S.C. 552). The overwhelming 383 to 8 vote of approval of this measure has been noted in a recent editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which has a long record of advocacy and protection of the public's "right to know." I commend this editorial to our colleagues of both bodies and include it at this point in the RECORD:

CHECKS ON SECRECY

In a gratifyingly strong show of support for public access to information about the public's business, the House of Representatives, by a 383-to-8 vote, has approved amendments to the 1966 Freedom of Information Act. The revisions would help to offset the arbitrary withholding of information by executive agencies by:

Reversing a Supreme Court decision that forbids federal judges to inspect defense and foreign policy documents to see whether they are being improperly kept secret under the law.

Requiring federal agencies to publish indexes of their decisions so that a seeker of documents knows what to ask for.

Scheduling of deadlines that agencies would have to meet in responding to informational inquiries or in fighting them in court.

Granting authority to judges to order the Government to pay lawyers' fees for a citizen who wins an access to information case in court.

Of the new provisions, the most important is the one allowing the courts to review classified documents to see whether they are being legally withheld from Congress or the public. Under the Supreme Court ruling of January, 1973, members of the House of Representatives had been denied access to information about a nuclear test in Alaska on the ground that it was part of a package classified by the executive and that a federal judge had no authority to inspect the documents privately to determine if the executive had exceeded his authority.

To allow such a decision to stand would lead to the absurd result that the President can bar access to any information merely by putting it in the defense or foreign policy categories and stamping it secret; and even Congress, which makes the laws that also set policy for the executive, would be powerless to find out about activities of the government of which it is a part.

The other proposed changes in the law are all designed to prevent executive agencies from continuing to use tactics of delay and evasion which they have developed as means to frustrate access to information. The Senate should quickly act on the House-passed bill in order to check the all too prevalent trend of arbitrary secrecy in government.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**PLATFORM OF THE NATIONAL
YOUNG DEMOCRATS**

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD excerpts from the National Young Democrats' platform which was approved at their recent national convention. My constituent, Susan Kohn, served as chairman of the platform committee, and all of us in the district are proud of her leadership both in Los Angeles and at the national level.

The excerpts follow:

The year 1973 finds our nation in a crucial time which demands basic political reform, a greater concern for the individual and his or her rights, and an immediate reordering of priorities. While in this decade we have seen serious attempts at peace abroad and for better foreign relations, domestic affairs strain toward crisis level.

As the economic situation worsens, as the dilemma of military spending becomes entangled with the scandalous cost-overruns by mammoth military contractors, as many of the federally-funded social service programs are scrapped, as the interests of the average citizen are subordinated to those of the powerful and monied, each citizen might well question what kind of administration now holds the reins of government.

Where there should have been progress, there is now confusion and distrust. Where there should have been cooperation and unification, there is definite division between those holding power and those subject to that centralized power. Where confidence and understanding should be, there is incredulity and disillusionment.

We as Young Democrats seek to dispel this atmosphere of distrust and helplessness fostered by the misuse of power at the federal level. We want the government returned to the people—a government which serves people who are ready to bring about their own self-improvement through the many opportunities offered by a government which wants the well-being and fulfillment of all its citizens.

MIDDLE EAST

The Young Democrats of America condemns the actions of other nations who do not conform with the true ideals of democracy and who suppress human dignity and rights. Those nations and states which guarantee democracy, free trade union movements, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and those freedoms which are integral to basic human rights and dignities deserve and are in need of the support of those nations and organizations which legislatively, constitutionally or, in fact, guarantee similar freedoms.

There exists at least one situation where such a free and democratic state is threatened by aggression. Its very existence is forcibly threatened on a daily basis.

This situation is now confronting the state of Israel. We as Young Democrats will work for and support a U.S. Middle East policy which will bring an end to world wide Arab terrorism; continues to give Israel economic assistance; insures the supply to Israel of arms sufficient for its defense; begins a program of regional economic and technical development to better the life of Arabs and Palestinian refugees; and we strongly urge the U.S. not enter into a big power agreement to bring about direct negotiations between the Arab states and Israel so that a permanent peace can be achieved which is consistent with the principles of freedom and democracy.

March 27, 1974

SOVIET JEWRY

The government of the Soviet Union is currently engaged in a concerted effort to deny the political and religious rights of its Jewish citizens. It has not permitted Jews to celebrate many of their sacred rites and has denied them the opportunity to receive an education in their own cultural and religious heritage. We are appalled at the treatment of Soviet Jews by the Soviet government.

We urge the government of the Soviet Union to grant to Soviet Jewry the political and religious freedoms granted by its Constitution to all citizens of that nation, including the rights to travel freely throughout the country and abroad, to engage in gainful and meaningful employment and to establish ties with Jews in all other parts of the world. We further urge that the government permit them to emigrate to Israel or any other nation.

* * * * *

CONVERSION OF THE ECONOMY

While the war has ended according to the President, the request for military funds has been increased in the budget request for fiscal 1974. The Congress must hold the line on military expenditures and reallocate those funds to the domestic programs which have had to wait while the senseless war went on. Housing, transportation, education, and ending of environmental abuses are substantial areas where the Democratic Party must insist on placing these funds. The needs of the elderly and the poor must be made high priorities in our actions. We have neglected our duties to improving our society too long.

* * * * *

CAMPAIN FUNDING

We in America must eliminate the formula that wealth equals power and influence. Reform is urgently required. Recent events have emphasized how dangerous such a combination can become.

The public has a right to know in the smallest amounts the sources of political funds and how they are spent. Unfortunately, all recent attempts to strengthen disclosure laws have not proven effective. We urge the following action: 1. full and total disclosure of campaign contributions and the subsequent disposal of funds; 2. the name, amount contributed, and occupation of all contributions exceeding \$10.00; 3. such report should be readily available to the public; 4. committees must be required to report amounts spent for any and all candidates they support.

We as Democrats must recognize that the political process costs money and we must be individually prepared to share a reasonable portion of these expenses in order that the processes remain open to all. States should be urged to adopt income tax check off campaign funding schemes so that an unbiased and influence free fund for political purposes can be established. Electronic media must also be regulated as to amounts of air time granted to candidates. Adherence to these laws should be insured by vigorous, impartial, and independent enforcement of all campaign spending laws.

* * * * *

HEALTH INSURANCE FIELD

There is a national health crisis. The President and leaders of the Congress have warned of the pending disaster in the 70 million dollar a year health care industry despite massive sales of private health insurance and the enactment of federally financed programs such as Medicare and Medicaid, most expenditures for personal health services must be born out-of-pocket by the patient at the time of illness or as a debt thereafter. The private health insurance industry has failed to control costs, has ignored problems of the quality of services, has severely distorted the way health care is delivered by narrowly defining the context in which services are covered. The result has been a raging inflation of health

costs at rates approaching 15% annually, with hospital costs rising 100% and physicians fees 50% faster than the cost of living. At the same time, the health of the American people, as measured by such items as infant mortality and life expectancy, has declined in recent years in comparison with the health of persons in other nations. Health services are unavailable in many parts of the country, especially in the city and rural areas. The quality of care, when available, varies widely and there are virtually no safeguards to protect the consumer.

The Young Democrats of America recommend the development and adoption of a unified and coherent national health strategy to deal adequately and simultaneously with the interrelated problems of manpower, quality, lack of effective delivery systems, financing and consumer participation. The national health strategy should include a comprehensive program of national health insurance which provides universal entitlement of all Americans under the same program, comprehensive health benefits which cover the full range of accepted diagnostic and preventive and rehabilitative services, an equitable system of financing based upon the strength of the entire national economy and resulting funds to be administered by a public agency accountable to the President and the Congress, strong fiscal incentives to move the health care system towards organized programs of patient care and to pay for all services on the basis of predetermined annual budget, a program of resources development which can serve as a catalyst to change the health care system. It should be an integral part of the overall plan with sufficient money to improve manpower, facilities, and planning, and to stimulate new concepts in patient care and systems organization. The Health Security program for national health insurance embodied in the Kennedy-Griffith bill is found to meet these criteria and is, therefore, endorsed by the Young Democrats of America as the plan most likely to make the promise of decent health services a right and reality for the American people.

AMNESTY

Some 30,000 American citizens are being deprived of their right to live in the country in which they were born due to their moral convictions against an illegal and undeclared war in South East Asia. Therefore, we the Young Democrats of America gathered in convention urge a policy which would unconditionally enable these deprived citizens to return to their homeland with the assurance that their return will not be restricted.

STRIP MINING

In many areas of this Nation those engaged in the practice of strip mining have demonstrated gross irresponsibility as to the environment. Although there are some good laws presently on the books dealing with such forms of ecological devastation, they are, for the most part, ignored by industry and not properly enforced by the governing agencies. Stronger and more far-reaching laws are needed.

Therefore, we urge the Congress and the various State legislatures to enact laws which will insure the cessation of all current strip mining in areas where such mining will do irreparable harm to the ecological balance and to the living creatures dependent on that area for their existence.

We further urge that action shall be taken by the state and federal governments to begin immediately the reclamation of said lands damaged prior to the enactment of controls. These laws should also include protections against erosion during the mining and specific provisions to require the return of the land mined to a condition of ecological balance equal to its condition prior to strip mining.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WIRETAPPING

It is the accepted belief of this convention that the rights of the individual must be secure from reduction and expeditious usurpation. The Constitution of the United States specifically guarantees "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 be issued 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.

We recognize that such guarantee is necessary to protect an individual's presumption of innocence and to maintain the government's responsibility of burden of proof from those who would politically repress. It has been noted that certain governmental agencies are eroding this basic guarantee at an ever accelerating pace through such recently undertaken powers, contrary to said guarantee, as "Stop and Frisk," and "No Knock," wiretapping, and government surveillance of individuals exercising constitutional prerogatives among others.

In addition to the purely philosophical inconsistencies real physical repressions and transgressions have been noted with alarming increased frequency. The cause for alarm is real in that such abuses are not confined to an isolated geographical area nor perpetrated by merely a single level of law enforcement, but have been committed by federal agents as well as state and local police officials in all regions of our nation. Such abuses have not been limited merely to those who were indictable given "due process" guarantees. It is the studied conclusion of this convention that clear and present danger to the sanctity of the individual, and, therefore, to our constitutional government will exist until such measures as do exist are interpreted within the strictest confines of the First Amendment.

We, therefore, strongly urge all who support basic Democratic principles and the philosophy of the Democratic Party take whatever steps they are able to immediately eliminate not only those practices known as "Stop and Frisk," "No Knock," wiretapping and surveillance, but also expeditious police techniques that, in fact, cause the subordination of the individual's rights and freedoms.

NEWSPERSONS SOURCES

The free flow of information is necessary for an informed public and democratic government. Traditionally 1st, 5th, and 9th amendment provisions cover freedom of the press. However, different courts and judges around the country have been choosing to ignore this fact. This assault on our basic rights has become serious enough to have innocent men imprisoned in violation of their constitutional protection.

A newsperson is anyone who gathers news for any type of news media, newspaper, magazine, house organ, television (local and national), radio, or does research, photography, writing, editing, procuring, compiling, reiterating, disseminating, transmitting, broadcasting, interpreting, or publishing news.

The Young Democrats support and will actively seek legislation to prevent any newsperson from being compelled by any court, commission, committee, department, bureau, or governing body, or any government official to disclose the source of any confidential information or not to disseminate confidential information procured or obtained for publication or broadcast.

CONGRESSMAN RIEGLE

We wish to express our welcome and support of Congressman Donald W. Riegle, Jr. of the state of Michigan. In February 1973, Congressman Riegle announced his affiliation with the Democratic Party. He has repeatedly expressed his belief in youth recognition

and the need for party unity. He has expressed his desire for open political processes within the party organization. He has demonstrated his ability to work for his district, his state, and his nation. The Young Democrats of America, gathered in convention, do hereby formally and officially welcome Congressman Donald W. Riegle, Jr. to our Party.

CAMPAGN PRACTICES

The findings of the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities up to this time do not constitute an indictment of either political party; rather these findings indicate the great harm which can be done to our Democratic institutions when those in power seek to circumvent traditional party processes to maintain power.

Richard Nixon has impounded funds previously appropriated by Congress for domestic programs. He has either directly or indirectly, through the failure to monitor the activities of appointed Presidential advisers, brought about a crisis in public trust. He has conducted clandestine bombing and other acts of warfare against essentially defenseless peoples. He has turned his back on the poor, on the aged, and on the racial minorities while at the same time proclaiming that he supports generous programs of assistance for persons unable to work. He has imposed a complex set of controls on the United States economy and these controls have failed for the average consumer while corporate profits soar to record levels.

Public faith in our system of governmental checks and balances has been crippled by the interpretation of this administration as being more important than and unaccountable to legislative and judicial branches of government.

It is premature to draw any conclusions at this time. However, we endorse the current efforts of the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities to inform the public on what the committee discovers. It must be remembered that only the first round of these hearings is over and that there will be further inquiries into corrupt election practices, illegal fund-raising, "dirty-tricks" and the like as it relates to all political parties.

Therefore, the Young Democrats of America formally censure President Nixon for his past and present reluctance to fully cooperate with the officially designated and empowered legislative and judicial commissions enfranchised to investigate these aforementioned incidents.

Further, should high crimes and misdemeanors be proven, proper legal proceedings shall be instituted.

Finally, the Young Democrats of America urge the President to initiate a new policy of full and complete co-operation and disclosure of all information necessary to quickly alleviate the credibility crisis which is plaguing the United States government at home and abroad.

CONCLUSION

It would be naive to think that after Watergate is behind us and the truth is known, that all will be well with the American body politic. It is apparent by now that our political, economic, and social system is afflicted by serious ills. The evil influence of big money; the callous acts of insensitive bureaucracy; the prevailing belief in success measured in terms of money; the shameful treatment of the elderly; an economic system seemingly out of control; a nation that has become almost nonchalant about bombing, killing, and maiming defenseless people; a removal from spiritual values and the advance of hedonism, greed, and self-gratification fostered by a pervasive consumer ethic; the shameful waste of natural resources by our insatiable demands for energy; all these things will be with us after Watergate. We do not have the solutions to these

problems. We can only dedicate ourselves to a sincere effort to solve these difficult tasks.

A truly successful democracy requires the merger of two principles: majority rule and representation, and respect for minorities. Though there is no formal equation through which this can be achieved, the actions of the Democratic Party must continue to be guided by the basic truth of these principles. We, as Young Democrats, seek to bring the spirit of these truths to all facets of our society.

THE AMERICAN FARMER

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the American farmer in our national economy and our way of life is too often ignored and too little understood.

I include a statement in the RECORD, recently delivered before the Agriculture Council of America by my constituent, Mr. Thomas H. Roberts, Jr., president of DeKalb AgResearch, Inc., of De Kalb, Ill. His brief comments are well worth reading.

The comments follow:

THE AMERICAN FARMER

American agriculture, during the past few years, has often been the target of public criticism.

We have seen agriculture criticized for the government production controls that were once necessary to avoid disastrous over-production. Farmers have often been criticized for receiving government subsidy payments that, in reality, are more of a subsidy for the American consumer, helping provide him with low-cost food.

Farmers, because they are at the beginning of the food production chain, are often blamed for increases in food costs. And often, farmers and ranchers are accused of tainting the meat and vegetables they produce with growth stimulants and pesticides and of polluting the environment with fertilizers.

Most of these criticisms are not justified. They are often based on misinformation and misunderstanding.

If anything, farmers have helped hold the line on increasing food costs—the farmer receives less of the food dollar today than he did 20 years ago.

The farmer is perhaps the nation's original environmentalist. He began decades ago to preserve the land through improved cultural practices and to improve the soil's fertility through the wise use of fertilizers. The American farmer, traditionally has treated his resources wisely so his land will still be productive when the next man is ready for it.

The farmer is too important to our economy for us to take him lightly. All Americans need to understand and be aware of this importance. They need to understand how a healthy agriculture translates into a healthy economy, with personal benefits for everyone.

But the American farmer needs a favorable public image and favorable legislation that will help him survive as the world's most efficient food producer. For this to be accomplished, the American public needs to fully understand the farmer and his important industry.

The American public must be told that the food they eat is of better quality than ever before in history. They must be told that the food they eat is being produced in greater quantities than ever before in history. And

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

they must be told that they will continue to receive an adequate supply of wholesome and nutritious food products if the American farmer has the opportunity to continue doing what he likes to do best.

These are some of the things to which American agriculture must address itself. And these are the areas in which the Agriculture Council of America is directing its efforts. Their purpose is to tell the story of American agriculture to the public—to acquaint every American with this important and vital industry.

We at DeKalb AgResearch, Inc. support these efforts. We congratulate the ACA for its progress in this direction and we pledge our assistance in the future.

It is with this thought in mind that De Kalb dedicates to the Agriculture Council of America a new 27½ minute movie, entitled "The American Farmer." It is our hope that, through the combined efforts of the ACA, DeKalb and other member groups, we may succeed in telling the story of the American farmer to the American consumer.

CONSTITUENT'S BRAVERY CITED

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, today's news shows far too many instances of people not wanting to "get involved." We hear of crime victims who are left to fend for themselves while passersby go right on about their business. Just last week in London, business went on as usual in a nearby street and park while a gunman fired numerous shots at the car carrying Princess Anne and her husband to Buckingham Palace. Stories about those who do get involved, while few and far between, are often overlooked.

Recently, however, an article came to my attention which I feel deserves a great deal of further publicity. The story involves one of my young constituents, Bart Ehrman, who, by "getting involved," helped save a woman and her son from injury and possible death.

I am submitting this article from the Lawrence Daily Journal-World for publication in the RECORD as one way of commending Bart for his brave actions. I sincerely hope that what he did will serve as an example for other young people.

LAWRENCE YOUTH RESCUES WOMAN, BOY FROM AUTO

Bart Ehrman, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard L. Ehrman, 1013 W. 27th, Lawrence, recently made front-page news in Chicago newspapers after rescuing a woman and her son from a run-away car in the heart of the city.

Ehrman, a freshman major at Chicago's Moody Bible Institute, was walking down Chicago Avenue at 6 p.m. Feb. 26, when he heard a woman screaming for help. The brakes on her car had failed, and she was frantically trying to dodge other vehicles while running red lights in Chicago's busy intersections.

"I ran after the car, but it took me about a block to catch up with it," reported Ehrman. "Then the lady threw open her door, so I jumped in. The emergency brake was broken and the gears wouldn't jam into park, so I just tried to avoid the traffic." By then the vehicle had slowed down to less than 20 miles per hour, so Bart rammed it into a police paddy wagon parked by the side of the road, and brought the car to a stop.

Ehrman, a graduate of Lawrence High

March 27, 1974

School, was the 1973 Kansas State 5A Debate champion and was active on his high school tennis and baseball teams.

FOOD STAMPS FASTEST GROWING WELFARE

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, it is a well known fact that although Federal programs are usually initiated on a modest basis, they tend to grow as the years go by as various parts of the program are amended and expanded. Such seems to be the case with the food stamp program. U.S. News & World Report recently pointed out in their issue of March 25, 1974, that this program will shortly be providing subsidies for 1 in every 14 Americans. In my view, this matter deserves the most careful attention of my colleagues. We should be thinking as to how best to control this growing expenditure. The article follows:

FASTEST-GROWING WELFARE

Almost unnoticed in a time of general prosperity, one rapidly expanding federal welfare program will soon be providing subsidies for 1 in every 14 Americans.

It's the food-stamp program, which offers, to needy people, stamps that can be used just like money in stores to buy food. Officials say no other Government welfare program has grown as fast over the past decade.

Started in 1961 when about 50,000 people received stamps, the program has shown its most spectacular expansion since 1967, as the Pictogram on these pages shows.

[Pictogram not printed in Record.]

By mid-1975, under the budget proposed by President Nixon, 15.8 million Americans will be receiving stamps valued at 7.2 billion dollars.

Actually, people participating in the program in the year starting July 1 will pay 3.3 billions themselves for the stamps which they receive—leaving the U.S. Government to pick up the tab for the remainder.

Add in the costs of other food welfare programs, such as school-lunch aid, and the Government will spend close to 6 billion dollars of taxpayers' money on food subsidies next year.

Officials say that the stamps, by adding to the demand for food, may increase somewhat the general level of food prices.

PLAN'S GROWTH

The stamp program now is expanding in all directions. For one thing, the value of stamps that needy people can buy has been increased—to \$142 a month for a family of four in January, up from \$116. In addition, more families were brought into the program by raising the amount of income that could be earned while still qualifying for stamps.

So high has the ceiling been raised, in fact, that people not usually considered "needy" may qualify. For example, officials of Ingham County, Mich., say that one third to one half of all recipients there are students at Michigan State University.

With new areas added steadily, just about every city and county in the U.S. will be participating by mid-1975.

Amounts paid for food stamps by recipients depend on income—families with no income getting stamps free, those earning \$473 a month paying \$118 for stamps worth \$142.

What's ahead? If President Nixon has his way, the growth in food stamps may come to an end. A plan presented to Congress would

give each State the option of continuing the present program, or substituting direct cash payments to the needy in an amount equal to the bonus value of the food stamps they would have received.

**"JUSTICE"—AFTER THIS WORD
FROM OUR SPONSOR**

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1974, the Dallas Times Herald printed an outstanding editorial authored by Mr. Felix R. McKnight. It is entitled "The Worst Watergate Scar."

I feel strongly that this editorial has a significant message for every Member of this Congress. I am including it in the RECORD for each to read:

THE WORST WATERGATE SCAR

Of all the scars to be left by Watergate, none will be more permanent than the irresponsible violation of institutions and disciplines designed to safeguard the rights of individuals.

In prejudice some treasured old cornerstones of justice have crumbled.

Grand jury proceedings have been openly leaked; prosecuting staffs have spilled incriminating information to their favorite newsmen; erstwhile respected congressmen have succumbed to the electric lure of network television to prejudge before the fact.

No one, including once irreproachable Rep. Wilbur Mills, wants to wait for orderly processing of facts before constituted bodies in pressing the case against Richard M. Nixon.

If Nixon were any other lowly defendant, he would have a gut clinch for a change of venue because of the unceasing flow of pre-trial accusations and insinuations made on the hour by government officials, members of the Congress and some elements of the media.

But Richard Nixon has no other place to go. The House of Representatives files the charges; the U.S. Senate conducts the trial.

The San Francisco Examiner reminds that all members of the House of Representatives are in effect prospective grand jurors. If this Judiciary Committee decides to press impeachment proceedings against President Nixon, it will be up to the Congressmen to weigh the evidence and vote or reject an indictment in the form of specific charges.

Will those congressmen who have been going around telling newspapermen and television interviewers they believe the President should be removed from office, or resign—which amounts to the same thing—will they be allowed to vote on the indictment in spite of their recorded advance bias?

They will.

And so will U.S. senators, who will be sitting as a trial jury if the House votes an indictment. Including those you have seen on television solemnly insinuating guilt of the President.

There is something dreadfully wrong in the prospect, something quite alien to the traditional spirit of American justice. Those members of Congress who have been prejudicing the President are reminiscent of the outlaw kangaroo court that vowed "a fair trial before the hanging."

We do not speak in defense of Richard Nixon, who will have to speak to alleged improprieties, tax violations and lack of control and discipline of a wayward staff. We speak in defense of a system, of institutions, that are far bigger than an individual.

Vice Chairman Mills of the Joint Commit-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the body investigating Nixon's challenged income tax returns, went on the CBS Face the Nation show and predicted that the President will be out of office by November—shoved out by the tax investigation and pressure.

And then Rep. Mills charges that Nixon owes some \$350,000 in back taxes because of improper deductions—citing Sen. Russell Long of Louisiana, chairman of the joint committee, as the source of the information.

Whereupon, Sen. Long promptly denied it, saying, "I have never attempted to fix a figure on the amount of taxes the President may owe on his returns." Further, Sen. Long added that there has been no "proof of fraud on the part of the President."

But all of it had been said on national television and reported in every daily newspaper. The pre-trial knife had slashed again.

Out of respect for the badly battered judicial process and its presumption of innocence until guilt is proven, congressmen should keep their opinions to themselves or disqualify themselves as jurors. The rest of us, the majority, still have respect for constitutionally ordered rights under law—whether it be the accused Nixon or Joe Blow.

**CHARLES HADLEY AND OPERATION
BIG VOTE**

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently citizens and leaders of Miami, Fla., gathered for a testimonial luncheon in honor of the father of "Operation Big Vote." A civic effort put together to sell the citizens of Miami on two recent bond issues by Charles Hadley.

Those who attended were paying homage to a man who volunteered and then performed over and beyond the call of duty.

In the words of one of Hadley's co-workers on the campaign, Alva Chapman, president of the Miami Herald:

He is an extremely competent, dedicated Miamian and rendered great service to this community in helping the civic committees explain the importance of these bond issues to the future of this great community.

Without Hadley's participation and leadership, it is unlikely that any significant amount of the \$120 million in bonds passed by the City of Miami in recent years would have been approved.

He is an outstanding Miamian and I was proud to be his associate in these civic endeavors.

Prominent attorney Bill Colson was the master of ceremonies and told of the difficulties he had convincing Charles Hadley to agree to help. Colson explained:

Charlie feared the bond issue would pass and all of the monies would go to beautifying downtown Miami, Flagler street in particular. The Committee then sat down and re-wrote the priorities for the Bond issue. . . . After this was done Mr. Hadley took the responsibility for the bond issue in the predominantly black precincts. . . . The bond issue passed 3 to 1 in all of his precincts.

When I am asked by executives seeking to save their decaying cities who have recently had bond issues defeated what they should do. I say simply, Find you a Charley Hadley.

For over a year Charles Hadley worked without pay to pass the issue. He was

successful and the city of Miami received a needed financial transfusion. Without men like Charles Hadley, Miami and this country would be in very bad shape.

Perhaps the most fitting tribute to Charles Hadley is the last line on the plaque he was presented at the luncheon. "Thank you from the city of Miami."

**OHIO INAUGURATES WOMB TO THE
TOMB WELFARE STATE**

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, following a recent decision by an Ohio Federal court, a pregnant woman in Ohio can now collect aid to dependent children—ADC—for her unborn child. According to the Mansfield News Journal, an expectant mother, from the time of verification of pregnancy to the time of delivery, can collect more than \$700 in ADC payments.

This incredible decision brings to fruition a goal long sought after by our liberal social planners. As is stated in the News Journal:

A welfare state based upon a concept of assistance "from the womb to the tomb" is now reality.

Following is the complete text of the March 17 news article:

WELFARE PAYMENTS START AT PREGNANCY

(By Joan Brown)

A welfare state based upon a concept of assistance "from the womb to the tomb" is now reality.

The Ohio Department of Public Welfare, in complying with a December, 1973, Ohio federal court decision in *Stuart vs. Canary*, can pay pregnant mothers as much as \$100 each month in Aid to Dependent Children for a child conceived but not yet born.

From the time that a pregnancy is medically verified, which may be as early as six weeks, until the time of delivery, a pregnant woman can collect more than \$700 in Aid to Dependent Children (ADC).

Miss Ruth Strong, director of the Richland County Welfare Department, explains that before the *Stuart-Canary* decision an expectant mother with children would not have received any special ADC allowance because of her new pregnancy. When the child was born, however, she could apply for additional assistance.

The opinion of the court, however, was that "the absence of other living children shall not bar a pregnant woman from eligibility for Aid to Dependent Children."

"What this means is that any woman of any age who can provide a medical statement verifying her pregnancy and meet all other eligibility requirements, may receive Aid to Dependent Children," says Miss Strong.

Specifically, this can mean a mother may receive funds under the federal program for a "child" that not only is unborn but may not yet have indicated "life" through "quickeening."

Miss Strong, who indicates she has just received a guideline from the state welfare department, says a single pregnant woman with no children and no income could receive an ADC grant of \$73 a month and an additional \$20 for nutritional needs.

A married expectant couple could receive an ADC grant of \$141 a month plus an addi-

tional \$20 for special need. An expectant woman with three children would receive \$201 plus \$20. All the qualified women could also receive Medicaid assistance and possibly food stamps.

"We have 15 women who may now be eligible for this program," notes Miss Strong.

CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN'S 1974 ANNUAL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as has been my custom over the years, I am pleased to report the results of my annual questionnaire which was conducted by mail and printed in several district newspapers during the past few weeks and just tabulated by computer.

Responding to this survey, Michigan's Sixth District residents indicated that, based on information to date, a majority feel that President Nixon should neither be impeached nor resign, although those favoring such action constitute a significant percentage. On the question of impeachment, 33 percent favored it and 58 percent opposed it—and, on the question of resignation, 34 percent supported and 57 percent opposed the President resigning.

Other areas of strong opinion showed 70 percent were opposed to gasoline rationing, 68 percent felt antipollution controls should be temporarily eased to help alleviate the energy crisis, and 51 percent did not want election campaigns to be financed with tax dollars.

On the question relating to national health insurance programs, a clear majority want Federal assistance to help meet the costs of catastrophic illness, but there was a definite reluctance to support the nationalization of health insurance.

The poll also provided an opportunity to "rate" spending priorities, and only in the area of mass transit was there a willingness to spend more, with 65 percent making it clear that they want less spent for model cities programs. A majority of respondents urged that the same or less be spent on consumer protection, national defense, drug abuse prevention, education, and environmental programs.

While the statistical results are indeed significant, Mr. Speaker, the added comments on moral values and the disillusionment with the integrity of both businesses and Government were emphatic and perhaps carried a message of greater meaning than the percentages themselves.

Mr. Speaker, these comments—several thousand—made me feel that our people are aroused about their country. This recognition of and identification with the problems by our citizens is not only a wholesome indication, but an essential first step toward finding solutions. With such public concern, constructive change has to follow.

I include the results of this survey in the RECORD so that others may be aware

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of the sentiment being expressed by the people of Michigan's Sixth Congressional District:

CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN'S 1974 ANNUAL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

[Figures in percent]

	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Do you think gasoline should be rationed now?	14	70	16
2. Should anti-pollution restrictions (such as auto-emission controls) be eased temporarily to help solve our energy problems?	68	24	8
3. Based on information to date, if you were a member of this Congress would you vote to impeach the President?	33	58	9
4. Do you think the President should resign?	34	57	9
5. Should Federal election campaigns (Presidential, Senatorial and Congressional) be financed by tax dollars?	31	51	18
6. If we were to have a national health insurance program, what basic concepts would you prefer:			
New program of health care for the poor to replace Medicaid	19		
Additional tax credits for premiums for private insurance	33		
Programs to help meet costs of catastrophic illness	52		
Requirement that employers provide health insurance for employees	25		
Complete nationalization of health insurance	24		
7. With respect to priorities, do you feel we should spend more, less, or the same for:			
Mass transit	59	14	20
Consumer protection	44	13	36
National defense	21	35	39
Drug abuse prevention	38	13	42
Education	35	14	45
Environmental programs	27	26	40
Model cities	7	65	20

¹ Note: Since question 6 allowed multiple choice answers, percents do not add up to 100 percent.

Data released: Mar. 27, 1974.

INTRODUCTION OF LAND USE PLANNING LEGISLATION

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it has become apparent that the intelligent planning of land use is vital to our getting the most out of our vast real estate resources in the future.

Today, I am joining with my colleague from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) in introducing the Land Use Planning Assistance Act.

At the present time there are 11 States that have passed land use laws. I believe that before the Federal Government jumps in with stringent land use regulations, we should study the impact of these laws on land within the States that have them—what problems are being encountered, and what success land use planning is having in meeting State goals.

I support the concept of land use planning. I believe that the Federal Govern-

March 27, 1974

ment certainly has a responsibility to encourage the States to develop overall plans. We must preserve our wilderness areas. We must clean up our environment. We also must fashion our land use policies so that the economies of the States affected can remain strong.

It has been traditional in America for States and localities to regulate use of land through zoning and State laws. I feel that this responsibility should remain at that level. The legislation introduced today would provide an incentive for States to adopt a comprehensive land use policy—and would provide Federal assistance and grants to develop such plans. It provides an added incentive for the States to include local units of Government in planning and carrying out land use program and policies.

I feel that this is no field to act in haste on, and I would hope that the House Interior Committee will make a thorough study of land use plans in effect today—with field hearings to get the local impressions—and that the needs and experiences of localities would be taken into full consideration when land use legislation is being drawn up.

CUBA HAS EARNED ITS OSTRACISM

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in response to inquiries from many members of the Greater Miami and Florida Latin community regarding my position on resumption of diplomatic and economic relations with Communist Cuba, I would like to make the following statement:

A few people in responsible positions, who should know better, are suggesting that the United States renew diplomatic and economic relations with the Castro Communist Government in Cuba.

They compare such a course to recent steps to change our relationship with the Soviet Union and Communist China. Such a comparison however, must not be made. Castro remains a revolutionary prophet committed to revolutionary policy throughout the Western Hemisphere. His answer to economic and political problems in Latin America is revolution. Recent history is replete with examples of attempts by Castro and his followers to overthrow democratic government.

The American people, as well as I, do not want to offer the hand of friendship to a ruthless government headed by a tyrant who keeps the Cuban people in the deepest depths of despair, hunger, misery, pain, and death, denying them liberty and freedom that we in America enjoy as a matter of course.

There are more than 100,000 political prisoners held in Castro's jails. More than 20,000 have been killed before firing squads.

Thousands have died in the waters of the Gulf while attempting to reach freedom.

While thousands of the more fortunate have fled their homeland to find sanc-

tuary in the United States, many thousands have found it impossible to get the necessary papers to leave.

Others work, fight, and die in their homeland trying to liberate her from the clutches that today oppress her.

For these reasons, I cannot support any initiatives to restore diplomatic relations with Cuba. We would have nothing to gain.

The day will come when Cuba's civil liberties and her democratic and Christian ideals will be restored, and this nation will be reintegrated into the order of the democratic people of the free world.

LAND USE PLANNING ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with my colleague from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) in introducing the Land Use Planning Assistance Act. This is an area of critical need, and I urge my colleagues to take the opportunity to review this new piece of legislation.

I support land use planning and believe that we should encourage and assist the States and localities in developing reasonable approaches to the use of land. We need to preserve the natural beauty of our wilderness areas as well as balance environmental and ecological concerns with orderly urban growth.

I believe that States and localities are best suited to develop and implement land use plans. Traditionally, the States and localities have controlled zoning and other uses of land and I feel strongly that the responsibility should remain with them.

Under the legislation I have introduced today, States which adopt a land use policy and create a land use planning agency would be eligible for grants to develop and implement a land use plan. The bill also provides an incentive to the States for including local units of government in the development and implementation of the land use plans. In addition, States are authorized and encouraged to cooperate on an interstate basis in planning, policies and studies for land use in interstate areas of critical environmental concern and key facilities.

At the present time there are 11 States with their own land use planning legislation. It is important that we evaluate the experience of these States with this type of legislation. The Federal Government should encourage States to develop land use plans, but should not itself enact hasty legislation which puts the Federal Government in the business of regulating and controlling land within the States. I would urge the members of the House Interior Committee to conduct field hearings throughout the country to determine the needs of the States and their experience under existing land use laws.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GOP CHIEF A HERALD OF LIBERTY

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, in recent years many people in America have come to believe that both major political parties have abandoned all principle in a mad rush for power through expedient politics. In many respects this has been the case. However, I would like to point out that one arm of the Republican Party—the young Republicans—are still proud to stand firmly by the traditional principles of the Constitution and individual liberty. Late last year the Ft. Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel carried a story on Dick Smith, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation. I think that Mr. Smith correctly points out the proper role of the Republican Party in that it should be a vehicle to support the cause of liberty and not remain just an entity unto itself.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper story that I refer to reads as follows:

GOP CHIEF A HERALD OF LIBERTY

(By Jennie Phipps)

Dick Smith hung up the phone, swore he'd get the truth out of the Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare yet, and settled back with a Schlitz to tell how he, one of the country's chief protagonists of conservative Republicanism, thinks.

As national chairman of the Young Republican Nation Federation (YRNF), an organization for Republicans under 40 years old, Smith holds one of the most powerful posts in the GOP.

Philosophically speaking, he calls himself a "classical liberal, in the Jeffersonian sense. Today," he concludes, "they call such people conservatives."

His mission of the moment, recently, was to find out from HEW just how much fuel the country is using in the midst of a power crisis to transport school children, and to point out this figure to the nation.

Telephoning Washington from his Fort Lauderdale office, he wasn't having much success obtaining the information, and his bad luck only fanned the flame of his dislike for big government and welfare programs.

FREE SYSTEM A MOTIVATION

"There is no incentive for people to produce, if you are a slave of the state," he said.

"God doesn't guarantee anything. The magic of this country is that you are free to get it yourself. If you are free, human ability will surface to the top. If the person doesn't have the drive or the ability, they wouldn't surface to the top anyway."

"All the welfare system ever did was get more and more people on welfare. Do you know anybody who ever starved to death? Do you know anybody who knows somebody who has starved to death? Of course you don't, because it doesn't happen here. An American comes to his neighbor's aid when he is in trouble. The government doesn't need to do it."

"People have the freedom not to be poor," Smith continued. "They have the freedom to be the best of what their capabilities are. Some people just have greater abilities than others. It shows up in what they do in life."

"I have a very very strong belief in freedom of the individual and the free enterprise system. I think any kind of social engineering is one more piece of government meddling.

Our history has shown that the basic American philosophy has been stronger than the egg brains."

HIS POLITICS NOT POPULAR

Smith, born in Charleston, W. Va., still has a little piece of a mountain twang and wouldn't mind a bit being tagged with "country boy made good" image. He's quick to point out that he worked his way through the University of Miami, and he adds that his conservative views didn't make him the most popular student in his liberal political science classes.

"You don't find as many left wing ideologues in college as you did when I was in school," the 33-year-old said. "Their attitude has changed because more of them have already been out in the world. They've had to take responsibility and they've started paying taxes."

While he's a staunch supporter of tax cuts and fewer bureaucrats, one budget and personnel reduction he can't justify is in the defense department.

"In the light of Soviet buildup, a first line military strength is the most important tool in maintaining our individual freedom. If you are going to deal with the Russians or any Communists, you have to deal with them with a feeling of strength."

"I think you have to keep in mind when you are dealing with those people that their ultimate goal is our conquest. If the Russians gain first strike capabilities, they are either going to strike first or blackmail us. It's nice to talk about everybody getting along, but there have always been bullies."

One of this country's biggest mistakes, he adds, was its failure to do a complete job in Vietnam. "It's a damn shame that we didn't go in there and win and get out. We had the capability to go in there and win it and wipe them out. Instead, we let a bunch of our guys get shot," he said disgustedly.

"The Communists are chipping away at the base of our society. If we let them keep doing that, pretty soon they are going to get to the core and have us."

Earlier this year, Smith made national news when he recommended, as the spokesman for Young Republicans, that the country not support Halloween collections by UNICEF. "That was his finest hour," a colleague said, passing by the door as the conservative commented further.

"UNICEF would be fine if all the money were going to countries friendly to us, but it's not. It's a fraud upon the people who give their pennies. No society can exist if it persists in helping those who want to destroy it."

The YRNF is the most conservative arm of the Republican party, Smith pointed out proudly. He was elected its head nearly unanimously at the national convention of the half-million-member organization in July.

PARTY HELPS WITH CAUSES

The YRNF has been known to criticize the President for his liberal stands. "We're the more idealistic arm of the party. To me, the Republican Party is not an entity within itself. It is a vehicle to support a cause. The cause of freedom of the individual and the free enterprise system," Smith said.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XXXVI

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following article, reprinted from the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 27, 1974

March 15 edition of the New York Times, tells of the kind of brutal gun assaults that are commonplace in America. Handguns must be kept out of the hands of the vengeful, irrational, and vigilante elements of our society, and that can be done in the long run only by keeping them out of the hands of private citizens generally:

FROM THE POLICE BLOTTER

A 21-year-old Bronx man was shot dead in Harlem shortly after 1 A.M. by an unidentified woman while standing on the sidewalk in front of 2321 Eighth Avenue, near 125th Street. The victim was identified by the police as David Tate of 1-4 West Farms Square Place. He was shot once in the chest by the woman, who was described as between 17 and 19 and heavy-set. . . . A 27-year-old Brooklyn man was shot and seriously wounded at 2:30 A.M. during a dispute with an unidentified man in Norah's Lounge, a bar at 167 Greenpoint Avenue. The victim, identified by the police as Robert Rabatin of 653 Leonard Street, was admitted to Greenpoint Hospital with a back wound.

REASONS FOR CERTAIN AUTHORIZATIONS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, many of us who are members of the "Dauntless Dozen"—more or less—on the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee are frequently verbally chastised for certain authorizations of appropriations. However, this group often uses the strong arm of the GAO to see that funds are wisely and well spent.

As for our motivation, I submit the following little poem to this fearless forum to shed light on the reasons for our authorizations:

Today upon a bus I saw a lovely maiden with golden hair
I envied her, she seemed so gay, and I wished I was so fair
When suddenly she arose to leave, I saw her hobble down the aisle
She had one foot, and wore a crutch but, as she passed, a smile.
I have two feet, the world is mine.
Oh God, forgive me when I whine.
And when I stopped to buy some sweets, the lad who sold them had such charm
I talked to him—he said to me, it's nice to talk to men like you
You see, he said, I'm blind.
Oh, God, forgive me when I whine.
I have two eyes, the world is mine.
Then walking down the street, I saw a child with eyes of blue
He stood and watched the others play, it seemed he knew not what to do
I stopped for a moment, then said: "Why don't you join the others, dear?"
He looked ahead without a word, and then I knew he could not hear.
Oh, God, forgive me when I whine.
I have two ears, the world is mine.
With feet to take me where I'd go,
With eyes to see the sunset's glow,
With ears to hear what I would know,
Oh God, forgive me when I whine,
I'm blessed indeed, the world is mine!

BOG AMENDMENTS

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I intend to introduce a bill proposing these important changes in the basic opportunity grant program. The first would allow the Office of Education to carry over funds that are unspent this year to increase the size of grants for the coming year. Because the Office of Education should be publishing the payment schedule for next year in the coming few weeks, I am hopeful our committee can act on this legislation before the Easter recess.

Under the present law, any money not spent on BOG's during this school year must be reallocated among those students who received a grant this year. In practical terms, this could require hunting down approximately 300,000 students who have already completed a year in school to give each of them a rather small check. I know of no one who seriously suggests this would be a wise use of Federal student aid dollars.

The second portion of the bill changes the date before which the Office of Education must submit to Congress the proposed family contribution schedule for the following year. This schedule outlines the details of how a student's family and personal income and assets are evaluated in the process of determining eligibility for a grant and the amount of the grant.

The law now allows the Commissioner to submit his proposal as late as February 1 of each year. I propose that this date be moved forward to the preceding July 1. I understand that the Commissioner is agreeable to that date and is already planning to get the family contribution schedule to us by then.

The bill would also change the date by which Congress could pass, if it wishes, a resolution of disapproval of the proposed family contribution schedule. Now Congress has until May 1—far too late for the application forms to be designed, printed, and distributed to students who are already making their plans for college by that time. My bill would move that date forward to the preceding October 1. That date would give us the same 90 days to evaluate the proposed schedule as we have under present law.

The third portion of the bill changes the way in which social security education benefits are computed in determining a student's grant. Presently, all of these benefits are assumed to be available to meet a student's educational costs, and so his BOG is reduced accordingly.

Now that we have had experience with this provision, and understand better the complicated way in which a widow's or disabled person's children qualify for these benefits, we know that the present required computation causes a substantial hardship on the family by expecting a most unreasonable family contribution in these cases. This bill would

allow social security education benefits to be treated as "family" income instead of "student" income often making a very substantial increase in the amount of BOG awarded to these students.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that there really should be no controversy about the need for this bill. I earnestly hope and fully expect that we can get it before the House in the very near future.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM MOVES AHEAD WITH PUBLIC TRANSIT IN THE PARKS

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the energy crisis bears down ever more indelibly upon us, it is encouraging to see the efforts of one branch of the Federal Government, notably the National Park Service, being strongly directed toward the reduction of fuel consumption. Several years back this agency began, rather experimentally, inaugurating the use of public transportation systems in several parks. Building on that experience, and coupling with it the pressing need to conserve fuel and a commitment to reduce the adverse impact of too many private cars within the parks, the ingredients for the success of public transit in the parks looks ever more promising.

I believe my colleagues of the House and the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would find it of interest to read the comments on this matter made recently by Mr. Ronald H. Walker, Director of the National Park Service.

The article follows:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROVIDES ENERGY-SAVING TRAVEL METHODS FOR PARK VISITORS

National Park Service Director Ronald H. Walker announced today he has ordered all 298 National Park Service areas to develop "detailed plans for helping Americans visit the national parks with a minimum use of gasoline and other forms of energy."

"I am confident that we can develop new ways—matched with systems now in use—to help reduce gasoline consumption in getting to parks and to reduce private auto traffic within the parks as well," Walker said.

The plans, covering all areas managed by the National Park Service, an agency of the Department of the Interior, should be complete within a month, he said.

In spelling out the challenge to the National Parks posed by short supplies of gasoline, Walker said, "We think that there will be little change in park visitation this year, but Americans will take shorter trips and will stay longer in each park that they visit. Visitation should increase greatly in those areas close to urban centers, and 205 of them are less than 100 miles from such cities. The National Parks have got to be ready to make this new pattern of visitation work—to provide energy-saving ways of seeing the parks and to make the extended visits more meaningful to the visitor."

"In many ways I think this new trend will be a real blessing for the park visitor. Get away from your automobile and there is a whole new world of beauty and discovery waiting in the parks. Part of our new effort will be to make sure the trails and other

backcountry facilities are ready for increased use."

Walker noted that alternate transportation systems have already gone into operation to conserve park resources while saving fuel. These range from the horsedrawn vehicles serving visitors to the Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site in Texas to the mini-trains carrying visitors to widely spaced points of interest in Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado.

Shuttle buses bring visitors to Dinosaur National Monument, Colorado-Utah; Yosemite Valley in California; the Shark Valley area of Everglades National Park, Florida; Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska; and Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona, where an expanded bus fleet of 12 vehicles will serve the west rim when the visitor season gets into full swing this spring.

Mini-vans will carry visitors through the Carl Sandburg Home National Historic Site in North Carolina, while a similar system saves gasoline at Point Reyes National Seashore in California.

National Park Service boats will carry visitors to Rattlesnake Island from the Visitor Center at Fort Mantanzas National Monument in Florida while at the other end of the nation, boats were used to bring in the vehicles which carry people from point to point in Stehekin Valley of the North Cascades National Park in Washington—a valley otherwise inaccessible by automobile.

Some energy-saving solutions are new, like the electric bus being tested in the National Capital Parks to provide quiet, pollution-free travel within the city of Washington, D.C. Others are old, like the fleet of pre-1937 buses which are used in Glacier National Park to move visitors over the road from Lake McDonald to Logan Pass, a road too narrow for more modern vehicles.

Walker said that the National Park Service is working with the Department of Transportation and the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide mass-transit links between the railroads and the New York Gateway recreation areas, and to extend the existing tourmobile service in Washington's National Capital Parks.

Stressing that mass transit systems help to protect the environment of the park from damage associated with heavy automobile traffic, Walker was optimistic about the Service's ability to meet the challenge.

"No matter how long the gas shortage continues," Director Walker said, "Americans know that they must reduce wasteful uses of energy which now sees six percent of the world's people using thirty percent of the world's energy. We can save energy and at the same time make sure that Americans are not denied the privilege of enjoying their National Parks, Recreation Areas, Monuments and Historic Sites. We'll preserve our heritage by giving people new and better ways to see the most glorious places in America—the National Parks."

PASSAGE OF S. 3228

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend this body for the swift passage of S. 3228 which brings immediate assistance to those families of men who are at last being brought home for final honors.

I read with great sadness and a sense of disbelief, the newspaper article, which

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

brought the plight of these families to the attention of the Nation. It is only just that we offer every possible assistance to spare these families from unnecessary financial hardships which might be attendant upon personal funeral arrangements for their men.

We watched with joy as our prisoners returned to their homes last year, and we will watch with sorrow as these other heroes are accorded their last services. I know that my colleagues join me in gratitude that we were able to be of a small measure of assistance to their courageous families.

There is no possible compensation for their loss, but I would hope that our actions will at least have let them know that America has not forgotten what we owe to them and to their sons.

PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE CENTRAL CITIES UNVEILED

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues proposals for diverting private investment capital into the Nation's central cities. Following is a March 11, 1974, press release issued by FNMA outlining the proposals.

The proposals are ideas that grew out of a private industry "think tank" on housing problems sponsored by FNMA last year under the title of "Forum One." The organizer and director of Forum One was Albert M. Cole, former Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency—predecessor of HUD—and now a Washington attorney.

Some of the proposals are highly controversial. This is not an expression of support for the proposals. I do, however, feel that the problems they are concerned with are vital ones and that these proposals deserve our attention and study.

PRESS RELEASE FROM FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

WASHINGTON.—A far reaching new concept for diverting private investment capital into the nation's central cities, coupled with new ways to encourage the involvement of financial institutions with central city consumers, was unveiled today at a press conference in the offices of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Fannie Mae Chairman and President Oakley Hunter made plain, however, that his participation in the press conference did not indicate his or his company's support for the proposals. He acknowledged that many of them would be highly controversial.

The outline of the new proposals was sketched by Albert M. Cole, former administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (predecessor to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development) and now a Washington attorney. Cole was the organizer and director of a private industry "think tank" on housing problems sponsored by Fannie Mae last fall under the title of Forum One.

"What we are presenting here today are some ideas that grew out of Forum One," Hunter said. "To many, they may be consid-

ered too far out to be worthy of consideration. And it may be that they are ahead of their time. But we believe that at the very least they are worthy of serious public discussion. They address themselves to a problem which must be faced, and it cannot be faced by the government alone—it must be faced by the nation's financial institutions and by the general public."

As outlined by Cole, the basic concept is this: A new federal corporation, operating without appropriated funds, and known as the Central Cities Corporation, would designate certain sections in major metropolitan areas as "Central Cities Projects." This would be done only with the certification of the city involved.

The Central Cities Corporation would be a strongly consumer-oriented agency whose function would be both to facilitate the financing for, and protect the consumer interest in, private development in Central Cities Project areas.

Local governments such as cities and counties would issue tax-exempt bonds which would be traded to banks, savings and loan associations and other financial institutions such as mortgage bankers, in exchange for mortgages. The Central Cities Corporation would monitor these transactions to assure that the conditions of the exchange were fair to not only the local government and the financial institution, but the public as well.

These tax-exempt bonds, Cole said, would then be sold to the general public not only through traditional market mechanisms but also by the financial institutions on an over-the-counter basis, in denominations no smaller than \$1,000. The proceeds from the sale of the bonds would have to be invested in the Central Cities Project area—either in housing or commercial or industrial developments. The sale of tax-exempt bonds to the public on an over-the-counter basis is a major departure from the present method of marketing these securities, Cole said. They would be exempt from registration by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

"Hopefully," Cole said, "this system would utilize the negotiated margin between tax-exempt and mortgage rates to provide a continuing means of transferring the moneys represented by older low yield mortgages into current funds for lending in the projects in the inner city. In one sense, it is a subtle 'variable rate,' and could have the effect not only of providing a large volume of housing funds, but also eliminate factors tending to require high rates on home loans generally."

Cole stressed two other important aspects of the legislation, both of them included only in skeletonized, conceptual form.

One would provide that financial institutions could purchase the individual homes of elderly people, many of them living in insecure neighborhood surroundings. These persons would be enabled to buy or rent in safe, secure housing in Central Cities Project areas.

The other provision would develop a new type of protection for the property rights of an inner city consumer who elected to enter into an ongoing credit relationship with the lending institution which loaned him the money for his home. Under this program, the consumer could go to the lender and borrow money for an automobile or household appliance or other consumer good and have the balance added on to the home loan. The lending institution would be required to carry on a family financial planning program with the family and would be obliged not to allow the homeowner to over-obligate himself. Other lenders could also loan to the affected family, but would be unable to place any liens on the homeowner's property to enforce their demands for payment.

IMPEACHMENT EFFORTS ARE ON SHAKY GROUND

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, certainly one of the critical questions with which the House must deal this year, first through its Judiciary Committee, and then, if the evidence is deemed sufficient, as the whole House is the definition of an impeachable offense. A recent commentary by columnist Richard Wilson, which appears in the February 18 San Diego Union, is excellent food for thought and I wish to share his observations with my House colleagues.

Mr. Wilson's article follows:

IMPEACHMENT EFFORTS ARE ON SHAKY GROUND

(By Richard Wilson)

The American Civil Liberties Union, which is lobbying for the impeachment of President Nixon, contends that he can be removed from office for causes not confined to "narrow violations of the law." In its brief on this subject, ACLU convincingly rebuts itself on one point by reciting the circumstance that no official of the executive branch of government has ever been impeached except for specific violations of law.

The two who were impeached by the House, President Andrew Johnson and Secretary of War William W. Belknap, were both accused of specific violations of law and neither was removed from office by the Senate. This might seem to be legalistic niggling were it not for the fact that if the impeachment procedure is to go forward, a stage is likely to be reached when one or more specific key charges will be subjected to vote.

In President Johnson's case it all came down to three charges, two of them specific on law violation and a third of a general nature, and the vote on each was 35 guilty to 19 not guilty, which was one less than the number necessary for conviction.

In the case of Belknap, though he had resigned, he was impeached on specific charges of bribery of which the Senate held him guilty, but in a sense acquitted him by voting against removing him from office. What the past procedure illustrates is the legislative tendency to focus on specific issues, and this is not confined to impeachment but is a common occurrence. Decisions of a broad nature may turn on test votes. The question of what is impeachable and what is not has therefore become the most important matter before the House Judiciary Committee.

The realization that on the basis of present evidence, conviction of the President of a violation of law is on shaky grounds has led to the projection of the issue onto the broader base of betrayal of trust and excesses of power. But experience suggests that, in a show-down, Congress will desire something more specific than the formation of the "Plumbers unit," or the "secret" bombing of Cambodia or creating the atmosphere of "oppression" on which to hang an impeachment vote.

Unless the House Judiciary Committee can bring forth what amounts to an indictment of the President for specific violations of law, its case will not be in its strongest posture.

Given the present prospect that the Senate, on the basis of existing evidence, would fail substantially short of even a majority for conviction, (two-thirds is required) it is hard to see how the ACLU argument can sensibly prevail with doubtful congressmen.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Those who vote in the House for impeachment—except for the committed anti-Nixonites—will be uncomfortable without a specific reason, and even more so if the present attitude in the Senate continues, and the prospect is against conviction of President Nixon and his removal from office.

As the Judiciary Committee studies the question, its problem will not become any easier. It will see that in the absence of specific law violation, the Senate has been skittish about removing judges from office. ACLU itself points out that of the 12 men impeached by the House of Representatives, only four were convicted.

Of the nine federal judges who have been impeached in all history, only four were actually removed from office.

It is clear that the last of them, in 1936, was acquitted of specific criminal charges, but nevertheless was removed from office on general principles. He had, however, been charged by the House with specific crimes such as acceptance of bribes and evasion of income taxes, and it was the exploration of these alleged offenses which caused the Senate to decide that he had brought his court into scandal and disrepute.

So it is not so much the legalities of the matter as the record that in practice the removal from office of any official would be doubly difficult in the case of a President as contrasted with some obscure federal judge.

The practicality of the matter is that, unless President Nixon can be exposed to a strong indictment that he violated the criminal law by obstructing justice and authorizing illegal acts, the impeachment case against him will be on shaky grounds.

NORTHEAST CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, Northeast Catholic High School of Philadelphia recently placed first in the National Model United Nations Championship hosted by Georgetown University here in Washington.

Northeast Catholic won out over competition from 300 high schools from the United States, Canada, Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Western Europe. A total of 2,000 students participated, and the Philadelphians defeated Miramonte High School of Orinda, Calif., for first place. Their award was presented by Deputy U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations W. Tapley Bennett.

Like all of the participants, Northeast Catholic was assigned a representative country's point of view on international affairs. Judges from Georgetown's school of foreign service determined which school did the best job of portraying the policies of the Government it was representing. The students from Northeast Catholic represented the United States, and as one judge stated: their "portrayal—made me proud to be an American."

Mr. President, Pennsylvania is proud of Northeast Catholic.

March 27, 1974

WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be sending a newsletter to my constituents within a few days. I wish to include the contents of that newsletter in the RECORD at this point.

WASHINGTON SPOTLIGHT—REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN ED ESHLEMAN
BELIEVE IT OR NOT

At the height of the energy crisis when Americans were waiting in long lines to get gasoline, the Saudi Arabian ambassador to the United Nations was insisting that our state Department furnish him easy access to unlimited supplies of gas. It seems that he was upset by the fact that his staff was having trouble obtaining fuel for the ambassadorial automobile; trouble meaning that they, too, were having to wait in line.

That request, coming from a diplomat whose nation led the embargo of crude oil from the Middle East, seems something less than a model of delicacy. In fact, it should qualify the ambassador for someone's "nerve of the year" award.

QUESTIONNAIRE QUISTERS

One of the interesting things about sending out a questionnaire is the comments that you receive when they come back. This year the commentary has ranged from objective to obscene and from intellectual to infuriated. But all of it helps me get a better feel for what's on people's minds.

Someone in my office even suggested that the pay raise question was the subject of the smiles in the picture at the right. Aides Bob Walker and Tom Bucher are shown looking at the questionnaire returns with me and the suggestion was that we had just found the one constituent in favor of the salary hike.

But if the pay hike was unpopular, the poll, itself, was not. This year's return was the biggest I have ever received, so big, in fact, that my staff and I were buried in an avalanche of polls for several weeks.

INFLATIONARY INFECTION

A sore that has been festering on the national scene for too long is runaway prices. Inflation has been eating into our paychecks, unchecked, for nearly a decade. Congress has talked a lot about the problem, but really has been unwilling to "take the bull by the horns."

It is apparent to many Americans that the partial wage and price control program enacted so hastily by Congress a couple of years ago has been a failure. The time has come for Congress to let supply and demand govern the marketplace. Giving the consumer rather than the Government the power to regulate prices now can be seen as a reasonable alternative to the intolerable cost-of-living jumps under the control program.

But the chief action Congress could take as an anti-inflation measure is to get a grip on Federal spending. As it now stands, Federal taxes are a double-barreled burden. Not only are they the burden felt on April 15, but because they are used to finance the big spending schemes that fuel inflation, the same taxes take another chunk of cash out of everyone's pocketbook. If Congress would just curb its spending habits enough to balance the national budget, each family budget would be easier to manage.

WHO'S SORRY NOW

In a bulletin from the UAW, credit is given to the Nation's labor lobbyists for pushing the postcard registration bill along in Congress. With all the potential for mischief contained in that legislation, I wonder if the labor movement will be so quick to claim it if sometime in the future it results in some fraudulent elections.

Or, will this be another case of forgetfulness on the part of labor, like forgetting who pushed through the bill that shackled us with unworkable wage and price controls.

ECONOMIC DIFFERENCES

You may have heard it before, but the following definition of economic systems is so descriptive, I think it bears repeating. The definition illustrates the effect of each system on a small, two-cow farm.

Under socialism, you milk the cows, the government confiscates the milk, gives you a receipt and a little of the milk back; under communism, the government milks the cows, seizes the milk and then shoots the cows; under nazism, the government seizes the cows and shoots you; under bureaucratism, a federal inspector comes to milk the cows and then throws the milk away; under capitalism, you sell one of the cows and buy a bull.

ENERGY A-PLenty

According to a report issued this month by the Department of the Interior, coal holds a vast potential as a primary energy source for the future.

The study says that there are 3 trillion tons of coal in the earth's crust within the United States. That figure represents 80 percent of our known fossil fuel resources. Some is deeply buried; other deposits are at or near the surface. It is estimated that about one-half of the total amount could be recovered with modern technology while still providing adequate environmental safeguards.

The question is how the vast supplies of coal can best be used to meet our energy needs. One choice is to burn the coal directly, but much of it has a high-sulphur content meaning this method of usage would aggravate our pollution problems.

Another suggested way to make coal work for us is to convert it into clean synthetic oil. The yield would come to two barrels or more per ton of coal. That would mean potentially 4 trillion barrels of oil made from coal—about seven times the world's proven reserves of oil.

Conversion to clean gas is an additional alternative. This method would yield about 32,000 trillion cubic feet of gas—approximately 10 times the amount of recoverable natural gas now available to the nation.

The coal study alone indicates to me that energy independence is an attainable goal for the United States. All we have to do is be willing to try.

ROAD TO RUIN

A former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Dr. Warren Nutter, says there are three roads to ruin: alcohol is the most expensive, women the most pleasant, and economic planning the most certain.

WASHINGTON VISITORS

Springtime is when many groups decide to hold their legislative meetings in the Nation's Capital. Other organizations from which representative constituents have stopped by to see me in recent weeks have included the Pennsylvania Farmers, the American Legion, and the Lancaster-Lebanon School Superintendents.

A Washington visit is not a bad idea for fuel conscious folks in Lancaster, Lebanon and Chester Counties. With a light foot on the accelerator and a minimum of driving once you get into D.C., you can come and get back home on one tank of gas. And, there is

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a wealth of things to do for everyone in your Nation's Capital. Don't hesitate to get in touch with either of my district offices if you want some advice on what to see and do on a Washington tour.

COST PER GALLON

If you are upset by the increasing cost of a gallon of gasoline—and who can blame you for that—you might also be interested in what you are paying for a gallon of other prominent items in many budgets. The following list compiled by the New York Times Company, does not mean much because the products differ so greatly in production expense and the like, but still it is rather interesting.

Gallon of beer, \$2.50; gallon of catsup, \$2.90; cough syrup, \$25.00; Mr. Clean, \$4.00; distilled water, \$.95; mayonnaise, \$3.95, and vinegar, \$2.90.

BUDGET BULGE

From the days when our country was founded until the middle of World War II, Federal spending totaled \$300 billion.

Next year's budget recommendation is for more than \$300 billion for that single year.

And, I remember coming into the Congress seven years ago when there was concern about breaking the \$200 billion barrier.

You have to wonder how much further the tax dollar can be stretched before it snaps back and gives us all a stinging.

TAX HELP

Experts appearing before the Senate Committee on Aging have testified that as many as one-half of all elderly taxpayers may be overpaying their Federal taxes. Among the reasons given were that some older citizens are overwhelmed by tax law complexities, others are baffled by the government forms and many are simply unaware of legitimate deductions, exemptions and credits.

To help correct that final problem area, the committee has produced a checklist of itemized deductions meant to provide the information older Americans need to figure their taxes. It is not an exhaustive summary, but it could be a useful item, and it is somewhat unique in that it was printed in large type to make it easier for elderly persons to read.

Committee spokesmen have pointed out that the checklist might be very useful to younger taxpayers, too. It is available for 35¢ from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (stock number 5270-02228).

FUELISHNESS

There was a Congressman who heard from a constituent this winter complaining that the fuel shortage has done wonders for her landlord. "Without doing anything," she said, "he's gone from being cheap to patriotic."

BILL MAILLIARD—RESPECTED LEADER

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1974

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives lost one of its finest Members when our colleague Bill Mailliard resigned to assume the post of Ambassador to the Organization of American States.

Bill has done a remarkable job as ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. As the ranking minority member on the Foreign Affairs

Committee, Bill has earned the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle because of his good judgment and sound leadership.

Bill Mailliard was very helpful when I first came to office as a new Member of the House of Representatives. I shall be eternally grateful for his willingness and eagerness to always be available to those of us who wished to learn. This is a trademark of Bill Mailliard.

I am confident that Bill will continue his career of public service with great distinction and I wish him well in the years ahead.

A STEP SHORT OF IMPEACHING

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the growing power of the executive branch has made it increasingly difficult to respond effectively to Presidential abuses of power; an outraged citizenry can only wait, helplessly, until the next election. Presidential impeachment is a drastic, tedious, and involved process that has been attempted only once in our history.

Last May, I proposed a constitutional amendment providing for an alternative between inaction and impeachment. It would give to the Congress the power, by a two-thirds vote in both Houses, to call for a new Presidential election when it determines that the President has lost the confidence of the people to so great an extent that he can no longer effectively carry out the duties of his great office. My distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) has introduced a similar resolution, and resolutions authorizing the Congress to order new elections where the President has been found guilty of certain offenses have been introduced by Mrs. GREEN, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. UDALL.

Reprinted herewith, from the March 5 edition of the New York Times, is a thoughtful article by Tom Wicker advocating a similar approach:

A STEP SHORT OF IMPEACHING

(By Tom Wicker)

The muddled and dangerous political situations in Britain and Israel should be a caution to those who have been glibly promoting the idea of parliamentary government in the United States. On the other hand, the criminal indictment of four men who were once Richard Nixon's closest personal and political aides—not to mention all the other Nixon men implicated by indictment or guilty pleas—raises again the troublesome question of accountability in American government.

In most parliamentary democracies, Mr. Nixon might long since have been voted out of office, not necessarily for any specific offenses of his own, but for the generalized offense of having brought into power men who had violated the public trust and broken the law they were supposed to uphold, as well as for having brought the Government and the office of the Presidency into disrepute and disarray.

In the American system, outraged citizens can only wait three years—in this case—for the opportunity to turn Mr. Nixon's party

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

(not even Mr. Nixon himself) out of office; or they can depend upon Congress to move the legal and political uncertainties of impeachment to the distasteful point of a forced removal, not only of the head of government but of the head of state.

Impeachment is, at best, a lengthy, cumbersome and sweeping process; it might be inappropriate for some relatively minor transgressions by a President, and in some cases it might be too difficult politically even for important offenses. But it is all the Constitution provides for. Therefore, might it not be that the most important institutional reform needed is some guarded version of the "no-confidence" vote that enables parliamentary democracies, in times of great stress, to dismiss governments and get new ones?

This is a matter that deserves long and careful consideration before anything is done; because Mr. Nixon is right that the Presidency ought not to be vulnerable to public opinion polls. No reform ought to make it possible for a President to be removed or censured merely for doing unpopular things; nor to be dissuaded from doing something likely to be unpopular by the threat of Congressional retaliation.

In a stable democracy, however, the no-confidence vote does not necessarily provide a swinging door for governments to be shuttled in and out. After all, it has been 34 years since the British Parliament turned a Government out of office by such a vote—and then it was the Government of Neville Chamberlain in one of the dark periods of World War II. Winston Churchill, on the other hand, was master at provoking no-confidence votes that failed—in effect, providing him with recurrent showings of support.

While mere popularity should not be the criterion for keeping or evicting a government, moreover, a leader in a democracy does have to retain substantial support if he is to be an effective leader. Incidentally, the proper response to Mr. Nixon's contention that the Presidency "should not be hostage to what happens to the popularity of a President," is the question: but can Mr. Nixon still govern effectively, whatever the polls show? And could a two-thirds vote in the Senate for his removal possibly be obtained if he were merely unpopular, and not charged with serious offenses as well?

The two-thirds vote—a familiar constitutional safeguard, necessary, for instance, to override Presidential vetoes—should be the key to a no-confidence amendment to the Constitution. Upon a resolution of no confidence, which should contain specified charges either of official misbehavior or of inability to govern effectively, if two-thirds of those voting in each house concurred, the following would be set in motion:

1. The President and those he had appointed to the executive branch would become a caretaker government, pending:

2. A special Presidential election to be held on the first Tuesday after ninety days had elapsed following the no-confidence vote.

3. The winner of the special election, who could be the caretaker President, would be sworn in as President immediately afterwards, would have the option of retaining or dismissing anyone then in the executive branch, and would serve as President until the next regularly scheduled Presidential election.

Admittedly, this is a general idea rather than a precise proposal and it has obvious disadvantages. It does not provide much time, or a method, for an opposition party to select a ticket—or for the in-party to choose a candidate other than the caretaker President. If the latter was a candidate, he would have at least some of the advantages of incumbency, despite the no-confidence vote.

Nevertheless, the present anomalous sit-

uation suggests the utility of this or some other device short of impeachment, but safeguarded against casual or frivolous use, by which Americans could choose to change their Government when the need for change had been formally stated by Congress.

HELP: DOCTORS NEEDED

HON. HAROLD V. FROEHLICH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

MR. FROEHLICH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing contemporary trends in the American medical profession is the emigration of doctors from smalltown practices to larger community hospitals and multiple-doctor clinics. Increasing emphasis on specialization, personal desires for more leisure time and expectations of inadequate compensation have encouraged young doctors to seek employment outside of rural areas leaving many small communities without sufficient medical services. Small towns and villages, however, still offer the advantages of strong community support, friendly atmospheres, and beautiful surroundings which are often lacking in urban areas.

This trend away from rural communities has become apparent in my home State of Wisconsin and, most recently, in the community of Tigerton which I have the honor of representing in Congress. The village of Tigerton—population 750—supports a 26-bed hospital with its own X-ray facilities, operating room, medical laboratory, examining rooms, pediatrics section, and medical clinic. Unless a doctor is found, the Tigerton Hospital-Clinic will close its doors on May 1, 1974, when its present doctor leaves after 25 years of dedicated service. The loss of this service will leave only two doctors in a 60-mile spread between Clintonville, Shawano, and Wausau, and patients from Tigerton and the surrounding area will have to report to these cities for normal and emergency hospital treatment. Moreover, Tigerton will lose its second largest employer and the center of volunteer activities.

Tigerton area citizens recently formed a local health planning committee with the objective of attracting two doctors to the community. Letters have been distributed throughout Wisconsin and the Midwest inviting doctors interested in working with friendly people and enjoying fresh air, clean water, and outdoor activities to contact local officials. The activities of the area health planning committee indicate the strong community support a doctor would enjoy and the urgent need for medical service in Tigerton. Hopefully, someone will answer Tigerton's call for assistance.

I want to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD the following article from the February 15, 1974 issue of the Shawano Evening Leader:

[From the Shawano (Wis.) Evening Leader, Feb. 15, 1974]

TIGERTON CITIZENS FIGHT TO SAVE SMALL HOSPITAL, CLINIC

The Village of Tigerton faces the bleak prospect of losing not only its one doctor, but

because of his leaving, their 26 bed hospital as well.

Many members of this community of 750 find a double loss such as this a bit hard to imagine and have embarked on an all-out campaign to preserve what they call a vital need and a major industry.

Dr. Lawrence Heise, has operated the Tigerton Clinic and Hospital since 1953 and has been an area doctor since 1950. He has decided to leave the village to open a practice in another community.

The doctor is slated to leave on May 1 and after that time the hospital will be rendered virtually inserviceable because of laws requiring a doctor to admit patients.

Representatives from local service groups, churches and a number of concerned citizens have banded together and formed a area health planning committee to deal with their health crisis.

The expressed purpose of the committee is to woo at least two doctors to the Tigerton area thereby retaining their own hospital.

The first order of business undertaken by the committee was to meet with Northeastern Wisconsin Area Health Planning Commission on Jan. 23. Those attending the meeting expressed disappointment that more positive results failed to grow out of the meeting.

Robert O'Dell, a committee director, explained this disappointment was due to trends medicine is taking today. "According to the commission the trend of health planning is to phase out small community hospitals such as ours and the formation of large centralized hospital complexes. They feel that we in the more rural areas can be adequately serviced by an ambulance fleet," he said.

The Tigerton group found this explanation not at all suited to the trends in the Tigerton area and set out to solve their own problems.

They have begun a concentrated letter campaign in which they hope to blanket the entire midwest if necessary to find doctors for their community.

Doctors in the State of Wisconsin have already been contacted by letter and an extensive newspaper and television campaign is in the planning stage.

Their appeal is simple and to the point. The letter frankly states "We in the Tigerton area are in need of your help. Our community urgently needs two physicians. We have the facilities, and a community which would be most inviting for any doctors interested in working with friendly people and enjoy fresh air, clean water and outdoor activities."

O'Dell noted one of the hardest problems in the United States is getting doctors for small community and rural areas.

They plan on pushing the availability of the Tigerton Hospital to the limit. "Our area is unique to most of those others in the U.S. in the respect that we have our own hospital. For this reason we should be able to guarantee any doctor plenty of work," he said.

Work is the one major reason the present doctor is leaving after 25 years. The city pharmacist Joseph Gwidt, a consulting member of the hospital staff felt the work load is too much for one doctor. He in his early 50's would prefer cutting back on the amount of time it normally takes to service the hospital and his extensive clinic practice also located in the hospital. This has prompted his decision to leave Tigerton for a multiple doctor clinic practice in Clintonville.

When he leaves in May there will be only two doctors in a 60 mile spread between Clintonville, Shawano and Wausau; Dr. F. L. Litzen in Gresham and Dr. Deo Almazar in Wittenberg.

The hospital is the main reason for the high work load and stands as a comforting haven to those people reaching the elderly stages, young parents with children, or those who have health problems that need constant monitoring. Their only other alterna-

March 27, 1974

tive is a long, high speed ambulance ride to Shawano, Wausau or Clintonville.

Statistics for the year 1973 are interesting for a community this size. A total of 495 patients were admitted with a daily census figure of seven persons in bed care. A total of 67 babies were born in the facility which boasts an adequate pediatrics section.

The hospital has its own x-ray section, operating room which can handle several types of major surgery, several examining rooms, its own lab which has service from Marshfield hospital for the more complicated analysis.

One of the most appealing things available to a doctor team is the location of the clinic in the hospital basement, which solves the patient transportation problems that plague many clinic-hospital arrangements. The clinic also serves as the emergency room.

Loss of the hospital will affect the community in another way that could have even more far reaching effects on the surrounding area—an economical loss.

The hospital is the second largest industry in the area topped by the Tigerton Lumber Co. About 30 people are employed and the combined impact on the community involves about \$500,000 if it had to be replaced.

Gwidt also referred to the social impact of losing the hospital. It has been the center of many community projects by service clubs and much of its equipment and furnishings were provided in this way. A 14-member hospital auxiliary would be disbanded, again depriving many of community input.

The hospital has been state inspected and approved as well as certified by Medicare.

Russell Kostrzak, chairman of the new health committee summed up the area's feelings in the closing remarks of the letters mailed to doctors:

Closing the hospital, "would be not only a catastrophe for the community but also for the thousands of people in the immediate area who have come to depend on the fine service which our medical facilities have been able to offer.

"We believe that our community and area could very easily support two physicians, with each having adequate free time to enjoy our recreational facilities."

The Village of Tigerton faces a fight many other communities are facing and have already faced. They claim the trends of medical planning are missing the mark completely.

Because they have chosen to live apart from the high speed commuter-computer frenzy of population centers and centralized medicine, somewhere are medical men who feel the same.

They fight to remain captains of their own lives and destinies, not lost somewhere in the sterile halls of the depersonalized system.

TIGERTON HOSPITAL AND CLINIC, Tigerton, Wis., February 6, 1974.

DEAR DOCTOR: We, in the Tigerton area are in need of your help. Our community urgently needs two physicians. We have the facilities and a community which would be most inviting for any doctors interested in working with friendly people and enjoy fresh air, clean water, and outdoor activities.

For the past few years our Hospital & Clinic has been served by one physician in Tigerton and he has decided to join a clinic in another community, which would leave us without a physician as of May 1, 1974. Obviously, without a physician, we would be unable to continue operating our hospital which is currently approved by Medicare and has state certification. This would not only be a catastrophe for the community, but also for the thousands of people in our immediate area who have come to depend on the fine service which our medical facilities have been able to offer.

We believe that our community and area could very easily support two physicians, with each having adequate free time to enjoy our recreational facilities.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We would be very happy to arrange a meeting with any physicians, who may wish more information regarding our hospital, clinic or community and invite them to call collect (715) 535-2115 and speak to Miss Jean Samps or contact us by mail.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL KOSTRZAK,
Chairman, Area Health Planning Council,
Tigerton Hospital and Clinic, Inc.

BREAKTHROUGH IN SOLAR ENERGY TECHNOLOGY AT UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the March/April 1974, edition of the University of Chicago magazine, concerns a recent breakthrough in the way solar energy is gathered. The new solar energy collecting unit is an invention of Prof. Roland Winston and it is capable of 10 times as much energy concentration as the general level of sunlight without diurnal tracking of the sun. This makes the unit practically applicable as a power source. Demonstration models will be built at the University's Enrico Fermi Institute and at Argonne National Laboratory. I know that because of the energy crisis the invention of new energy producing technology is of high interest to my colleagues and I commend it to your attention:

SOLAR POWER NEARER IN WINSTON BREAKTHROUGH

Roland Winston, associate professor in the Department of Physics, the Enrico Fermi Institute and the College, set out in 1966 to develop a new type of collector for Cherenkov radiation. Today he winds up having invented a device which may prove to be of considerable importance in solving the world's energy shortage.

Mr. Winston (SB'56, SM'57, PhD'63) recalled, at a departmental colloquium on campus earlier this year, how he worked out the mathematics for an "ideal collector" of the faint Cherenkov light, which is emitted by charged particles traveling faster than light (in a medium) and is useful in identifying energetic electrons. The collector turned out to be composed, in cross section, of two tilted parabolas.

Enter Robert G. Sachs, professor in the Department of Physics and the Fermi Institute, who last year took over the reins as director of Argonne National Laboratory. In the course of meetings with an Argonne planning group working on possible energy sources, Mr. Sachs remembered the Winston light collector project and suggested to Mr. Winston that it might be adapted for the collection of solar energy.

Previous efforts to harness the sun's energy had not produced practical results, in part because stationary collectors could concentrate only about three times as much energy as the general level of ambient sunlight. The Winston collector, lined with a thin reflective film, was capable of ten times as much energy concentration as the general level of sunlight (figured roughly, under ideal conditions, as one kilowatt per square meter), without diurnal tracking of the sun. It had, therefore, the potentiality of being practically applicable as a power source.

Mr. Winston and his collaborators at Argonne received in January a go-ahead, in

the form of research grants, from the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Science Foundation. Following the prescribed pattern of feasibility studies, test models and demonstration installations, the solar collector is expected to be ready to put the sun to work.

The light collector obviously will not play a role in this year's energy crunch, but if the energy squeeze is viewed as a long-term phenomenon—which it is—the Winston apparatus may become valuable on one or both of two levels, one longer-range than the other. The device is capable of converting enough sunlight so that it may ultimately be used as a primary source for the generation of electricity, but its development for this purpose will take a while. In the shorter haul it may be possible to develop units for the heating (and also cooling) of individual homes and other buildings.

One of Mr. Winston's key contributions in working out his ideal collector was his abandonment of the notion that the collector would necessarily be governed by the principles of conventional imaging optics. His light concentrator would have, in optical terms, and extremely low *f* number—0.5. The *f* number is a concept familiar, at least in approximate terms, to anyone who operates a camera; it represents the relation between the brightness of the image and the size of the aperture. No ordinary camera can achieve as small an *f* number as 0.5, but this is because of the necessity of creating an image. If the imaging requirement is dropped, Mr. Winston found, the ultimate *f* number can be obtained.

Mr. Winston's chief collaborator in the early stages of his work was Henry Hinterberger, formerly chief engineer of the Fermi Institute's cyclotron; he is now at the National Accelerator Laboratory at Batavia, Illinois. More recently Riccardo Levi Setti, professor of physics, became an enthusiastic proponent of the application of ideal collectors to solar energy.

Another difficulty encountered in previous efforts to make use of solar radiation was the apparent motion of the sun. It was possible to build tracking equipment like that used in an observatory, where it keeps the telescope trained on its objective. But this represented tremendous added complications—and cost factors. Mr. Winston worked out a simpler solution to this problem: adapt the collector in the form of a trough, so that the sun "follows" the collector, rather than the reverse.

Not all the problems are now solved, of course. One difficulty is that the sun (1) doesn't shine at night, (2) is weak at the start and ends of the day, and (3) on cloudy days lacks a good deal of its sunny day punch. The answer, obviously, is energy storage, and there are many methods of storing energy, including batteries.

The whole effort has been a course of scientific ecumenism for Mr. Winston. In the course of the work he found himself studying a number of subjects outside his own field of physics—optics, astronomy, and even human anatomy and marine biology. After he had completed his initial studies on the shape of the "ideal collector" he learned in a conversation with Mr. Levi Setti, who also has a considerable interest in biology, that, more than 100,000,000 years ago, nature had perfected in the horseshoe crab very much the same parabolic collector, in the form of the receptor units (ommatidia) of the animal's compound eyes. He had read of the phenomenon in a journal.

Messrs. Levi Setti and Winston, working with Donald Park, a research assistant at Fermi, acquired and studied a horseshoe crab; the work confirmed Mr. Levi Setti's recollection, and Mr. Winston later acknowledged ruefully that if he had been aware of the eyes of the *Limulus* earlier it would have saved him a year of work.

Even the cone cells in the human eye, which can detect the presence of even a few photons, use the same structural principle,

he learned from Jay Enoch, of Washington University School of Medicine, who is an expert on the optics of vision.

And while the Atomic Age has yet to reach its zenith, the Solar Age may already be dawning.

GREAT GRAIN ROBBERY OF 1972

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, at a hearing sponsored by me on March 2 in New Britain, Conn., representatives of the baking industry in my State, along with concerned consumers, provided valuable insight into the hardship and suffering that are resulting daily from high costs for needed commodities. Skyrocketing family food prices are the painful result.

It is no secret that last year food prices rose some 16 percent. Moreover, the Agriculture Department predicts that food will cost 12 to 16 percent more by the end of this year. All who share my deep concern for the plight of the American consumer have decried the "Great Grain Robbery of 1972" in which the sale of some 440 million bushels of wheat to the Russians left our stores seriously depleted, causing the price of wheat to more than triple in less than 2 years, and resulting in higher prices at the supermarket.

Those who testified at my hearing touched upon these areas and more. They registered distrust and frustration with the conflicting reports of grain supplies that have surfaced recently. Many echoed my call for an embargo on wheat exports until we are sure that we have enough of this needed grain for domestic consumption this year. Those who delivered testimony painted a very real picture of the disastrous effects inflation is having on their businesses and their daily lives.

Alan Parker, president of the Nutmeg Bakers Supply Co. in New Haven, Conn., predicted that unless something is done about runaway prices, one-third of the bakers in our State will go out of business in the next 3 months. Mr. Parker reported that flour selling for \$14 per 100-pound bag at the beginning of the year was going for \$18 per bag at the time of the hearing. Before the Russian grain deal, the same size bag sold for \$7 or \$8, he said. Moreover, soybean oil shortening that sold for 16 cents a pound 1 year ago went up to 26 cents a pound by last November and cost over 50 cents a pound at the time of the hearing earlier this month. Mr. Parker, whose company has been supplying bakers in my State for over 50 years, indicated that, due to price increases in the past 18 months, over 100 major bakeries and more than 300 smaller ones nationally went out of business with a loss of over 10,000 jobs.

Dominic Cassone, president of Cassone's Bakery, Stamford, Conn., noted that prices for bakery ingredients are rising so fast that bakers can hardly

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

keep pace. Benjamin Price, president of Cousin's Bakery in New Britain, reported that in the 20 days preceding the hearing the price of sugar rose \$5 per 100 pounds. Indicating that Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz has ruled out dollar-a-loaf bread, Price queried, "Does he mean he's pushing for 85 cents?"

Fred Schro, president of the Marchigiano Bakery in New Haven, said he hoped the American people would learn from the mistake of the Russian wheat deal, while John Rader, of the Reymond Baking Co. in Waterbury, expressed concern with conflicting reports on the grain situation. Fred Wolfe, president of Wolfe's Baking Co. in New Haven, questioned how long consumers would put up with necessary increases in bakery product prices. He called for immediate disclosure of wheat supplies and exports, and urged that adequate domestic supplies be conserved. Mr. Wolfe expressed the view that the Export Priorities Act, which I introduced earlier, is an excellent basis for such action.

Bertha Groski, president of the Connecticut Bakers Association, echoed the sentiments of many of her colleagues at the hearing in recommending an immediate embargo on wheat exports. She questioned how much longer bakers would be able to absorb cost increases.

Michael LaRose, director of the Senior Citizen's Center in New Britain, provided an example of how inflation, particularly spiraling food prices, is having a devastating effect on the meager budgets of our senior citizens, who are trying to exist on fixed incomes while living costs skyrocket. According to Mr. LaRose, increased costs will lead to either a reduction in the nutritional content or an increase in expense to the elderly for meals provided to them in the New Britain area under a program established with funds from the Federal nutrition program for the elderly. The admirable intent of Congress is thus being seriously undermined by spiraling inflation.

Albert Science, deputy director of the Norwalk Economic Opportunity, NOW, Inc., indicating that bread is a staple for many Americans, noted that high food prices had a particularly harmful effect on low-income families. Mrs. Arlene Stange, representing the Junior Women's Club of Plainville, spoke as a mother of four children and a consumer when she said that prices for food are increasing at such a rapid rate that middle-income families just barely get by.

Also testifying at the hearing was New Britain Mayor Stanley J. Pac, who called for a replenishing of our grain reserves to stabilize prices.

Mr. Speaker, the message coming from my hearing is unmistakable: Something must be done now to curb spiraling inflation, particularly in the food sector. Time and again I have called for a commodity policy in the Agriculture Department that recognizes the plight of the consumer. Such a policy at this time would require an embargo on wheat and other grain exports until we know that there is enough grain for domestic consumption. Yet, time and again the De-

March 27, 1974

partment has refused to follow this reasoned track, and has instead provided questionable assurances that echo the hollowness of erroneous grain supply predictions for last year and the year before.

It is my opinion that, as Mr. Wolfe suggested at the hearing, the Export Priorities Act I introduced could serve as a basis for a sensible agricultural policy—one which takes the consumer into account. This is as it must be.

An amendment to the Export Administration Act of 1969, the bill would require the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the quantity of raw and certain refined agricultural products that will be available in a crop year. He would then determine the amounts needed for domestic consumption, with a reasonable quantity to allow for a carryover supply of the products, including an amount for disaster relief and other emergencies. The remaining quantity of the commodity would be available for export.

Under this mandate the Agriculture Department would have to insure that domestic commodity needs are met. There would be far less chance of excessive exports depriving our people of badly needed food and food stuffs.

Only by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to set out the commodity situation anticipated for the coming year—emphasizing domestic needs and dealing with these needs as a priority—can we assure that the people of Connecticut and all Americans will have a sufficient variety of foods at reasonable prices.

PROVIDING EMERGENCY GENERATORS IN HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, older Americans, senior citizens, the elderly—all merely catch phrases describing our parents, our grandparents, and all those a generation removed from us who strove and labored in good faith to make a better life for us. In recognition of our great debt to them they must be now accorded every dignity, consideration, and ease which we can provide. It has always been one of my prime concerns to seek constant improvement in the lifestyle of older Americans. I call the attention of my fellow Members to a resolution passed in the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and approved by the Governor on the 7th day of February 1974, memorializing Congress to provide emergency generators in all housing for the elderly:

RESOLUTION—STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
Resolution memorializing Congress to provide emergency generators in all housing for the elderly.

Whereas, the housing for the elderly in many instances are above three floors and the elderly during a power failure are unable to use the elevators, and physically unable to

use the stairs, emergency generators are necessary; now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the general assembly of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, now requests the congress of the United States to provide for emergency generators in all housing for the elderly; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of state be and he is hereby respectfully requested and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate of the United States, the speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Rhode Island delegation in Congress.

DO NOT GAMBLE WITH SUMMER YOUTH JOBS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the GAO has released a report, compiled at my request, which documents a misuse of Federal funds by the city of Cleveland in its operation of summer youth employment programs in 1973.

The report reveals that the same cold, callous, calculated political manipulation of Federal funds which permeated the model cities program stifled the summer job program for work-hungry inner-city teenagers.

For years the summer youth employment program was run by the Cleveland Board of Education. But in 1972 Mayor Perk requested control of the program and, according to the Malek Memos, the White House OK'd the transfer as part of President Nixon's reelection strategy. Cleveland City Hall, however, did not operate the jobs program in 1972, relying instead, through a subcontract, on the board of education with its long experience and success.

But in 1973, the city of Cleveland, with no prior experience and completely inadequate preparation, took over two-thirds of the summer youth employment program. The result was a patronage bonanza and a bureaucratic snafu of near-monumental proportions. Ineligible youths from families whose incomes exceeded poverty levels drew checks that rightly belonged to poor youths—and often for doing no work at all.

A great number of youths—1,765 of them—were given \$110,866 for working more than the permissible number of hours. Every day of the summer, youths were bused to distant worksites only to find little or no equipment waiting for them and frequently no supervisors. The program was designed to provide meaningful, supervised work experiences for low-income students who would otherwise find no jobs and earn no spending money. But these young people very often considered the work they were given both demeaning and meaningless.

The crowning failure of the city program was the payroll system. Some youths were paid before they did any work, while others sometimes had to wait 2, 4 and even 8 weeks after the time they were supposed to receive their

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

checks. In fact, some still have received no checks.

The GAO has concluded:

The large number of errors created a climate for even more errors and the city was not equipped to handle the problem.

The GAO has found some defects also in the Board of Education's share of the program but overall it was far superior to the city's.

Congress never intended that the poor and disadvantaged inner-city youth, for whom they earmarked these summer job funds, be treated as political pawns. I intend to see that this disgraceful misuse and abuse of Federal funds by an inept, inexperienced and insensitive administration does not occur again.

I have written to Secretary of Labor Peter Brennan urging him to return the summer youth employment program to the experienced and substantially successful Cleveland Board of Education. The Cleveland Plain Dealer agrees that this should be done. I wish to reprint here their editorial strongly endorsing this urgently needed action.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 15, 1974]

DON'T GAMBLE WITH JOB PROGRAM

The only encouragement the city of Cleveland might find in the General Accounting Office's report on the city's administration of the federal summer job program last year is that it would be hard to do worse.

Rather than taking that bet though, the U.S. Department of Labor should return the job program to the school system, which had run it until last summer.

Control of jobs is a powerful political weapon, and there is evidence that the summer program was shifted from the schools to the city to benefit Republican Mayor Perk.

It's time to stop playing politics and to recognize the city's inability to run the program efficiently. The summer job program is supposed to give young men and women from poor families the chance to earn some money and acquire work experience. It is not supposed to be an introductory course in political patronage.

The GAO report gives the Labor Department the evidence it needed to compare the efficiency of the programs operated last year by the city and by the school system. Though the school system, which had about one-third of the jobs, was not perfect, it was far ahead of the city.

The Labor Department may have to find some face-saving device for the city, but nonetheless it should act quickly so that the summer job program can be organized and ready to go by the end of school. Counselors must be hired and trained, work applications must be taken and screened, jobs and applicants must be matched up. The time to do it is within the next few weeks, and the responsibility is the Labor Department's.

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, now that the Arabs seem in a mood to call a recess in their blackmailing of the United States, I hope we do not invite them to do it again.

But the House Interior Committee is considering H.R. 11500, the bill that would prohibit the surface mining of much of our most accessible coal reserves. If we enact this bill, we will be sending the Arabs a signal that we are not serious about becoming self-sufficient in energy. When we cut back on our coal supply, that is an open invitation for them to do the same with our oil supply.

On the other hand, if we develop our great coal reserves fully, we can tell the Arabs to stick the oil in their oases.

Enacting H.R. 11500 would be as crazy as trying to grow bananas on Pike's Peak, but a good deal more dangerous to our national welfare.

MISSION TO MOSCOW

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger is at this moment in Moscow engaged in intensive discussions with the leaders of the Soviet Union on a wide array of critical problems in international relations. In pursuit of détente the Secretary is expected to discuss arms limitations, the Middle East and trade with Soviet Communist party leader Leonid Brezhnev. On the eve of the Secretary's departure, two warnings were sounded in the United States which underlined one of the most important points at stake in these discussions. On March 21, Rabbi Israel Miller, chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations, and Stanley Lowell, newly elected chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, issued a joint statement on behalf of nearly 40 member organizations and hundreds of local community councils urging the Secretary "to unequivocally state the view of the American people in regard to emigration of Soviet Jews." The full text of the statement follows:

On the eve of the departure of the Secretary of State to the Soviet Union, the American Jewish Community has received alarming reports of a severe decline in the emigration of Soviet Jews. This Soviet effort to shrink the movement of Jews to Israel and elsewhere is contrary to ongoing efforts to expand.

Mindful of the impact of pending trade legislation on the emigration of Soviet Jews, we therefore choose this moment to endorse the strongest possible legislation by the Congress, which will assist an unhampered and unrestricted emigration. We unanimously state our support for the Jackson Amendment, now before the Senate, which was overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives.

We have requested the Secretary of State to continue this Administration's efforts, and to unequivocally state the view of the American people in regard to emigration of Soviet Jews. We trust that the Secretary will convince the Soviet Union that the roots of the problem and the resolution of the issues are in Moscow.

On March 24, nationally syndicated columnist Joseph Kraft developed this

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

same point, concluding that easing the conditions for emigration of Soviet Jews is "an extremely narrow concession to ask in return for easier (trade) credits." I commend both these cogent and powerful statements to the attention of my colleagues in the belief that many of us share the hope that Secretary Kissinger will return from this latest mission with heartening news of a Soviet decision to fully observe the internationally guaranteed right of emigration. The Kraft column follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 24, 1974]

(By Joseph Kraft)

MISSION TO MOSCOW

Overwhelming evidence argues that the Soviet leaders are eager to cut a deal with Henry Kissinger on his visit to Moscow this week. The question is on what terms.

For Dr. Kissinger, for the first time, goes to Moscow representing a President in deep trouble at home. So there is an inevitable temptation to go for an arrangement which serves the President's short-term domestic interest as distinct from the longer-term national interest.

The best evidence of the Soviet mood lies in a recent intelligence analysis of statements made by 14 different Soviet leaders over the past eight months. The analysis shows that all of them line up behind party boss Leonid Brezhnev in favoring cooperation between Moscow and Washington.

Only two—President Nikolai Podgorny in a speech on July 31 and Marshal Andrei Grechko, the defense minister, in a speech on Jan. 6—stressed the risks of easing tension. Several others—including the party ideologists Mikhail Suslov, who emphasized Chinese maneuvers against detente in a speech on Dec. 6—seem surprisingly favorable to Big Two harmony. Mr. Brezhnev himself, in a speech in Alma-Alta on March 15, surveyed all the possible dangers and then asserted, "We will continue to advance firmly down the road" of cooperation.

That analysis is reinforced by Dr. Kissinger's conversations with Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin. Mr. Dobrynin returned to Washington after a couple of weeks of talks in Moscow early last week. After seeing Dobrynin, Kissinger told his Thursday news conference that he was "reasonably confident" about the upcoming talks.

The guess here is that Dobrynin laid out for the Soviet leadership President Nixon's grave impeachment problems, with a warning that Mr. Nixon might not be in the White House for long. Apparently the reaction of the Russians was to try to make a deal now with the President they know, rather than to have to begin all over again later on.

In these conditions, with the Russians evidently keen for a deal, the important thing is not to get a quickie cosmetic undertaking which will go no further than helping Mr. Nixon in his immediate problems at home. What counts is to make arrangements that lead on to further agreements for future Presidents, and the momentum needs to be maintained in at least two separate areas.

Arms control is one. In the Moscow summit of 1972, the Big Two reached an agreement to limit the absolute number of offensive and defensive nuclear launchers. The logical next step is a qualitative limitation that would restrict the number of multiple warheads, or MIRVs, which each side can use in a single launcher.

But if the agreement only applies to numbers of launchers with MIRVs, the Russians, who have far larger weapons, would gain a distinct advantage. That is why Defense Secretary James Schlesinger has been insisting that any agreement should achieve "essential equivalence", which means that Dr. Kissinger needs to go beyond limiting multiple

warheads to arrangements that put a lid on Russia's massive build-up.

A second area of discussion involves progress toward more freedom in the Soviet Union. The Russians are cooperating with the United States in part because they want to import American technology on favorable credit terms. Since they want special favors, it is legitimate for the United States to set special conditions.

The one condition on which there has been American agreement so far is Sen. Henry Jackson's stipulation that Moscow ease up on conditions for emigration. That seems to many people, including this writer, an extremely narrow concession to ask in return for easier credits. But since it is the only demand that has surfaced, it ought to be hammered home. At a minimum, in other words, Dr. Kissinger needs to come back from Moscow with Soviet agreement that there should be an end to harassment of those who want to emigrate and an undertaking as to numbers permitted to leave.

These conditions for agreement may seem too tough to President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger and other recent converts to the concept of detente with the Soviet Union. In fact they are minimal. Anything less will merely represent a cosmetic agreement, designed to help Mr. Nixon battle against impeachment by a trip to the summit in Moscow. The thought to bear in mind is a statement made by Dr. Kissinger, that he wanted to "conclude the building of a structure which we can pass on to succeeding administrations."

MICHEL'S WATCHDOG IDEA

HON. LESLIE C. AREND

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. AREND. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the House Republican task force on congressional reform and minority staffing under the chairmanship of our colleague, Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, published a series of recommendations in a volume entitled, "We Propose: A Modern Congress."

My colleague from Illinois, Congressman ROBERT H. MICHEL, was a contributor to this study, and one of his recommendations was that reforms be instituted which would give the minority party in any Congress a more effective investigative role. Mr. MICHEL sponsored legislation in the House (H.R. 9252) on June 21, 1965, and in succeeding Congresses to implement this recommendation.

On February 29, 1974, Mr. MICHEL and Mr. CLEVELAND in a joint statement before the Select Committee on Committees made the following proposal: That when both the executive and legislative branches are under the control of the same political party, a select committee in the House under the control of the minority party be automatically created, funded, and vested with wide-ranging investigatory authority.

The idea of a watchdog committee is beginning to generate more interest in the light of recent events. On March 23 the Peoria, Ill., Journal Star endorsed the proposal editorially. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include this editorial herewith. It should

March 27, 1974

provide much food for serious thought on both sides of the aisle:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Mar. 23, 1974]

MICHEL'S WATCHDOG IDEA

It must be admitted that Congressman Bob Michel has looked a bit ahead from the dust-storm now going on in Washington, and taken a position that makes more sense for a GOP legislator than the reactions of many others these days.

Michel has had the guts to look beyond Watergate to the situations that have often prevailed in Washington—and try to remedy it in future.

There have been rocks turned over before that demanded extensive investigation—but went no further.

Naturally, those were times when both the President and the Congress were in the grasp of the same party.

Bob Michel's idea is that there should be a permanent watchdog committee chaired by the minority party as a key investigative operation of the Congress.

He has pointed out the doctrine of this Congress that the administration can't investigate itself. He has taken the principles which the Congress has proclaimed and practiced regarding Watergate, and said, "Now let's apply these principles to ourselves and on a permanent basis", in effect.

He says that by their own moral pronouncements in the past year clearly the majority party in Congress cannot "investigate itself", and clearly such levels of power must be subject to inquiry just like the President.

His answer: which ever is the minority party ought to automatically control a permanent watchdog committee—just as Democrat-controlled committees have investigated and are investigating the Republican President.

It does seem that if those active in this affair have been sincere in their principles and moral pronouncements—and not merely opposition political opportunists—they would have to agree with our Congressman.

And, indeed, if we are faced with a landslide election this year, some such watchdog restraint will be badly needed in Congress for Congress—lest we have a real power runaway there.

The truth is, if they think about it, such a set-up might save Democrats from themselves next year.

As we said, more prophetically than we knew on the eve of the 1972 election, in advance to emotional young partisans:

If you think you'll be frustrated if you lose an election, you haven't seen anything. You may win one. That's when you can really get hurt.

That's of course, is when you have awesome responsibility—and also when there is the greatest hazard of going off the deep end.

We've seen it too many times. We don't need it again in 1974.—C. L. Dancey.

LAWS OF NATURE VERSUS LAWS OF MAN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record today an article from the April/May publication, National Wildlife, which offers comments on the historical prelude to laws Congress has enacted "to conserve and protect" species

of wildlife, fish, birds and plants. I would only point out that there are many other laws Congress has enacted with the purpose of preserving the various wildlife habitats and species of all wildlife which are not mentioned in the following article:

LAW OF NATURE VERSUS LAWS OF MAN
(By George Reiger)

From the time of the Babylonians down to the present day, governments have been passing countless laws ostensibly designed to protect wildlife. Within the past decade, however, an event took place unprecedented in man's complex and often disastrous relationship with the other creatures on this planet. For the first time, a body politic—specifically, the U.S. Congress—actually passed a law to protect endangered wildlife with no other motive than a genuine wish to see something rare and wonderful saved for its own sake.

In the past, laws touching upon wildlife have hardly been so altruistic. The Egyptians, Jews, Greeks and Romans all created laws apparently bearing on wildlife protection. But every one of these laws was preoccupied with the welfare of the lawmaker, not wildlife. There were taboos, for instance, against the casual killing of wild cattle in some early societies—but only because the cattle were to be saved for sacrifices during religious festivals, or used for ceremonial entertainments such as the "bull dances" of Crete. The Semitic prohibition against the slaughter or eating of swine may have incidentally protected some lingering bands of wild pigs. But the law was created primarily to eliminate swine cults once prevalent throughout the Middle East.

Ironically, the more legal or religious interest man has taken in some species, the more disastrous the consequences have been to the wildlife concerned. The Egyptians, for example, venerated hawks (the sun god Ra was hawk-headed) and ibises (the deity Thoth was an ibis). Eventually, such worship led to wholesale destruction of these birds by worshippers throughout Egypt. In the late 1960s, an underground gallery was discovered holding more than a million mummified ibises!

Historically, the privileged classes—priests and aristocracy—have been entitled to use certain species of wildlife considered "above" the common man. Lion hunting in Mesopotamia was strictly a royal sport. In medieval times, the nobility in Europe were entitled to hunt deer; the common folk hunted rabbits. In England, all sturgeon "belonged" to the crown and if a commoner caught one, he was expected to turn it over to the authorities. While some of these laws seem politically unjust today, they did serve the purpose of providing certain wildlife with some measure of protection. Doubtless one reason why there are still wild boar in densely-settled Belgium, or wolves in Spain, is that the larger mammals of Europe have traditionally been hunted by limited numbers of privileged people. Indeed, since World War II greater recreational opportunity for every man has done more to threaten wildlife in Europe than all the hunting by royalty and clergy in centuries past.

One factor that forever changed man's attitudes about non-egalitarian restraints on trapping, hunting and fishing was the discovery of the New World. Whereas deer, grouse and sturgeon were food and game fit only for the likes of kings in the Old World, they were everyone's meat in America—first through necessity, then out of custom and a faith that every man had the right to any resource he could gather through his own initiative. Clearly, in fact, the growth of democracy in the New World is linked to the earliest settlers' contact with forest, water and wildlife resources that seemed inexhaustible.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

table. A New England farmer with a musket might some years kill more deer than an old English king would see in a lifetime. And Captain John Smith intentionally dramatized this contrast between Old World and New World when he wrote, after one of his early visits to the Chesapeake Bay, that "we had more Sturgeon than could be devoured by Dog or Man." The sturgeon, interestingly enough, is now extinct in the Chesapeake.

As traditionally exclusive wildlife values were overturned, that overturning contributed to the emerging philosophy of independence that finally led to "the great experiment," as American democracy came to be known. However, while there were enormous human benefits in that experiment, the results for wildlife were little short of disastrous. By the time of the Revolution, the slaughter of deer was so widespread that it became necessary to impose closed seasons in every colony but Georgia.

Unless such laws can be enforced, though, they are merely curious footnotes in history. And since Massachusetts was the only colony to set up a system of wardens or "deer reeves" in 1738—and since by then in America it was every man's right to own a gun and take whatever game he desired—poaching became a vigorous tradition. As early as the 1640s, Plymouth Colony governor William Bradford warned of the precipitous decline of waterfowl in New England. In 1710, Massachusetts passed a law prohibiting the use of boats to pursue ducks and geese. The main idea behind this measure was to give the birds some respite during the summer molt, when they are unable to fly.

Even the history of offshore fishing features early legislation that gives the appearance, at least, of being conservation-minded. In 1668, Massachusetts passed a law that no cod could be killed or dried for sale in December or January. Another law specified that no mackerel could be caught before June, except for barter while fresh. Such restrictions may have given the great schools of sea fishes some respite during a part of the year, and even protected certain species during spawning. Yet, U.S. statesman Elihu Root once pointed out that those laws actually had little to do with conservation. Rather, he said, they derived from a belief that roe-laden fish were inferior items of trade that would ruin the fame and value of salt-fish barrels bearing the Massachusetts seal. Thus, like most colonial laws affecting game birds and mammals, the early restrictions on fisheries were less concerned with the future of wild species than they were with the fortunes of the men who enacted them.

The primary responsibility for regulating and protecting wildlife has always rested with the state governments, under whose jurisdiction resident species of animals fall. During the mid-1800's, however, when the excessive use and abuse of all natural resources began to weigh heavily on the nation's conscience, the American people began to look increasingly to Washington for leadership. And often, they were disappointed. The momentum for creating the Yellowstone National Park in 1872 came from a handful of men dedicated to saving its unique attributes and wildlife. But the idea literally had to be sold to Congress. The legislators were persuaded that more long-term money could be made out of a tourist industry bringing people on the new railroads to see the geysers and hot springs than was to be made out of cutting up and selling the mineral formations to the highest bidder.

In this century, the extinction of the passenger pigeon and the near miss with the bison also helped persuade Congress to act on a number of laws aimed at perpetuating all game birds and animals. Again, however,

the motive was rarely altruistic. While guilt over past losses contributed to those first turn-of-the-century successes, a desire to perpetuate birds and animals for sport and a possible return to market use lay at the core of the effort.

Still, those turn-of-the-century laws represented a momentous change in the course of wildlife history in America. After all, while the nation was establishing a system of refuges primarily to give respite to migratory waterfowl, it was also offering sanctuary to a host of birds and mammals not considered in the original plans for such a system.

By mid-century, fueled by the loss of the heath hen and the Carolina parakeet, as well as the successful fight to save the trumpeter swan and the wood duck, there arose a popular feeling of interest and attachment for all creatures in jeopardy. In support of such sentiments, the first U.S. domestic law exclusively concerned with the welfare of all endangered wildlife came into being in 1966. In that year, to quote from the Endangered Species Act, Congress declared that "one of the unfortunate consequences of growth and development in the United States has been the extermination of some native species of fish and wildlife" and "serious losses in other species of native wild animals." Consequently, Congress pledged the nation "to conserve and protect, where practical, the various species of native fish and wildlife, including game and non-game migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction."

In enacting the landmark omnibus legislation, the House and Senate cited historical, educational and scientific considerations—but not, significantly enough, economic factors. That charitable posture was further reinforced in 1973 by the passage of an expanded Endangered Species Act that strengthened all previous statutes. For the first time, moreover, it provided federal funds for endangered species programs administered by the states.

Unfortunately, Congress enthusiasm for saving wildlife was not matched by its generosity. Over the next three and one-half years, the federal government will spend no more than \$10 million in cost-sharing programs with the states—and quite possibly a good deal less. Then too, it remains to be seen whether state and local agencies will be able to develop effective programs. In recent years, federal cost-sharing ventures into education, welfare and other local services have produced a disappointing number of good programs.

For all that, though, the heartening flurry of legislative activity in the wildlife field indicates that the American people have passed an important turning point. By creating truly benevolent laws, the nation has at last turned away from its determinedly self-centered view of the world to one that recognizes man's proper role as its custodian.

SOME ADDITIONS

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

MR. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, I spoke in high praise of the third annual congressional scholarship program which is sponsored by the First and Second Congressional Districts of Ohio and the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce.

Four names were omitted from the list of persons who participated in that program. I wish to add the names of Dave Cawdrey, of North College Hill High School; Jean and Dave Cooper, and Mike Wiater.

AFTER THE EMBARGO—TWO
VIEWPOINTS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the oil from the Middle East is apparently on its way again. Production levels are being increased by the Arab suppliers and tankers are either steaming for Middle Eastern ports or leaving them bound for U.S. refineries.

President Nixon has told us that the "crisis" is over, but the "problem" remains.

There is serious question in many minds, however, whether or not the crisis did indeed occur—or, was it in fact a contrivance designed to boost gasoline and fuel oil prices in order for oil company profits to increase markedly.

As if to dramatize the dichotomy of views on the "oil shortage" there appeared in today's newspapers two widely divergent opinions on the state of the Nation's petroleum problems now that the Arab embargo is over.

One view is that of Christopher T. Rand, of Kensington, Calif. Writing in the New York Times today, Mr. Rand questions the severity of the shortage this past winter.

On the other hand, we have the views of Keith J. Fanshier, publisher of the *Oil Daily*, who warns that the "crisis" is far from over.

Mr. Speaker, I think it instructive and informative to read these two articles and I wish to submit them for the RECORD:

[From the *Oil Daily*, Mar. 26, 1974]

SUMMER WILL HAVE ITS OWN PROBLEMS

(By Keith Fanshier)

The 1973-74 winter is turning out to be one of those perverse late and delayed ones, in which a considerable run of relatively low temperatures strikes after the season as a whole has been mild, and after the industry had just about written off the season as regards any further strong demand for fuel oil.

Although now the industry has plenty of fuel oil to finish out the season, maybe too much, these stocks are now being drawn down more rapidly than was true in much of the main part of the season. To some extent, this might be regarded as good in the industry because some suppliers are reported to have too much fuel for efficient, economic handling, owing to the hitherto slower-than-expected-earlier demand.

Stocks of distillate fuel in primary storage are now some 143 million barrels, which exceeds a year earlier by 28 million barrels, or 20%.

Meanwhile, the great enigma is whether stocks of gasoline—in fact, total petroleum stocks—will take a sharp fall-off in the next few months from the feared over-reaction of the public to the Arab embargo lifting. If the public drops its conservation performance as a result of this easing, then any help that supply would get from it would rapidly evaporate. Both public and industry need to maintain their conservation stance. So does the government, in its oil position.

It should be remembered constantly that the government still has not enacted any real fundamental, long-range national energy policy, and urgently needs to do so. In other words, legislators as well as the common citizen, and the industry itself,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

should follow constructive patterns in this whole energy problem, especially now and in the next few months.

Psychologically, literally everybody, from low to high, has been so eagerly seeking a ray of light on the problem that there is danger of being too ready to accept a moderate action as being the answer to the hopes. This is what make the new Arab move dangerous. It could make this nation too complacent. Better we should all remain cautious and wary, even at the cost of continuing discomfort. It should be kept in mind that what has happened before—arbitrary cut-off action from Persian Gulf courses—could be repeated.

Stated otherwise, there are no miracles, and literally no security, in depending on other nations and peoples. The lesson of what has happened is that the U.S. must be the master of its own fate in energy—that vital answer to survival in the world of the present and the future. Complacency in this context could be our worst enemy. In fact, hasn't the country been too complacent about future energy needs and resources already, and for years?

And isn't this exactly the element which has caused us to be too unready and has brought us trouble when the long approaching crisis became reality?

It seems appropriate in this situation to paraphrase a famed quotation from Shakespeare's great play, King Richard III: "Now is the winter of our discontent made glorious summer by this new Arab action." We would submit that it should not be expected too easily that our winter's problems should turn too easily into summer's solutions. For summer is sure to bring its own problems.

The prime difficulty seen at present is that production of all this country's petroleum products is currently considerably below what it should be, owing to the fact that much of the total refining capacity is not being utilized as a consequence of the requirement that considerable crude oil be shuttled from the refineries of numerous companies that are crude-comfortable to other refining companies in serious need of crude.

How long this dislocation will continue it is difficult to be sure. It is just one more of the many intangibles, unsettleds and unknowns that are plaguing the general petroleum supply situation of the U.S.

[From the *New York Times*, Mar. 27, 1974]

AFTER THE OIL EMBARGO

(By Christopher T. Rand)

KENSINGTON, CALIF.—During the winter, when Americans endured bitter cold and parked in long lines at the few gasoline stations that remained open, production of domestic crude oil and natural-gas liquids was running at a reasonable level, imports of oil products averaged 2.8 million barrels a day, and crude oil imports were up 11 per cent from the previous winter.

Despite the Arab embargo, this nation's crude oil and oil products situation hardly worsened, contrary to the more pessimistic predictions.

On March 1, the United States had almost 805 million barrels of crude, unfinished and finished oils in stock, an increase of 7.8 per cent above figures for a year ago.

United States demand for crude oil has been increasing by only 6 per cent a year and the nation's refineries have been running so close to the supply of crude that they could not have used up more than 8 million barrels, or 3 per cent, of the nation's crude oil stocks between Dec. 7 and March 1, according to American Petroleum Institute statistics.

During this period one real lapse of supply did occur, in the middle of February, when American crude oil imports, which had been averaging 2.4 million barrels a day in January, dipped to a daily rate of 1.8

March 27, 1974

million barrels. This is curious in that it did not occur at Thanksgiving, when the Liberian vessel *Sidney Spiro* steamed into San Francisco laden with the last shipment of pre-embargo Arab oil to America. Nor did the lapse occur gradually. The imports dropped off sharply, then picked up again just as sharply.

This suggested that the supply problems of the United States consumer had nothing to do with the Arab embargo.

Evidence to support this suggestion has been provided by the International Longshoremen's Association, which has demonstrated through a study of tanker movements that the Persian Gulf countries must have been exporting at least 20.73 million barrels of crude oil a day in December—over a million barrels more a day than industry sources were claiming.

What the Arabs have apparently done, successfully, is to use, primarily for political and commercial ends in Europe, the threat of an embargo rather than a real one. They have helped influence Europeans, and President Nixon, to exert diplomatic efforts in favor of an equitable peaceful resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

They have driven a wedge between the major international oil companies and France, Italy, West Germany, Great Britain, Japan, India and other oil-importing countries, all of which in the last four months have greatly accelerated the dispatching of officials, quasi-governmental and private delegations to Iraq, Iran, Libya, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Abu Dhabi and Algeria in quest of oil for cash, weapons, spare parts, expertise and industrial plants.

Now the Arabs have gained substantial if ephemeral financial success, have largely set aside the threat of embargo, have shown appreciation to Western governments for their evenhanded approach to the dispute with Israel, and have relegated the quibbling and haggling to oil-poor Syria.

Western European countries have gained stature, too, by showing that they do not need to go through the international oil companies to acquire Middle Eastern oil.

President Nixon has preserved his status as an international peacemaker. American oil companies continue to enjoy deluxe cooperation from the Government, and those oil concerns that possess shares of Middle Eastern oil concessions as well reaped very good earnings in 1973.

As a group, except for the Gulf Oil Corporation their profits have grown by more than 9 per cent per year since 1967 and they seem destined to do even better this year.

Only the consumer, especially the American consumer, has really suffered from this winter's exercise in international commercial diplomacy. He has finally won back the gasoline he had in October but he is paying the companies 30 per cent more for it.

In fact, the only unfinished business of the so-called crisis is for the Administration to do something for the consumer, to honor some of the consumers' specific wishes.

Although the Government has neglected to form a cohesive and just energy policy over the past generation, although it has utterly failed to take any initiative to acquire and thoroughly audit oil industry costs, reserves and inventory data, it has the capacity to do so now.

At the very least, President Nixon and the Federal Energy Office must roll back crude oil and petroleum-product prices to pre-October levels. They must give up the campaign to end regulation of the price of natural gas piped across state lines, because this is the only area of domestic petroleum activity in which the Government is not subservient to the oil industry.

They must also become prepared to enter the business of importing, storing and refining crude oil—as European governments are doing—if crude-oil imports and refinery runs do not pick up.

This is the bare minimum that the consumer must demand before this winter fades into history and takes its lesson with it.

REPORT ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968 marked an important beginning, but it was only the first step toward cultural awareness and equal education. With the advantage of hindsight, we can see how slow and painful the process of change has been. Today we are still confronted by the lack of adequate funding for bilingual programs.

As one of the coauthors of this act, I have worked to correct this inequity. Last year the administration proposed only \$35 million for title VII bilingual programs which the House Appropriations Committee increased to \$45 million. During debate on the Labor-HEW bill for fiscal 1974, I offered an amendment to raise bilingual funding to \$60 million. Although the amendment lost on the House side, we were able to increase its budget to \$50.3 million in the Labor-HEW conference report.

But even this increased effort failed to reach a significant portion of children who should be served. With an estimated 5 million children in need of this program, only 143,000 were reached during fiscal 1974, representing at the most 3 percent of the total eligible population.

Given this opportunity gap, we should be extremely cautious of any proposed cutbacks. The fiscal 1975 budget calls for a \$15.35 million cutback in title VII projects, and a drop in number of children served. Some may argue that this slash is softened somewhat by the \$9.7 million outlay of fiscal 1973 impounded funds. This type of argument is an example of doublethink applied to the budget process. As a result of this impoundment an estimated 30,000 eligible children were not served during fiscal 1973. Even if we add this money it would still mean a severe cutback for title VII projects for fiscal 1975.

In the case of the emergency school aid program, the proposed budget recommends a dismantling of ESAA, with no assurance that bilingual funds will be included in new legislation promised by the administration. Without this guarantee as much as \$10 million a year in bilingual funding may be lost—\$9.1 million for fiscal 1973 and \$9.9 million for fiscal 1974.

To put the proposed cutbacks in perspective, let us compare the fiscal 1975 budget with this year's spending. For fiscal 1974 Congress appropriated \$60.3 million for both title VII and ESAA bilingual projects; but for fiscal 1975 the administration recommends only \$35 million, representing a 42-percent cutback. This \$25.3 million slash contradicts an internal OE recommendation for title VII projects alone of \$60 million for fiscal 1975 and \$80 million for 1976.

Now we are being asked to ignore recent findings by the U.S. Civil Rights

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Commission, about the educational neglect of Mexican-American children and the exclusion of this minority group from school decisionmaking. In my own State of California, it is estimated that the ratio of Spanish-speaking students to teachers is 152 to 1, while for Anglos the ratio is 20 to 1. Further, according to a 1972 survey by the Los Angeles Unified School District, there are only 3 percent Spanish surnamed school staff serving nearly 24 percent Latino students at the elementary and secondary levels. Clearly these figures indicate an institutional failure to meet bilingual educational needs. It would seem to me that similar findings apply to other children facing language barriers in our school system.

The administration's 42-percent cutback runs counter to these Federal findings, and represents a serious reversal of our 1968 commitment which pointed to the "urgent need—for comprehensive and cooperative action" by Federal as well as local and State levels. We must return to that commitment, particularly in light of the recent Lau decision.

This decision ranks in importance with the 1954 Brown ruling in mandating equal educational opportunity for all children. It has taken nearly two decades to gain national recognition of the problems of language discrimination in this country and the need for bilingual/bicultural education. The Supreme Court in Lau concluded that English-only classes failed to meet the educational needs of children whose dominant language is other than English, and that supplemental programs are necessary to protect the students' right to equal educational opportunity.

In passing the Bilingual Education Act, Congress realized the national scope of the issue and the Federal responsibility to develop a "comprehensive and cooperative" action plan with State and local school officials. To withdraw that cooperation now would weaken—and perhaps even sabotage—the aim and significance of Lau. Unless an increased Federal commitment is made, millions of children will continue to be denied equal education and economic opportunity in this country.

It seems ironic that while we haggle over whether to spend \$60 or \$35 million a year for bilingual education, this country spends a staggering half a billion dollars or more a year to support educational efforts abroad through U.S. foreign aid programs, including contributions to multilateral development banks.

I offer these figures not as an argument against aid to developing nations but to show the frightening gap in our Federal commitment and responsibility to our 5 million children who need bilingual education. There is no excuse for this lack of funding priority for this program, particularly in the light of the Lau decision. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting a more effective level of funding for bilingual education.

The Lau decision has another important aspect which bears directly on Federal responsibility. In order to carry it out, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare must increase its administrative enforcement and compliance responsibilities to assure that State and local school officials comply

with the Lau mandate. This will likely mean additional funding for these investigative and enforcement activities, as well as congressional scrutiny of HEW's performance in this area.

In addition, Congress must probe into the affirmative action program of the U.S. Office of Education to insure that the Spanish-speaking and other language minorities are properly represented. These minority employees must be involved in every phase of the Office's policymaking as well as participate in the formulation of bilingual goals and program priorities.

In a January 23, 1974, letter to Commissioner John Ottina, I raised the issue of OE's "serious lack of employment opportunity." On the basis of this agency's own data, I found that for the Office of Education as a whole, the Spanish-speaking held 44 out of a total of 2,588 positions, representing only 1.7 percent. In the school systems division, this group held just 8 out of a total of 430, representing 1.8 percent. In the higher education division, they held 3 out of a total of 458, representing 0.6 percent.

I believe the Lau decision offers us a challenge to expand our horizons of cultural understanding and educational opportunity. Bilingual education should become for all citizens a resource—a necessary ingredient of American education and society. I hope that you share with me in sustaining this effort as a Federal responsibility. To achieve this requires cooperative and binding ties between Federal and local school officials, as expressed in the 1968 act. Cutbacks will not fulfill the ideals and purpose of this act but only hasten its demise. Join me in the call for a stronger Federal commitment to bilingual education as a national educational goal.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT FUNDING FOR TRAINING IN THE FIELD OF AGING

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution calling upon the Administration on Aging to continue financing of long-term and short-term training programs in the field of aging.

And I take this action, Mr. Speaker, because the Nixon administration has requested no funds for fiscal 1975 for the training programs supported under title IV of the Older Americans Act.

Last year Congress overwhelmingly approved the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments, which authorize a comprehensive social service delivery system through the establishment of planning and service areas. But if this goal is to become a reality, it will be essential for additional personnel to be trained to respond to the growing and pressing needs for programs serving the elderly.

For today a critical shortage of adequately trained personnel continues to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 27, 1974

be one of the most formidable barriers to the development of a coordinated social service system for Older Americans.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker, title IV of the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments, which was enacted last year, continued authorization for both long- and short-term training of personnel in the field of aging.

The shortages of trained personnel in the aging field was illustrated forcefully in a paper prepared by the Gerontological Society, entitled "Research and Training in Gerontology."

Said the Gerontological Society paper:

The gap between the need for trained personnel and the capacities of present training programs is so great that there is no danger in overtraining for several decades.

In every region of our country there are numerous outstanding examples of the worthiness of the title IV training programs, whether they be university-based or short term. In Missouri, the Institute of Applied Gerontology at St. Louis University was created in 1969. During the past 5 years, this program has prepared students for careers in gerontology, expanded continuing education and consultation in the field of aging, and contributed to the building of an effective research program. But the major significance of the institute has been at the community level.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, visited the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center in Los Angeles which is supporting outstanding work in training, as well as research, in the aging field.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I affirm my strong opposition to the Nixon administration's efforts to cut the heart out of the title IV training program by not requesting any funds for fiscal year 1975.

And for these reasons, I urge early approval of this resolution to put Congress again on record in support of adequate funds for short-term and long-term training under title IV of the Older Americans Act.

AGRICULTURE GOES MULTINATIONAL

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months many Americans have become aware, perhaps for the first time, of the extent and reason American companies build facilities, operate plants, and generally conduct business outside of the United States. Because of the energy crisis and the belief of many Americans that it was engineered by the large multinational oil companies, we have all become aware of the tax loopholes, benefits, and shelters that accrue to these companies through foreign investment.

However, as will become clear upon reading the article I am inserting, this problem is not limited to the oil com-

panies. It is even now extending to food production. Although there are no farms in my district there are over 465,000 people who are trying to eat on what their ever-shrinking wages will buy.

If there was ever a time for the Congress to seriously get down to the business of corporate tax reform it is now.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article that appeared in the winter, 1974 issue of *People and Land*:

Food IMPERIALISM—AGRICULTURE GOES MULTINATIONAL

(By George L. Baker)

Mention the Del Monte Corp. and you don't automatically conjure up images of Anaconda Copper or United Fruit extracting profits from undeveloped countries. Not yet at least. But soon we shall be able to add Del Monte and a host of other American food companies to the roster of extractive industries that pluck countries clean as a chicken.

American food production appears to be moving lock, stock and tractor to outposts in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Agricultural chemical companies, farm equipment manufacturers, cattle feeders, corporate farmers, packing and processing magnates, banks and speculators are all joining the internationalization of farming. Their plants and farms are called "offshore production units," a choice of language that tells us much about how they view their investments abroad.

No matter where you turn, the evidence is mounting that overseas farms and factories are turning world agriculture into a kind of extension service for American corporations. From 1960-70, American foodstuffs and tobacco companies increased their overseas employment by 222 percent, compared to a 7 percent domestic increase.

In Argentina, the largest exporter of feed grains is Cargill, Inc., the Midwestern giant that figured so prominently in the Russian wheat deal. In Hawaii, pineapple, the state's number two agricultural product, is rapidly being phased out as Del Monte and Dole move on to the Philippines, Thailand and Kenya. Helped by investments from Green Giant, Taiwan has emerged as a major exporter of vegetables, including mushrooms, whose appearance in our markets threatens to ruin domestic producers.

A threatened domestic agriculture is by no means the whole story. The agribusiness giants would have us believe that their efforts abroad will result in jobs for everyone and the eradication of hunger, poverty and illiteracy. A more likely outcome is that agribusiness mechanization will displace rural farm workers and drive up unemployment in both city and country in the Third World.

Foreign sources of capital (i.e., American capital) needed to pay for expensive farm equipment will become increasingly important and make these nations increasingly dependent. The presumed cornucopia of increased food production will either be exported or priced out of reach of those who need it most. And who knows what will happen to the ecosystems of Third World countries when new seeds are introduced and chemical fertilizers and pesticides are sprayed with a free hand?

As the world's largest canner of fruits and vegetables, the San Francisco-based Del Monte corporation epitomizes the worldwide sweep of the American food business. In addition to canning and selling everything from applesauce to zucchini, it owns or operates 132,700 acres here and abroad and employs 40,000 people.

Its direct investments abroad total \$60 million and it has sales organizations in 100 countries. In the U.S. it has over 100 processing plants, canneries, ranches and distributing centers. Overseas it has processing plants or plantations in 17 nations. It has its own

trucking operations and cargo ships and is completely integrated both horizontally and vertically.

United States tax laws make overseas food production an attractive business. The Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation gimmick, for instance, allows corporations doing business in Latin America to have their income taxed at 34 percent rather than the customary corporate rate of 48 percent.

Then there's the preference for income derived from less developed countries, as explained by a feed-lot operator from Fresno and Ethiopia: "If you take an approval investment, approved by the host country and leave it productively employed for ten years, you can bring it back to this country and have it taxed at a capital gains rate. In other words, you can allow profits to pile up and at the end of ten years, you can bring them back for next to nothing in taxes." U.S. tax laws also permit any corporation to deduct taxes paid to host countries from its U.S. taxes.

In 1972, Del Monte had a total federal tax liability of only \$11.7 million on worldwide sales of \$820 million.

A more equitable tax structure might have saved the jobs of 5,000 pineapple workers in Hawaii. Stokely-Van Camp has already closed out there, and Del Monte and Dole will follow suit by 1975. The reason? In Hawaii, the minimum wage for a pineapple worker is \$2.69 an hour. In the Philippines it is 10 cents an hour. Yet, as a U.S. Tariff Commission investigation pointed out, "these firms (Del Monte and Dole) market the imported product at the same prices that they ask for their domestically canned pineapple."

When American farmworkers are driven off the land by international agribusiness, they have simply little choice but to migrate to the cities. A vision thus emerges of an America that is an urban fortress, with all the world as its garden.

The rationale of the corporations, of course, is that their operations will ultimately feed and clothe half of the world's population which goes to bed hungry every night. "Our business isn't just canning," writes Chairman Eames in Del Monte's annual report, "it's feeding people."

But which people? A fresh pineapple airlifted from the Philippines to Japan may satisfy somebody's desire for exotic fruit, but it does little to nourish those who cut and pack the fruit. And when agribusiness creates markets in the host countries, the appeal is to those who can already afford the products and not to those who most need them.

Another aspect of the hunger business is the capital trap awaiting countries which have little but food and raw materials to barter for goods and money. The U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America reported that the new private capital transfer to Latin America from 1961 to 1963 came to \$6.9 billion, while the net transfer from Latin America to the U.S. was \$11.9 billion—not exactly the kind of flow that encourages independent national status.

American agribusiness is in large part responsible for this situation, thanks to its effort to replace subsistence or collective farming with highly capitalized, highly mechanized operations that fit into the agribusiness structure like a plow into a furrow. The real question is: Can the world afford it?

COMPETITION NEEDED IN THE OIL INDUSTRY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, I called to the attention of the House

the dramatic ill-effects of the vertical integration that exists in the oil industry. I maintained that the direct consequence of this arrangement was to put the burden of resource shortages almost entirely on the independent operators at every stage in the production process. I urged the House Committees on Judiciary and on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to take a hard look at this phenomenon.

I wish at this time, Mr. Speaker, to refer the Members to a very sound and valuable article on this subject. The article, appearing in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 24, was written by Mr. Allen Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman also points to the vertical integration as the principle problem, from the national interest point of view, in the oil industry. He discusses the possibility of legislation to break up the companies and raises the problem of stockholder rights. Those rights are a legitimate concern, but may not be an insurmountable obstacle to a forced breakup. In any case, Mr. Hoffman goes on to suggest that the way to restore competition—and, therefore, we assume, protect the public interest—is to put the buying and selling of crude oil and its byproducts into a commodities market arrangement. In this format, the price of crude would be set—and, of course, would fluctuate—by bidding in an open free market rather than in corporate board rooms.

Whether or not such an arrangement will lead to lower gasoline prices for the consumer is an open question. Mr. Speaker and, for that matter, it may not be the most important issue involved here. What is more fundamental, I believe, is public confidence. It would be foolish to argue that existing commodities markets are free from manipulation and adverse side effects. On the other hand, a commodities market, even with all its attendant problems, may very well be preferable to the status quo and might stem the tide of public outrage that could lead to crippling regulation, such as that affecting the railroad industry, which is the direct result of an outraged public reacting to a shortsighted and "public be damned" corporate attitude.

PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Washington Report entitled "Problems and Solutions in a Global Economy":

PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY

The current oil crisis and recent food shortages remind us of the impact that the economies of other nations have upon the American economy. The unprecedented surge in international demand for American agricultural products improved our sales and helped the recovery of our trade balance, but it also caused food prices to rise significantly at home. The oil embargo made us aware

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that, although we are less dependent upon foreign supplies than most industrial nations, our economy could be quickly and adversely affected by the action of other countries.

These two experiences indicate how rapidly a global economy is emerging. World trade boomed to \$280 billion worth of goods in 1970 and may reach \$500 billion by 1980. Economic policy in one country affects the economic growth, employment levels and the rate of inflation in other countries. Buying and selling technology internationally is big business today. Only a small fraction of the 160 nations of the world are self-sufficient in energy, and no country has all the raw materials needed by a modern industrial society. Of 13 basic industrial raw materials needed by a modern economy, the United States is dependent upon import for more than one-half of its supplies of four of these commodities, and by the end of the century will be dependent on foreign sources for its supply for all but one (phosphate) of the 13 raw materials.

For years we have been trained to think only about the impact of our country on other countries. Now we must think also about their impact on us. And this fundamental shift, logical as it now seems, was not really foreseen in all its dimensions until these food and oil shortages hit us. As a result, in addition to our traditional concern to assure access for our products in foreign markets, we (and other nations, too) are showing increasing concern about access to foreign sources of supply for key materials.

While we have always promoted exports of our goods abroad, we have now begun to show a tendency to limit the export of commodities in short supply. When the booming world-wide demand for our soybeans rose to record heights, and exports began to jeopardize domestic supply, temporary controls were imposed on exports of soybeans. Export pressures, combined with price controls imposed to combat inflation, led to shortages of steel scrap and logs. To protect domestic supplies of food and steel, and to ease inflationary pressure, the United States imposed export controls.

In allocating any product between markets abroad and those in the United States, the American consumer should come first, and the advantage of exports should always be weighed against their impact on the supply and price of the commodity at home.

Nevertheless, the use of export controls presents several problems. They are inconsistent with our efforts to expand exports and offset the trade deficit. (We lost about \$500 million in exports because of the controls in 1973.) The United States, and most other countries, are under real pressure to expand exports in order to pay for the increased cost of oil. The use of export controls only encourages other countries to put controls on their materials and makes it more difficult to nurture good relations abroad. (France called our soybean controls "American aggression.")

It has become apparent that a practical accommodation on access to supplies is just as desirable as access to markets. No country will gain from economic warfare between producing and consuming nations over the supply of raw materials. Upcoming trade negotiations take on even more significance than in the past because, not only must barriers to imports be reduced, but procedures must be found to handle the increasing resort to export controls. More effective ways of insuring the efficient allocation of resources simply must be worked out.

The United States should take several steps. We should assert that access to supplies, as well as to markets, is a major trade objective. We should explore reciprocal agreements, which assure our access to the supplies of a producing country, and assure the producing country access to our markets.

We should enter into safeguard arrangements with producing countries to protect each country from the disruptive influence of excessive increases in imports or exports. The President should have the authority to apply sanctions against unjustifiable export controls, including the denial of aid and the prohibition of credit and foreign investment, thus putting countries on notice that they cannot wage economic warfare on us with impunity.

The emerging global economy will challenge us with all sorts of new problems, like the questions of shortages, access to raw materials and export controls mentioned here, and they should propel us toward, not a "go it alone" policy, but a multinational attempt to build a more effective world economic order.

ABOUT 65 PERCENT DISAPPROVE OF NIXON

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you and my colleagues in the House of Representatives the results of a poll taken by the Novato Advance, a newspaper in Marin County, Calif., to find out how its readers felt about President Nixon.

Mr. George A. Barnwell, the distinguished publisher of the newspaper, was kind enough to send me the results. The poll shows that two-thirds of those responding disapproved of the way Nixon is handling the presidency, and that 60 percent favored either his resignation or impeachment.

Mr. Barnwell commented in his letter to me that:

I hope this information will be of value to you in determining the actions Congress should take.

Mr. Barnwell's readers were furnished the poll results in two articles: the first appeared in the Novato Advance on Wednesday, February 6, 1974; the second, February 13.

PRELIMINARY NIXON POLL RESULTS: 65 PERCENT DISAPPROVE OF NIXON

A heavy majority of Advance readers favor either the resignation or impeachment of President Nixon, preliminary results of an Advance poll show. A final tally will be published next week.

Close to 300 returns had been returned as of this morning; most had been counted. Only 15 (or 5 per cent) gave Nixon unqualified approval.

Not only do 64.6 per cent of the returns disapprove of the way Nixon has handled the Presidency, but 61.2 per cent favor his resignation and 61.5 per cent his impeachment. The majority of those sending in returns were Republicans.

Thus Novato once regarded as a community of Nixon Democrats has become a town of anti-Nixon Republicans. (In 1972, Novato voted for Nixon, although registered Democrats outnumbered Republicans.)

Here are the results so far:

NIXON ADMINISTRATION

Do you generally approve the way Nixon has handled the Presidency?—100 (35.4 per cent).

Do you generally disapprove the way Nixon has handled the Presidency?—182 (64.6 per cent).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESIGNATION

Do you favor Nixon's resignation?—174 (61.2 per cent).

Are you opposed to his resignation?—110 (38.8 per cent).

IMPEACHMENT

Do you favor the impeachment of Nixon?—172 (61.5 per cent).

Are you opposed to his impeachment?—106 (38.5 per cent).

WHAT MOST CLEARLY RESEMBLES YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT NIXON?

(Several people marked more than one.) I'm for Nixon right or wrong—15 (5 per cent).

Watergate has been blown out of proportion—85 (28 per cent).

I'm for straightening out the mess in Washington, no matter whom it hurts—201 (67 per cent).

Of those returning votes 40 or 14.2 per cent were in the 18-30 age group; 176 or 62.6 per cent in the 31-55 age group; and 65 or 23.2 per cent in the over-56 age group.

A total of 156 indicated they were female or 56 per cent; while 122 or 44 per cent said they were male.

115 or 47.7 per cent said they were Democrats; 126 or 52.3 per cent said they were Republican.

The Advance Nixon poll does not pretend to be a scientific sampling. There was no testing of the questions. However the questions approximate those used in national polls.

POLL SKEWED

The poll is skewed by the obvious distortion in the audience responding to the poll. The under-30 age group is under-represented—only 14.2 per cent. Republicans are over-represented. Official registration lists show Democrats leading Republicans here by almost 10 per cent. There are 6167 registered Democrats in the city and 5560 Republicans as of last October.

Thus the poll probably over-represents the more elderly, conservative section of the community. This reflects the fact that it has been generally found that the average regular newspaper reader tends to be older than the average person. Younger persons tend to be lighter readers.

Despite this bias, what stands out in the Advance poll is the profound disenchantment with Nixon that exists. Obviously many registered Republicans have crossed over to express their dissatisfaction with the President.

The poll shows a disturbing disillusionment in the political processes of the country. Reaction to the President is strong—many of the returns calling him "crook," "liar," "thief."

Defenders of Nixon cite his record, particularly in the field of foreign policy. Some however claim this success is mostly due to Secretary of State Henry Kissinger rather than Nixon.

As expected, some of the defenders of Nixon suspect a gang-up on the President by the press.

TYPICAL COMMENTS

Some typical comments of those who favor resignation or impeachment are:

"A change is needed—now! I believe the president is deeply implicated in unprecedented acts of malfeasance."

"It's disgraceful about his non-payment of taxes. I believe his only aim is to enrich himself and family. I say expose him and make him pay!"

"President Nixon has misused the power of the Presidency and been unfaithful to the Constitution. He must be removed from office."

Some disapproved of Nixon, but were frightened of the consequences of his ouster. Said one resident:

"I don't trust Nixon and think he's dishonest. He has a lot of nerve to keep pulling

the things he does. However I'd feel insecure if he were impeached or resigned."

Those who support Nixon are equally strong in their convictions:

"I think Nixon has been tried and convicted by the press and TV media. If guilty, should be prosecuted. Let the Congress and courts do it, not Nixon haters."

"The good things he has accomplished far outweigh the bad ones."

"The dirty linen has been exposed, let's get on with the running of the country."

FOREIGN VS. DOMESTIC POLICY

Typical judgments on the quality of his domestic and foreign policies are these:

"Feel his foreign policy has been good, but his domestic policy has been a disaster. Only history will tell."

"Nixon has done well in foreign affairs but domestically he has failed. He should resign to avoid impeachment and its tremendous cost."

Unexpectedly, most readers did not make much of a distinction between resignation and impeachment. Most returns had either both categories marked or opposed. However some of the comments sought to differentiate their views more clearly:

"I favor the House of Representatives initiating impeachment proceedings. This will give Nixon his day in court and give him a chance to clear himself."

"His resignation would prove nothing. Impeachment proceedings would determine his guilt or innocence."

"I feel that if Nixon resigns, we will never know the truth. The House should prefer impeachment charges, and the Senate should either convict or clear him."

"The mediocrity of Vice President Ford has frightened me into reversing my position on impeachment or resignation. I feel Nixon thought Ford's nomination would do exactly this thereby saving the Presidency and his ego."

A check of the returns seems to indicate there was no wholesale attempt to stuff the ballot box, although a handful of votes seem suspicious. However the size of the return and the emphatic manner in which the people spoke tend to obliterate any impact such attempts might have had.—G.B.

DISAPPROVE OF NIXON: FINAL RESULTS IN NIXON POLL

Final results in the Advance Nixon poll show a slightly more conservative pro-Nixon tinge than in the preliminary tally published last week, however readers responding still disapprove of Nixon by almost two-thirds and favor either his resignation or impeachment by 60 per cent.

The original form to fill out and bring to the Advance was published two weeks ago. More than 325 readers participated in the poll.

As already noted the results are skewed, because an analysis of the returns show that younger readers or voters under 30 are under-represented as well as registered Democrats.

Many of the individual comments sent in by readers were published last week. Here's the final tally:

Do you generally approve the way Nixon has handled the Presidency? Yes—120 (36.9 per cent); No—205 (63.1 per cent).

Do you favor the impeachment of Nixon? Yes—194 (60.4 per cent); No—127 (36.9 per cent).

What most nearly resembles your feelings about Nixon?

1. I'm for Nixon right or wrong—16 (4.9 per cent).

2. Watergate has been blown out of proportion—98 (29 per cent).

3. I'm for straightening out the mess in Washington, no matter whom it hurts—223 (66.1 per cent).

Of those responding 42 or 13 per cent were

March 27, 1974

in the under-30 age group; 199 or 61.3 per cent in the 31-55 age group; and 82 or 25.7 per cent in the 56 and over group.

Democrats totalled 138 or 49.4 per cent and Republicans 141 or 50.6 per cent, while women composed 180 or 55.9 per cent and men 142 or 44.1 per cent.

The results are being sent to the White House and California's congressional delegation.

WOMEN IN BANKING—THE NEW YORK BANK FOR SAVINGS SETS AN EXAMPLE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, there is no area of the business or professional world which has been more identified as a male preserve than banking. Yet banking, like other areas of business, is beginning to be influenced by the increased presence of women in positions of responsibility.

The Women's Movement for Equality in Employment has coalesced to the point whereby an all-women's bank is to open soon as a shining example that women do not have to be trapped within a narrow specialized hierarchy in the business world.

But, really, it is nothing new.

The New York Bank for Savings has long shown that women can do and hold top management positions within the operations of New York's first savings institution.

Just last week, with the naming of Mrs. Estelle Coleman, an assistant secretary, as the new manager at the bank's offices at 600 Madison Avenue, the bank now has four women branch managers.

Other office managers—all assistant vice presidents—are Ms. Evelyn Blackstone, 72d and Third Avenue, Ms. Theresa Gradenwitz, 34th Street and Herald Square, and Ms. Rose M. Lavelle, 46th Street and Lexington Avenue. Ms. Coleman also established a first by becoming the first black woman in the mutual savings bank's system in New York State to serve as manager of a branch office. Other women assistant vice presidents in key banking roles include Ms. Mary D. Fragoletti and Ms. Jean W. Sheehan.

Further evidence of the recognition The New York Bank for Savings shows women is the recent transfer of Ms. Florence Kaye, an assistant vice president, to branch operations. She will serve as assistant to Ms. Phyllis S. Haniotis, a senior vice president who is director of branch operations for the bank's 14 branches and one of the highest ranking women in the banking industry in the State.

Another top woman officer for the bank is Ms. Frances Levenson who is director of urban housing.

And among the bank's assistant secretaries, the following are women: Ruth M. Brauchi, Estelle Coleman, Dorothy Groom, Margaret Riley, Paula B. Roman, Catherine Sarullo, Clarie M. Smith, Joan C. Tangney, Helen T. Williams and Gloria B. Wilson.

Indeed, the Women's Movement has long been moving within The New York Bank for Savings.

Alfred S. Mills, chairman of The New York Bank for Savings Board of Trustees said:

We have always been cognizant of our obligation to make promotions on ability and not discriminate against women or relegate them to lower level positions.

NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on a very important piece of legislation enacted by this body on Tuesday, March 19, 1974. I refer to H.R. 11105, the nutrition program for the elderly which we have extended for 3 years and have funded to the extent of \$250 million.

It would be gratifying, although obviously incorrect, to say that this program is a complete answer to the widespread and serious problems of undernourishment and isolation among the elderly in our country. Recent investigations by Senator McGOVERN's Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs indicate that real hunger exists among a startling and shameful number of older Americans. Part of the reason for this is economic and other reasons come from the isolation and resulting apathy that is the lot of so many elderly people. Sometimes people are simply unable to provide nutritious meals for themselves because of the infirmities of age. This program does not solve those problems, but it is directed toward the causes of undernourishment among this group. While tomorrow there will still be hungry elderly people in America, because of this program their number will be reduced.

I am pleased and proud to report that just recently in Alameda County in my congressional district, the meals for the elderly program has begun again and will be providing one hot meal a day to those over 60 who need this program. The meals will be served in centers where those who join the program will find not only a hot, well-balanced and palatable meal, but the companionship and friendship that gives people a reason for enjoying life. In Santa Clara County the program is an ongoing one.

Congress has exhibited its understanding that a health problem, caused not only by economic need but by personal and psychological needs cannot be alleviated simply by providing an economic answer. We must, of course, provide the financial support for the program, but we also recognize the necessity of companionship among the elderly. This legislation views the individual aged American as a person, not simply as a statistic that outlines the number of hungry in our country. We need more such legislation.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WATERGATE AND THE POLITICIAN

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1974, the management of television station WPIX in New York City delivered an editorial on a subject that has been on the minds of citizen and Representative alike since last year; that is, the effect of the Watergate scandal and subsequent indictments on all politicians and on politics in general. I believe that the WPIX editorial reflects a most rational and reasoned approach to the problem and I would like to insert the text for the benefit of all the Members. The editorial follows:

[WPIX Editorial]

WATERGATE AND THE POLITICIAN

One can only guess at when the Watergate scandal will be over. We hope the guilty will be punished, but even more important for the nation, it will be a relief to see that dark cloud, which now hovers over all politicians, begin to lift and disappear.

A number of things suggest that the respect which the average citizen has traditionally had for his representatives has been a casualty of Watergate. A recent survey showed that only 21 per cent of the people interviewed expressed respect for the Congress. No less than 28 representatives and six senators have announced that they will not run for re-election this year. That is more retirements than there have been in any election for the past quarter of a century, and it is expected that there will be even more before election day.

In our conversations with elected officials at the local level, there is very real concern that the fall-out from Watergate, the Cheap Shot that "all politicians are crooks, anyway" will hamper the working of state and city governments.

It seems to the Management of WPIX that all of us have an obligation to re-think this question. When we blame all politicians for the excesses of a few politicians, we do great harm to our government, and thus, to ourselves. The fact is that most politicians are dedicated public servants who work long hours, generally for less than they could earn in private life, to serve their constituents.

It is unfortunate that it will usually be the good and conscientious politicians who will decide that public service isn't worth the grief that goes with it. The demagogues, and there are some of them, couldn't care less what the voters think of them.

Watergate is a very serious matter, and the guilty should be punished fully. But if we let our revulsion for that illegal act affect our thinking about our entire political system, the people who will be punished the most for Watergate will be the citizens of our country.

We don't believe that should happen.

NOMINATION OF DR. LUTHER H. HOLCOMB TO THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the President made an excellent de-

cision when he nominated to the Federal Communications Commission Dr. Luther H. Holcomb of Dallas, Tex., and Washington, D.C.

I have observed the career of Dr. Holcomb over a period of years. He is a man of great talent, a man of fairness, a man who works effectively at the job of serving his fellow man. I have no doubt but that Dr. Holcomb will do an outstanding job as a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

I was pleased to read in the March 16 Dallas Morning News an editorial in commendation of the appointment of Dr. Holcomb, and I wish to place the editorial in the RECORD:

HOLCOMB TO FCC

In announcing he will nominate Dr. Luther H. Holcomb, former Dallas clergyman and civic leader, to the Federal Communications Commission, President Nixon is choosing an outstanding public servant.

As vice-chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Dr. Holcomb repeatedly has demonstrated fair and forthright leadership in establishing employment practices that benefit all segments of the population.

In the nine years that he has served on that commission, Dr. Holcomb has been instrumental in establishing civil rights in employment that have helped end discriminatory hiring practices.

Yet he continued to observe one principal guideline, which he noted in a Dallas speech a few years ago: The EEOC would not be party to abuses of the law by employees who might hide behind equal employment provisions.

"We still must have as a standard the willingness to work," he said.

Dr. Holcomb was named to the EEOC by President Johnson in 1965. He came to Dallas in 1946 as pastor of the Lakewood Baptist Church, and in 1958 became executive director of the Greater Dallas Council of Churches, the post he held when appointed to the government post. During the two decades he was in Dallas, he served on many local, state and national boards concerned with health, education, religion and welfare.

Senate approval of his nomination to the new post would be to the benefit of the country.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY GOES METRIC

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the metric system is increasingly coming into use in the United States. Among the leaders in making the change from the English system of weights and measures to the metric system is American industry.

Those companies who are making this change to the metric system are doing so for two basic reasons. One is that the metric system is much easier to work in, once the few basic principles have been learned. The other reason is that in order to remain competitive in foreign markets, American products must meet the requirements of those markets, and an important requirement today is that our products are made to metric specifications.

As examples of American firms who

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 27, 1974

have already begun the conversion I would like to mention three. One is from the aerospace industry, one is from the automobile industry, and one is from the food industry. A press release and two news stories describe who these companies are and how they plan to go about making the change to the metric system.

The materials follow:

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1973.
Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Science and
Aeronautics, U.S. House of Representa-
tives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: General Motors recently put into effect a policy of conversion to the metric system of measurement on all new engineering projects. We believe our conversion can be effected without disrupting production through this voluntary program, coordinated among all GM divisions, staff and suppliers by a special section of the GM Engineering Staff.

I think you may be interested in the attached release.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. MORRIS.

NEWS RELEASE

DETROIT.—In keeping with the long-term movement toward more general use of the metric system, here and abroad, General Motors President Edward N. Cole stated that "the rate of implementation to the metric system within GM will be governed by the release of new parts, metrically dimensioned, and by the normal phasing out of in-production parts."

The GM guidelines include:

1. New developments will be metric from the start. This includes items now in development stage.
2. Service parts now in production will remain as is.
3. Supplier coordination will be implemented as required.
4. In the interim before complete metrification is accomplished some capital equipment with dual measuring capability will be required.

Coordination of the entire program will be handled by the GM Engineering Staff.

ROCKWELL ANNOUNCES METRIC CONVERSION

Rockwell International Corporation has announced its intention to convert to metric usage.

Willard F. Rockwell, Jr., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, said, in announcing the change:

"Ninety percent of the world's population, conducting three-quarters of its trade, uses the metric system. That 90 percent is buying and selling to each other and they're increasingly cool to the products of the 10 percent who don't use the same system."

"Common sense dictates that this country make the decision to go metric. We at Rockwell International want to be in the vanguard of this change."

Rockwell said the company is acting now, rather than waiting for Congressional metric legislation to take effect, because "with the United States in the position of being the only major nation not yet committed to the metric system, delays can seriously affect our industrial position in the world."

He said coordination with other U.S. industries and other nations will be aided by the company's charter membership in the American National Metric Council.

C. J. Meehan, vice-president of research and engineering for Rockwell International, will be in charge of the program to adopt the International System of Units.

It will take an estimated 10 years for the system to become predominant in all divisions of the corporation, Rockwell said. Each

division will be responsible for detailed planning and implementation of the conversion.

Rockwell said preliminary planning was initiated in 1972 and some divisions already are making use of the metric system, and added that company employees will be encouraged to use metric units, where appropriate, in company documents.

U.S. WINE MAKERS TO GO METRIC

(By Richard M. Harnett)

SAN FRANCISCO.—The American wine industry is planning to go metric, which means that the traditional "fifth" will become three-quarters of a liter—and the familiar half gallon and gallon will disappear entirely.

U.S. wine officials recently attended a meeting with their counterparts in the European Common Market trying to work out an agreement on uniform sizes for international trade.

Attorney Jefferson Peyser, representing American wine makers, said there was almost unanimous agreement to cut the "great proliferation" of wine bottle sizes now used down to seven standard sizes.

"We have been trying to accomplish this for years in the American wine industry," Peyser said in an interview.

"We are now convinced it is one of the most important things to get done."

Americans who order imported wine in a restaurant usually do not know that they are getting a 24-ounce bottle instead of the 25.6 bottle they would get if they ordered an American "fifth." In buying a case of foreign wine, this is equivalent to one less bottle per case.

The "standard" bottle for U.S. wine is now the fifth of a gallon, 25.6 ounces. The comparable metric bottle will be the three-fourths liter, or 25.36 ounces.

Most other new sizes would be only slightly different from the most common of the 16 sizes now allowed under U.S. regulations. The half a fifth (12.8 ounces) would become a three-eighths liter (12.68 ounces). The "split" (6.4 ounces) would become three-sixteenths of a liter (6.34 ounces).

Wine guzzlers who drink half-gallon and gallon jugs would have to get used to buying a liter and a half (50.72 ounces compared to 64 in the half gallon) or three liters (101.44 ounces compared to 128 in a gallon).

The change to metric wine "involves a little retooling" by U.S. wineries, said Peyser. "The switch would be accomplished within two years after it is adopted."

HON. BILL MAILLIARD

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1974

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those of my colleagues in recognition of the accomplishments of a gentleman whom I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with ever since we both arrived on Capitol Hill 21 years ago.

Although we have not always been on the same side of the fence on issues, I have come to respect Bill Mailliard's good judgment and dedication and value highly his friendship.

The House is losing a man of uncommon stature whose experience and expertise in the field of foreign affairs will be sorely missed in these Chambers. But our loss will certainly be the Organization of American States' gain as he leaves us to become Permanent U.S. Representative to the OAS. I cannot think of

a more qualified individual, both in knowledge of the area and in his ability to handle the sensitive diplomatic problems inherent in the position. He has already distinguished himself in this capacity as a ranking member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and as an adviser and delegate to numerous international conferences, including the 18th session of the United Nations General Assembly. The growing importance of our relations with the member countries of the OAS certainly cannot be underestimated which makes having an individual with William Mailliard's qualities in this position so vital.

I am confident my colleagues in the House will want to join me in expressing appreciation for his many years of distinguished service and in extending to him our best wishes for a fruitful new career.

THE DIFFICULT STRUGGLE TO
ACHIEVE MODEST PRISON RE-
FORMS IN NEW YORK

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, last fall I called to our colleagues' attention one of the country's most unique corrections education programs, the establishment of a new State college in New York solely for prison inmates. The New York State Department of Correctional Services and the State University of New York were working together to develop plans to establish a college at the Bedford Hills correctional facility where both male and female prisoners would study on a full-time basis toward 2-year liberal arts or science degrees.

Certainly this proposal represented a hallmark in the effort to achieve not only meaningful reforms in corrections policy, but a worthwhile and substantive rehabilitation effort for those prisoners who would be participating in the program. It was proposed to meet a basic and crying need for large numbers of prison inmates who would otherwise leave their cells without adequate educational preparation for a return to civilian life and it offered real hope and promise.

Tragically the initial enthusiasm was short lived as the New York State Legislature, in one of its more ill-conceived actions, is attempting to eliminate the \$500,000 requested in the Governor's budget. The attitude in Albany appears to be one of disregard for the need for the rehabilitation of prisoners in order to cut down on the high rate of recidivism. A frighteningly large number of the legislators seem to have a completely punitive outlook on the situation and oppose constructive efforts to properly prepare prisoners for their return to society.

Last Saturday's New York Times carried a very timely and perceptive editorial on this issue. I commend it to our colleagues' consideration and also urge members of the New York State Legislature to carefully reflect on it before rejecting this worthwhile proposal:

RECYCLING PRISONERS

The state's prison-reform efforts still seem largely confined to the semantics of giving to penal institutions the new label of correctional facilities. Since wishing alone can't convert a jail into a place of rehabilitation, there was a flicker of hope in the proposal by Chancellor Ernest L. Boyer of the State University to create a college for prisoners. The plan, regrettably, has proved too sensible and too humane for the Legislature, which is trying to kill it by eliminating a projected \$500,000 appropriation from Governor Wilson's budget.

The plan would involve no new construction. An existing facility at Bedford Hills, in Westchester County, is ideally suited for establishment of a two-year, degree-granting college. Qualified inmates, eligible for minimum security, would be selected from prisons throughout the state.

The real reason for the negative response to this sound idea is not its cost, which is hardly more than that of more traditional but less effective training programs inside prisons. Rather, the concept has fallen victim to the vindictive notion that any constructive effort at rehabilitation represents a coddling of criminals.

Indulgence of that regressive view is as impractical as it is inhumane. Inmates who would be eligible for the college are obviously those who will, before long, return to freedom. If they left jail with the marketable fruits of a real education, they would be far less likely to be a burden and potential threat to society.

Although in grave danger, the college plan should not be considered dead. It has been approved by the Board of Regents and by the Governor. Support by more enlightened legislators could revive Dr. Boyer's plan by placing it on the supplemental budget. Its potential is too self-evident to permit its abandonment.

FOUR "TRAILBLAZERS" ATTAIN EAGLE RANK

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to stand before the House and commend to my colleagues the accomplishments of young Americans. In this instance, it is to recognize four "Trailblazers," members of Troop 510, Boy Scouts of America, from my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, who have attained the highest rank in scouting—Eagle Scout.

These young men—William J. Daw IV, Perry Lara, David A. Lewis, and Steven E. Neely—were advanced to this level during a Court of Honor conducted by the troop in the Windover Hills United Methodist Church in South Park Township. It is no easy task to achieve this rank. Stringent requirements must be met before one can wear the Eagle Scout insignia. Those who do, wear it proudly, for it symbolizes the highest qualities of young Americans and I have no fear for the future of our Nation if it lies in the hands of Eagle Scouts.

I also would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the leaders of Troop 510, who have given so much of their private life to molding the character of young boys today to be the leaders of tomorrow. Richly deserving of public recognition are men such as Phillip E. Neely,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

scoutmaster; Donald G. Schneider, William Prosser, Robert Weis, Edward Farrell, and Francis P. Nix, Jr., assistant scoutmasters; Ewell Menge, institutional representative; Dale S. Dunn, committee chairman, and Salvatore Benanti, G. E. Buddle, James Brickett, Alson Crow, William J. Daw III, Thomas Eleftheriou, William Halsey, Carl Hoge, Michael Kasyan, Peter Lara, Lawrence Marcoulitis, David Ellis, and Greg Hoge, committee members.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride I call the accomplishments of Troop 510 and its members to the attention of my colleagues. I know they join me in wishing the "Trailblazers" will continue to show others the way for many years to come.

CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 14

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lee White is a former Chairman of the Federal Power Commission and one of the country's foremost authorities on energy policy. He is also the originator of the proposal to create a federal oil and gas corporation, a "Tennessee Valley Authority" for the natural gas and petroleum industry. I have introduced legislation in the House to implement Mr. White's proposal.

Last month, in the Los Angeles Times, Mr. White explored some of the potential values and objections often cited in connection with the Corporation idea. No one can speak with more authority on the Corporation concept, and I would like to take this opportunity to introduce his remarks into the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sunday, Feb. 3, 1974]

A TVA-TYPE COMPETITOR FOR PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

(By Lee C. White)

The Tennessee Valley Authority, launched 40 years ago, has demonstrated that the federal government can operate efficiently in the energy field without destroying or weakening private enterprise in that industry. This country needs a counterpart of the TVA in funding, producing and managing oil and gas deposits on behalf of the people who own them. It is an idea whose time has come.

Geologists believe that 60% to 75% of all oil and gas yet to be discovered in the United States is on publicly owned land. There is no reason why at least part of these valuable resources should not be discovered and developed by a government corporation for use by their owners—the citizens.

Until now, the government has permitted privately owned corporations to exploit these resources by bidding for the right to go on public lands and explore for petroleum. Less than 5% of the petroleum areas on public lands has been thus leased.

Unfortunately, the administration of this program has been wretched. Leases requiring prompt development have been so loosely enforced that in the Gulf of Mexico there are tracts for which bidders paid the government more than \$750 million, but from which not a drop of fuel has been marketed even though

oil and gas in commercial quantities have been found.

A Federal Oil and Gas Corp., while no panacea, would make a significant contribution to easing our basic and continuing energy problem. Nor is the idea as novel as it seems. The United States is the only major industrial nation that leaves all the handling of petroleum to privately owned corporations, whose management must be responsive to stockholder, as distinguished from national priorities.

A Federal Oil and Gas Corp., as proposed in pending legislation, would:

Explore for and develop petroleum resources to meet national needs, not to maximize profits.

Develop and use the most advanced methods to minimize damage to the environment in all phases of the petroleum process.

Provide, for the first time in our history, complete and accurate information for public and government on the costs of producing oil and gas, as well as other data on the petroleum business.

Manage discovered reserves to reduce U.S. reliance on foreign petroleum sources.

Sell petroleum in a way that insures that a fair share goes to independent refiners and distributors, thus promoting a truly competitive industry.

Provide a competitive spur to the privately owned oil industry.

There was comparatively little need to consider major alternatives to our privately operated petroleum industry as long as the country's needs were being met. However, when things go wrong as they obviously have recently, the system must be reexamined.

The advantages of a government oil corporation are many. Energy shortages may exist for decades. In this situation, there should be an energy-producing organization motivated not by profits, but by national needs. There is nothing inherently wrong with the profit incentive, but where the product is as essential to national well-being and security as energy, at least part of the country's effort to provide it ought to be motivated by America's security, and the needs of the public.

Environmentally, a government corporation would help assure that trimming or delaying our goals is done in the most acceptable way. Residents along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, where offshore drilling probably will be stepped up, should have more confidence in the operations of a public corporation required by law to use the most advanced protective techniques than in those of a profit-making oil company.

Protecting independents in the oil business could be insured by requiring the federal corporation to allocate a fair share of its crude oil to them. Private companies naturally find it difficult to do this themselves. As one oil executive said: "There's no place in our corporate charter, the Constitution, the law, or the Bible where it says we majors must protect and preserve our competitors." He's probably right, but Congress ought to change things so the independents can stay in business as competitors of the majors.

There undoubtedly will be opposition from the oil industry to the proposed government corporation. But the industry ought to welcome the competition and the chance to show it can do a better job than a government agency. This competitive spur to the oil industry may be the best feature of a government oil corporation.

Objections include the assertion that the Postal Service and Amtrak do not augur well for another big government corporation. Apart from the merits of that argument, the TVA is a closer analogy. Though still somewhat controversial, TVA has long since ended any dispute over its electric generating operations. It is among the country's leaders, and has worked harmoniously with private, municipal, and cooperatively owned utilities.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Bonneville Power Administration is another example of an efficient energy agency run by government. I am confident that a federal oil corporation could be as successful as TVA and Bonneville.

Nor would such a public corporation be the first step toward nationalizing the oil industry, any more than TVA meant the end of the private electric utility industry as predicted by some in the 1930s.

No one can claim that creation of a Federal Oil and Gas Corp. is the single, dramatic solution to this country's energy needs for the next 20 years. But I think it is a minimal step that should be taken without delay.

We can no longer permit ourselves to be totally dependent for basic energy supplies on private industry that has failed to develop our resources in a way that meets national needs and protects consumers.

ANOTHER BLOW STRUCK FOR
OMBUDSMEN, H.R. 7680

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most frustrating cases it has been my opportunity to try to solve is a case which involves the Customs Service, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Transportation. In the end the Wonnacott family, not only constituents but also close friends of mine, were ready to give up on the Government. I was reminded of a man who told me in Milford, Utah, 2 years ago that he had had it with Government agencies. "You can't lick them!" he said. "And you can't beat them. Hell," he said, "you can't even join them!" In frustration, I decided, for what it is worth, simply to insert this case into the Record as outlined for me in a letter. The Wonnacott family may have struck a blow for my legislative ombudsman proposal, H.R. 7680. A legislative ombudsman could get to the bottom of these cases and would have the power to cut redtape and solve them and hopefully restore some of the individuality to the Federal administrative process:

MARCH 19, 1974.

Congressman WAYNE OWENS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OWENS: The following is an account of a severe hardship created by well-intentioned laws, the value of which has been partially destroyed by cumbersome regulation, compounded by multiple governmental agency administration.

CASE HISTORY

1. In March of 1973 a new Opel Kadett Holiday was purchased from the Stratemann Company in Dortmund, Germany by an American Citizen—Nancy Joy Wonnacott, a medical technologist employed at Knapp-schafts Hospital.

It was expected at that time the car would be used in Germany for a considerable length of time and that it would not be exported to the United States. Hence a European model was acquired, with little realization of the foolhardiness of such a move.

2. In November 1973 with some 30,000 kilometers on the odometer and with a desire to return to the states, Miss Wonnacott requested, by long-distance telephone, the judgment of her parents on the question of whether to sell the vehicle or have it sent to

America by ship. Her parents, little realizing that a problem of acceptance into the United States might occur, recommended that she ship the car, and forwarded money to accomplish it.

3. On the advice of A.A.A. Miss Wonnacott was referred to the firm of Hermann Ludwig in Dusseldorf, which firm arranged shipment on MS Luise Leonhardt-Bremen to Los Angeles, with all parties unaware of the implication of such a shipment.

4. Miss Wonnacott returned by air early December 1973.

5. She, with a companion, flew to Los Angeles on January 3, 1974 after notification that the car had arrived at Berth 178, Williams, Dimond and Company, P.O. Box 997, Wilmington, California 90744.

6. On her arrival she was informed by U.S. Customs that release required a Customs Brokerage Bond, inasmuch as the vehicle lacked a "Certificate of Conformity" issued by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare or by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (DOT SHIELD).

7. Miss Wonnacott's parents on being advised of the dilemma, took the following action to determine what need be done to satisfy the ninety day's bond compliance of U.S. Customs:

a. Contacted Custom's office, Wilmington, California Jim Lysaght (213) 548-2532, American Customs Brokers (213) 547-0809, Howard Hartry Customs Brokers (213) 830-1010

Failure to execute bond required General Order Storage after January 21st at \$20.00 daily charge, which was negated by action further described herein.

b. Contacted Department of Transportation (Joseph Zemaitis) 450 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco, California 94102 (415) 556-6415 who forwarded several documents including U.S. Department of Transportation HS Form 189 showing twenty-six "typical areas" where a vehicle not manufactured for the U.S. market does not comply. He sent in addition a copy of Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards underlined on page 19 which states that "The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is not in a position to advise as to the modifications necessary to bring any particular vehicle into conformance. The original manufacturer is best qualified to do this."

c. Contacted Regional Buick Opel at Thousand Oaks, California. No one was able to identify specifically what needed to be done to the car to affect compliance. The latter agency contacted Roger Szydowski, General Motor Overseas Operation Air National Vehicle Safety Director. They later reported that the vehicle would likely require at least the following:

Chrome trim replaced, estimated \$200-300.
Emission package, 300.
New head lamps, ?.
New seat belts, 80.
New windshield, 150.
New brake hose, 40.

d. Talked to Ray Bullock, Service Manager of Hayes Bros. Buick-Opel, Salt Lake City, Utah to determine their ability to make any necessary changes and satisfy the U.S. Customs Inspecting Officer at Denver. He referred Mr. Wonnacott to Art Rumsey, Service Manager of Simpson Buick, Downey, California. An earlier sad experience at conversion within ninety days discouraged any hope that sensible modifications could be accomplished and the customs bond satisfied.

e. Next solicited assistance from the Office of Congressman Wayne Owens and Senator Moss and visited them in Washington D.C. hoping for clearer instructions or hardship waivers.

f. Was referred to The Department of Transportation which in turn referred Mr. Wonnacott to the Environmental Protective Agency. No help was forthcoming.

g. Unable to be certain that changes could be consummated to satisfy a custom's bond

March 27, 1974

and to avoid a twenty dollar daily storage charge, a check in the amount of \$756.26 was sent to Williams, Dimond and Company requesting the car be returned to Germany.

h. The car was Laden on Board the Bertha Fisser on February 15, 1974.

1. A refund of \$227.69 has been received from Williams, Dimond and Company (25% on returned cargo).

j. Insurance and licensure has been cancelled and payment refunded.

k. A representative of a legal firm in Dortmund, Germany has been asked to assist in the hoped-for sale of the vehicle and final resolution of the fiasco.

l. Total outlay for this sad adventure is approximately \$1,500.

The greatest tragedy has been the emotional trauma to a hapless young girl, and the knowledge that such an incident could happen to citizens of a country such as ours.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE E. WONNACOTT.

CIVILIAN GRADE CREEP AT THE
PENTAGON

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, civilian grade creep at the Pentagon—the tendency for bureaucracy to become increasingly more topheavy—cost the taxpayers at least \$400 million annually, according to a Library of Congress report that was prepared at my request.

This year's costs for Pentagon civilian grade creep are actually lower than last year's by about \$30 million. But, the taxpayer can take little solace in this slight decline in the high cost of grade creep—the defense budget is still \$400 million higher than it should be. In fact, in the last 2 years this phenomenon has cost the taxpayers a total of \$830 million.

The Library of Congress report compares the fiscal year 1964 distribution of civil service ranks with the fiscal year 1973 grade structure. The total number of employees working on June 30, 1973, is used to arrive at the Library of Congress estimate and all pay raises are added. The report demonstrates that the cost of the 1964 grade structure at today's employment level and including all pay raises would still be \$400 million lower. For example, the study notes that since 1964 the number of civil servants who had the rank of GS-13 or above has increased from 8.2 to 10.3 percent.

The Library reports that—

It must be emphasized that these figures represent crude averages and only approximate the amount actually spent . . . According to our calculations, therefore, grade creep would currently account for an increase in the annual DOD civilian payroll of approximately \$400 million.

As many of my colleagues may know, Defense Secretary James R. Schlesinger has expressed concern about civilian grade creep in his posture statement to Congress. He told us that—

As with other federal agencies, the Department of Defense has over the long-term experienced a persistent rise in the average grade of civilian position.

Mr. Schlesinger reports that a program begun in 1971 to slow grade creep has had "encouraging results."

Mr. Speaker, unless the Pentagon re-

duces its costs, Congress should cut the cost through a specific amendment to the defense budget. Beginning this year, Congress in the Defense Department authorization bill set a limit on the number of Defense Department civilian employees that the Pentagon can hire.

The report follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1974.
To Honorable Les Aspin, Attention: Bill
Broydick.
From Robert L. Goldich, Analyst in National
Defense.
Via Chief, Foreign Affairs Division.
Subject Impact of Grade Creep on Department of Defense Civilian Pay.

This memorandum is provided in response to your request of February 22, 1974, for an analysis of the impact of grade creep on Department of Defense civilian pay. Mr. Broydick indicated that he desired us to isolate the effect of grade creep in the DOD civilian workforce since FY 1964, by determining what total civilian pay would be if the present DOD civilian work force were graded according to the FY 1964 grade distribution and paid on FY 1974 pay scales. This therefore consists of an updating of a similar analysis done for your office dated September 26, 1973, using then current pay scales and grade distributions.

Using the most recent data, the attached tables contain computations of total pay of the FY 1973 General Schedule (GS) total workforce based on FY 1973 and FY 1964 grade distributions, both according to the FY 1974 pay scale. As stated in our previous analysis, it must be emphasized that these figures represent crude averages and only approximate the amounts actually spent. According to our computations, the FY 1973 DOD GS workforce, graded on FY 1973 scales and paid on FY 1974 scales, would produce a total payroll of \$7.63 billion yearly. The same total number of employees, graded on FY 1964 scales and paid on FY 1974 scales, would produce a total annual payroll of \$7.23 billion. According to our calculations, therefore, grade creep would currently account for an increase in the annual DOD civilian payroll of approximately \$400 million.

You will recall that the cost of grade creep in the DOD GS payroll calculated in our previous analysis was approximately \$430 million. The decrease since then reflects a slight decrease in the total number of DOD GS employees—from 607,850 to 591,012—and a slight decline in the number of such employees in the higher grades. For example, the percentage of GS employees in grade GS-11 has declined from 12.08% at the end of FY 1972 to 11.82% at the end of FY 1973, and the percentage of GS-12's has declined from 10.07% to 9.90%.

PAY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE GENERAL SCHEDULE (GS) CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES GRADED ON FISCAL YEAR 1973 GRADE STRUCTURE AND PAID ACCORDING TO FISCAL YEAR 1974 PAY SCALES

Grade	Percent- age of total GS employ- ees ¹	Number in grade ¹	Current pay ²	Total pay of individuals in grade ³
GS-1	0.61	3,621	\$5,578	\$19,980,678
GS-2	2.75	16,267	6,249	101,652,483
GS-3	8.76	51,757	7,050	364,886,890
GS-4	13.22	78,145	7,918	618,752,110
GS-5	13.38	79,055	8,859	708,348,245
GS-6	5.59	33,021	9,874	326,049,354
GS-7	9.12	53,884	10,965	590,838,060
GS-8	2.01	11,884	12,133	144,188,572
GS-9	11.44	67,628	13,385	905,200,780
GS-10	1.10	6,497	14,717	95,616,349
GS-11	11.82	69,834	16,138	1,126,981,092
GS-12	9.90	58,536	19,246	1,126,583,856
GS-13	6.56	38,765	22,744	881,466,464
GS-14	2.53	14,974	26,671	399,371,554

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Grade	Percent- age of total GS employ- ees ¹	Number in grade ¹	Current pay ²	Total pay of individuals in grade ³
GS-15	1.06	6,256	\$31,089	\$194,492,784
GS-16	.12	698	36,000	25,188,000
GS-17	.02	137	36,000	4,932,000
GS-18	.01	53	36,000	1,908,000
Total	100.00	591,012	7,628,377,231	

¹ As of June 30, 1973. Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller). Directorate for Information Operations. Aug. 29, 1973.

² Pay of 4th step of each grade as of Oct. 1, 1973 (current pay scales), defined by the Civil Service Commission as average step within grade for comparability purposes.

³ Number in grade multiplied by pay.

PAY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE GENERAL SCHEDULE (GS) CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES GRADED ON FISCAL YEAR 1964 GRADE STRUCTURE AND PAID ACCORDING TO FISCAL YEAR 1974 PAY SCALES

Grade	Percent- age of total GS employ- ees ¹	Number in grade ¹	Pay ²	Total pay of individuals in grade ³
GS-1	0.09	532	\$5,518	\$2,935,576
GS-2	1.96	10,408	6,249	65,039,592
GS-3	12.46	73,640	7,050	519,162,000
GS-4	16.99	100,413	7,918	795,070,134
GS-5	13.12	77,541	8,859	686,935,719
GS-6	5.41	31,974	9,874	315,711,276
GS-7	8.62	50,945	10,965	558,611,925
GS-8	1.37	8,097	12,133	98,240,901
GS-9	11.58	68,439	13,385	916,056,015
GS-10	1.09	6,442	14,717	94,806,914
GS-11	11.12	65,721	16,138	1,060,605,493
GS-12	8.00	47,281	19,246	909,970,126
GS-13	4.87	28,782	22,744	654,617,808
GS-14	2.26	13,357	26,671	356,244,547
GS-15	.94	5,556	31,089	172,730,484
GS-16	.09	532	36,000	19,152,000
GS-17	.02	118	36,000	4,248,000
GS-18	.01	59	36,000	2,124,000
Total	100.00	591,012	7,232,262,515	

¹ As of June 30, 1964. Directorate for Statistical Services, Office of the Secretary of Defense. Oct. 22, 1964.

² The number of individuals in a GS work force totaling 591,012—the overall strength for end of fiscal year 1973—who would be in the grade noted if the fiscal year 1964 grade distribution were applied to the fiscal year 1973 force level. Numbers may not add to total due to rounding.

³ Pay of 4th step of each grade as of Oct. 1, 1973 (current pay scales), defined by the Civil Service Commission as the average step within grade for comparability purposes.

⁴ Number in grade multiplied by pay.

NATIONAL AUTISTIC CHILDREN'S WEEK

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce a resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the last week in June, each year, as "National Autistic Children's Week."

The merits of this event can be brought clearly to mind by the tragedy that is autism. This strange disease, which effects four persons in every 10,000, limits the power of these children to function appropriately in society. While they appear as problem free children at first glance, their ability to communicate and relate is severely impaired by mental disorders affecting speech and perceptual skills. Consequently they be-

come isolated and deprived. Educationally and medically theirs is a plight not provided for in most jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution will serve these children in two ways. First, it will provide needed publicity to make parents of autistic children aware of the various services available to them. And it will bring the problems of autistic children to the American people, which will, in turn, help the fundraising efforts of the National Society for Autistic Children. These funds will be used for desperately needed medical research, and provide services for these children.

I urge the Congress to give rapid consideration to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I request permission to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

H.J. RES. 959

Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in June of each year as "National Autistic Children's Week"

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the last week in June of each year as "National Autistic Children's Week", and calling the attention of the people of the United States to the plight of the autistic child, and the services which are available to help such children and their families.

BEST WISHES TO AMBASSADOR WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join in this sendoff tribute to our friend and distinguished colleague, Bill Mailiard, as he starts another phase of his public service career. After more than 21 years of service in the U.S. House of Representatives, Bill has been asked by the President to assume the important duties as our Ambassador to the Organization of American States. He will be a great Ambassador.

All of us are familiar with Bill Mailiard's experience and expertise in the field of the international interests of our Nation. In his position as ranking minority member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he has displayed a rare ability to obtain the compromises and statesmanlike attitudes necessary to a truly bipartisan foreign policy for this country.

While he will be difficult to replace here in this House, his abilities might better serve our national interests in his new position. The Secretary of State has announced new purposes and goals for our policies toward our Latin American neighbors. It will take knowledgeable leadership at all levels of diplomacy to achieve these new goals and to form better relationships with these countries. Bill Mailiard knows Latin America. He knows its problems and its strengths. He likes its people. He will represent us well.

March 27, 1974

So while saddened to lose his services and friendship in the House of Representatives, we wish you well, Bill, and pledge to you our cooperation and support in your new responsibilities.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS AND PRIORITIES

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like for my constituents, particularly those involved in the field of education, to have every opportunity to communicate with me concerning this important work.

I have a compilation of discussions and questions that have been submitted to me by various groups along with some of my own thinking.

In order for all citizens of the 24th District of Texas to be made aware of these discussions, I am including the report in the RECORD:

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS AND PRIORITIES

GENERAL

I feel very strongly that we must have, as a major national commitment, the education of every person to the limit of his ability to learn. Almost all of us have children or grandchildren—or plan to at some time. Our young are our future. In them lies the destinies of this nation.

In Congress, education must be considered for federal funding along with other programs on a year-to-year basis and take its place among the priorities established. Among long-range goals, education must be a major continuing commitment at all levels of government, not just in Washington.

In a political campaign, it is very easy for a candidate to promise the moon. It is "good politics" to make every special interest group, professional group, or ethnic and religious segment, believe that the candidate will champion "their cause". I have never done this, either in a political campaign or during my tenure in office. My goal is to see that all segments are fairly represented and considered within the perspective of the entire national legislative program.

ISSUES IN THE 1974 CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION

Issues in an election are a nebulous phenomenon. Candidates raise issues, the media raise issues, and lobbyists raise issues. More often than not, the real issues are never discussed during an election campaign. Real issues are often complex, boring and unpleasant to face.

While a "candidate" may never have to face the real issues, your Congressman must.

As far as I am concerned, only the voters can really identify issues. The candidates, the lobbyists and the press each have a self-interest. I want to know the issues—as you see them.

Lobby and representative groups of the education field have submitted questionnaires to me, detailing issues and priorities which they say are your issues and priorities.

I shall list them, in the order presented to me, along with a short general statement in reply.

ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE DALLAS EDUCATORS POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—DEPAC

1. Will I support federal funding of one-third of the total cost of education? My answer: No. We had the Library of Congress Economic Analyst research this possibility. The cost would be an additional \$12.3 bil-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

lion annually. Putting it another way, it would increase your income tax three percent, or increase the federal deficit by fifty percent.

2. Would I support collective bargaining for public employees? My answer: Yes, and I pointed out that public employees already have the right to collective bargaining. All they have to do is organize.

3. Would I support the allocation of funds for educational projects to eliminate the stereotyped presentation of women's roles in society? Note: I asked DEPAC to further explain the question and give examples. The DEPAC committee gave the content of textbooks as an example wherein the roles of males were predominant. They explained that the federally-funded project, referred to in this question, would, among other things, require publishers to print books that give equal emphasis to the sexes.

My answer: No. While I am a strong advocate for equal rights for all citizens, I would never want to see a government bureaucrat dictating either to publishers or to educators the content of text books.

4. Would I support funding of bi-lingual and bi-cultural education? My answer: Yes, enthusiastically.

5. Would I support mobility and protection of teacher retirement funds? My answer: Yes, I introduced H.R. 2919, a workers pension re-insurance bill which contained a portability section.

6. Would I support a copyright law revision? My answer: Yes.

7. How do I feel about National Health Insurance? My answer: I have introduced H.R. 5039, a National Health Insurance Bill.

ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY TEXAS STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

1. How do I stand on ESEA Amendments on 1973? My answer: I favor the original House Bill with an amendment to extend impact aid through 1978.

2. What is my stand on NEA's proposal for federal funding of $\frac{1}{2}$ of the cost of all education? My answer: (Same as DEPAC question).

3. What is my position on Metric Conversion? My answer: I am co-sponsor of H.R. 11035, a bill to convert to the metric system within 10 years.

4. Do I favor a Mobile Teachers Retirement Act? My answer: Yes, (see also answer in DEPAC question).

5. Would I favor Retirement Income tax credit? My answer: Yes.

6. Would I favor Copyright Revision? My answer: Yes.

7. What is my position on Impoundment Control? My answer: An impoundment control bill has already passed both the House and is now in joint conference. I am generally in favor of impoundment control but the wording of the bill will be extremely important lest there be unintentional interference with other laws.

THE ISSUES AND PRIORITIES, AS I SEE THEM?

In establishing issues and priorities, one must also be pragmatic by facing the world as it is, rather than how we would like for it to be. Herein lies the main difference between a candidate and a Congressman.

A candidate can be idealistic with little regard for practicality. He has nothing to lose. A Congressman knows that he will have to deliver anything promised.

With the foregoing in mind and the statements made in the general section of this report, the priorities and issues from my standpoint are as follows:

1. Re-orienting Federal aid to Elementary and Secondary Education.

Presently federal aid is involved in a number of grant programs that concern day-to-day operations of schools. Massive controls and guidelines have created a bureaucratic nightmare for both the federal government and the schools. Even the daily routines of

teachers are burdened with petty details brought on by federal edicts.

I would like to see federal aid projects limited to basic educational research, demonstration programs, statistical studies and other programs of general and equal assistance to all schools in the Nation.

2. Re-distribution of direct federal aid.

If federal aid is continued for use in day-to-day operations of elementary and secondary education, I think that this aid should be distributed on a pre-student basis. Consideration of welfare-oriented problems are creating another bureaucratic nightmare and establishes the school administrations as another "welfare board". Welfare matters should be taken care of outside the school system.

3. Return to the neighborhood school concept.

I am in favor of legislation or, if necessary, a Constitutional amendment to assure that every child has the right to attend his neighborhood school. This stance is by no means racially inspired. Instead, my concern is for the child and his development of a "sense of community".

We stress the child's development as an individual. The next important step, in building both character and good citizenship, is the development of his "sense of community". This of course is then followed by his development of national pride.

Pulling an elementary school child out of his immediate neighborhood (and nearby playmates) to inject him into another neighborhood is damaging to that important stage of development.

Racial integration, which I fully support, will only be possible by raising the economic levels of minority citizens. Through job opportunities, vocational training and other projects that will allow increased income. In this manner, any citizen may live in any neighborhood of his choice.

THE ISSUES AND PRIORITIES AS YOU SEE THEM

As stated earlier, you are really the expert. Only the voter can really establish issues and priorities. Please make the issue known to me, as you see them.

RED CROSS CERTIFICATE OF MERIT TO NANCY B. KEELER

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to commend Ms. Nancy B. Keeler, of Lakewood, Calif. Ms. Keeler has been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit, the highest award given by the American Red Cross to a person who saves a life by using skills learned in a Red Cross course.

On June 4, 1973, Ms. Keeler passed a parked truck and a group of excited bystanders. She saw that a 9-month-old child, placed in the seatbelt of the truck while his father was absent for a few minutes, had been accidentally strangled by the belt. Ms. Keeler placed the infant, who showed no life signs, on the sidewalk and began to administer mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. She continued until the unconscious child resumed breathing. The child was taken to a hospital and released later, completely recovered. Without doubt, Ms. Keeler's use of her skills and knowledge saved the child's life.

Ms. Keeler utilized her training and

intelligence to save another human life. Her concern for others as exemplified by her actions of last June 4 is commendable. On behalf of myself and my constituents, I am pleased to take this opportunity to express our pride and gratitude to Ms. Keeler.

FAREWELL TO H. R. GROSS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of profound regret that we have learned of the resignation later this year of Representative H. R. Gross of Iowa, after 25 years of distinguished service in the House. The Nation will lose the services of an honorable man, one who has stood tall in the halls of this body during his 25 years of service.

In its farewell tribute to Mr. Gross, the Wall Street Journal suggested that we in this body consider passing H.R. 144. In every Congress, House Resolution 144 has been submitted by Mr. Gross. It is a bill requiring Congress to pay off the national debt. Unfortunately, it has not yet been successful.

The Des Moines Register and Tribune, in announcing his retirement, said he had become a symbol of incorruptible integrity and independence in a Congress where these qualities are not always admired by the leadership.

The story noted that:

The leadership frequently steamrolled bills through, over the vigorous protests of Gross, but he was seldom, if ever, ignored in discussions of controversial legislation. Sam Rayburn and Joe Martin used to make it a practice to "find out what Gross thinks about it."

In another article concerning H. R. Gross, the National Observer, in its issue of March 23, 1974, noted that:

He once questioned the cost of John Kennedy's eternal flame; he didn't think Winston Churchill should be made an honorary American citizen, unless he helped pay off our war debts. He's one of a kind, the last of the gadflies. And this is his final year in Congress. After 25 years he's retiring.

The National Observer interviewed H. R. Gross and asked him whether the Government was still spending—and wasting—too much money. He replied:

Why, it's perfectly obvious. It's offering a \$304 billion budget with a built-in deficit of \$10 billion. It won't hold at \$10 billion either, because it never does. That's spending too much money.

When he was asked if we were getting more for our money from the Federal Government than when he first came to Congress in 1949, he replied:

Hell no. This budget calls for 22,000 or 25,000 more employees.

Concerning his fellow Members of Congress, Mr. Gross noted that:

It's their fault as much as anyone else's. The situation in this country is one of collapse, unless something happens very soon. The obvious answer is: Get back to a balanced budget. We ought to be paying off the Federal debt; should have been doing it all these years. Balance the budget. Retire the debt. Hold the line.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In an era when politicians are in growing, and often deserved, disrepute, H. R. Gross stands out as a man of unquestioned honor and integrity. It has been a privilege for me to serve with him in this body and I know that I speak for most of my colleagues in saying that we—and the Nation—will miss him.

I wish to share with my colleagues the interview with H. R. Gross which appeared in the National Observer of March 23, 1974, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

H. R. GROSS: WE'RE ONLY "ALLEGEDLY AFFLUENT"

Most members of the House of Representatives are faceless time-servers, interested mostly in getting re-elected and keeping out of trouble. The spectacular exception is Harold Royce (H.R.) Gross, the curmudgeonly, nit-picking, penny-pinching Republican congressman from Iowa. He once questioned the cost of John Kennedy's eternal flame; he didn't think Winston Churchill should be made an honorary American citizen, unless he helped pay off our war debts. He's one of a kind, the last of the gadflies. And this is his final year in Congress. After 25 years, he's retiring. He wants, he says, to go fishing, expecting that while he's gone the country will go the rest of the way to hell in a hand basket.

He was interviewed in his Capitol Hill office by The Observer's James M. Perry.

Congressman, I thought I'd ask this question, and then duck: Is the Government still spending—and wasting—too much money?

Why it's perfectly obvious. It's offering a \$304 billion budget with a built-in deficit of \$10 billion. It won't hold at \$10 billion either, because it never does. That's spending much too much money.

Are we getting any more for our money from the Federal Government than we did when you first came here in 1949?

Hell no. This budget calls for 22,000 or 25,000 more Federal employees.

I suppose you can remember balanced budgets?

There has been damned few of them since I've been here. Years ago, though, there was a very different climate here. There was a real concern about the gap between tax revenues and spending. Roosevelt, back in his balmiest days, warned that if Congress went beyond an \$85 billion debt, the country would be in real trouble. Today we're approaching \$500 billion—half a trillion of Federal debt.

Congress doesn't care?

Not much. It's their fault as much as anyone else's. The situation in this country is one of collapse, unless something happens very soon.

What must we do?

The obvious answer: Get back to a balanced budget. We ought to be paying off the Federal debt; should have been doing it all these years. Balance the budget. Retire the debt. Hold the line.

Did you expect Richard Nixon would bring in all these deficit budgets?

I hope for something else. I never dreamed he'd come in this year with what I believe is his fifth red-ink budget.

Where's the most money wasted?

Everywhere, but particularly in foreign aid. Do you realize that, aside from the war costs in Southeast Asia, we have spent \$260 billion for foreign aid. I didn't say million. I said BILLION!

And have you opposed all that foreign aid all these years?

Not all of it. I didn't get to Congress until 1949. But I've opposed every dollar of it ever since.

You don't think any of it was justified?

Not really. I would have voted for a minimal amount for Korea and a few selected places, but certainly not \$260 billion worth. The best evidence of what it hasn't done is

in the few friends we have around the world today. We've spent \$260 billion, and where do we have a solid ally? Look at NATO today. It's a shambles. It's a pretty sad situation, after having dumped \$260 billion around the world.

But didn't we pay for the recovery of Europe and Japan?

It helped them—and they've never paid their loans in full.

And didn't our aid stave off communism? That's what people say.

That's easy to say. It's just an assumption, and I'm not sure it's so. What I know are the facts of life today, and that's that we don't have any dependable friends.

Can you go back over the years and recall a memorable victory in cutting waste, reducing spending?

I don't have to go back years. I just have to go back to Jan. 23, when I led the fight that defeated the fourth replenishment, to the tune of \$1.5 billion, for the soft-loan window of the World Bank, better known as the International Development Association. If you can believe it, our Government went over to Nairobi and committed the taxpayers of this country to put \$1.5 billion into the capital fund of this soft-loan window outfit.

What's a soft-loan window?

It's loans to these countries for 40 or 50 years. They don't pay anything for 10 years, and then they pay almost nothing for the next 10 years. After that, maybe they pay 3 per cent. Maybe. These loans are so soft they'll never be repaid. These, in fact, are grants in disguise, and I'm just tired of bleeding the taxpayers of this country for them.

But we're a big affluent country. Can't we help countries that aren't so big and rich?

Allegedly affluent. Do you know that this big, allegedly affluent country of ours has a public and private debt, as of last Dec. 31, of 3 trillion, 200 billion dollars? That's *net*, public and private. That much debt is unmanageable.

What are the consequences? Another Depression?

Yes. Last time, the dollars were so dear you couldn't get hold of one. This time, they're going to be so cheap you won't be able to get enough of them. In terms of purchasing power, the 1939 dollar is worth 31.8 cents today.

Why are we in this trouble?

Improvident spending. Mismanagement of Government. Spending money we don't have for a lot of things we don't need.

What did you think of the way members of Congress tried to get a nice pay increase?

Not just members of Congress. Federal judges too and top-level employees of the executive department and the supergrades in the civil service. And they tried to get it through without a vote. I fought it, and it was finally knocked out in the Senate.

Don't members of Congress, and these other people, deserve a pay increase? They haven't had one for several years.

They got a 41 per cent increase four years ago. And this one was for 25 per cent, over three years.

Don't they deserve it?

Not on the basis of the way they've been working. They ought to be hungry over here, instead of being overpaid. And Federal judges aren't suffering and neither are Cabinet officers.

Doesn't a decent salary make a man a little more honest?

Did you notice any more honesty in Government after the 41 per cent increase?

I guess not.

All right. And don't forget that the President's pay was increased 100 per cent in 1969. Remember?

People say Congress is so impotent.

That's right. Nothing gets done. You know we can't go on piling up debt, paying so much interest. We can't go on—and maintain this form of Government. If you can't re-

March 27, 1974

tire this debt by orderly means, then it will be retired by disorderly means or unusual means.

How would that happen?

By devaluation, revaluation, or outright repudiation. You might have a little money in the bank and one fine morning you might wake up and find that each one of your dollars was now worth 50 cents. The other 50 cents would have been confiscated.

THAT'S PRETTY POWERFUL STUFF

Sure it is. You know there's a statute on the books right now, stand-by legislation, that provides the President can issue an edict to take over all the credit in this country?

What was Congress thinking about when it gave the President that kind of authority?

What was Congress thinking about when it give him all the rest of the delegated authority? How in hell did he get all this authority? Because Congress gave it to him, that's how. I say to my colleagues, stop your bellyaching and your wailing and groaning about the President usurping all this power. He hasn't usurped it. You gave it to him!

The point is, the President can't spend a dime. He can't impound a penny—unless we give it to him. Congress ought to get a mirror and take a look at itself.

But they know what they've been doing.

Deep in their hearts, they know it. But this is the easy way. This makes life more comfortable.

So what they've done is take the heat off themselves when it comes time to make uncomfortable political decisions?

Exactly right. Why, can you think of any one item the President ought not to take care of more than fixing the pay of members of Congress? But Congress gave it to him. They gave him power no President ever ought to have.

From what you say, you must believe conditions are more perilous in this country now than ever before.

They are.

I'm an old man now, but I have children and grandchildren. I worry about them. I wonder whether they're going to enjoy the liberties and the freedom I have known. This is the finest form of Government man has ever devised, but it's been badly mismanaged—by Democrats and by Republicans.

So why are you retiring?

If I served one more term, I'd be scraping 78 years. I'd like a little time to do the things I've been unable to do. I've worked hard at this job. I'm tired of late meals every night and so is my wife. And I'm tired of the frustrations. They happen every day around here now, and they're getting hard to take. Once in a while you win one. Most often, though, you lose. I'd like to go fishing.

REFORMS NEEDED

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in the March 9 issue of Saturday Review/World the fired Watergate prosecutor, Archibald Cox, comments on our Judiciary Committee's "awesome task" and makes an excellent case for a thorough reform of campaign financing. As a backer of such reform, I commend Professor Cox' views to the House:

EFFECTS OF WATERGATE

(By Archibald Cox)

Granted the debilitating effects of the Watergate scandal, the fact remains that if we will it so, Watergate can be made a turning point and therefore a blessing. Above all, it has shocked out of lethargy the con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

science of the nation. Possibly my view is too self-centered and too much influenced by the moving letters I still receive, but it seems to me that the "firestorm"—to borrow a phrase from Gen. Alexander Haig—that exploded over the weekend of October 21-22 had its source in the longing of countless simple, direct, and moral people for a new measure of candor, simplicity, and rectitude in the conduct of government.

The turn of events was extraordinary. On a Friday and Saturday the President announced that he was discharging the special prosecutor, terminating independent investigation of the Watergate affair and related offenses, and refusing to produce relevant tapes and documents in accordance with the order of a court. The public outcry forced an immediate, 180-degree turnaround. Within days the court was assured that the tapes and documents would be produced. Within weeks the independence of the Watergate Special Prosecution Force was restored, the staff was retained unimpaired, and a vigorous and independent special prosecutor was appointed.

This sequence of events demonstrates better than any other occurrence within memory the extent of this country's dedication to the principle that ours is a government of laws and not of men. It gave proof of the people's determination and ability to compel their highest officials to meet their obligations under the laws as fully and faithfully as others. On this occasion, as so often in our history when fundamental questions were at stake, the people had a far better sense of the goals of the enterprise and the needs of the nation than those claiming wider experience and greater sophistication.

The spirit is there. The power is there. The question is whether those who seek to be political leaders have the wit and will to evoke that spirit, articulate it, and take measures to restore confidence in the integrity of the government.

What measures? To answer this question, one is driven back to simplicities so obvious that to express them seems banal. Yet we risk forgetting the truths we do not avow.

First and foremost, we must restore to government a stronger appreciation of the line separating fundamental judgments of right and wrong in the conduct of government and political life, on the one side, from mere political loyalties and political opinions, on the other.

Too many of us grew up in an atmosphere of positivism and relativism in which the assertion of moral imperatives was taken as proof of ignorance and naivete, at least among those wishing to be supposed persons of experience and sophistication. Others took the imperatives for granted, supposing that the fundamentals would look out for themselves. The cynics found justification in Leo Durocher's "Nice guys finish last" or in presidential aide Charles Colson's "It's only hard-nosed politics." One way or the other, success in gaining power took precedence, and personal or party loyalty became a justification for silently going along with, if not actually participating in, wrongdoing.

I do not essay the role of Jeremiah or assume moral superiority. For me the worrisome figures in the Watergate story were not the major actors who planned or sanctioned the break-in or managed the cover-up; their fault is too great and their weakness too apparent. The stage was also peopled with relatively minor figures who made wrongs possible by going along in silence, by cutting sharp verbal corners, or by otherwise emulating the Three Monkeys: "Hear No Evil, See No Evil, Speak No Evil." Over and over again I found myself wondering, "Would I have done better? I hope so, but in all honesty I cannot be too sure." The moral imperatives will not take care of themselves. We need to articulate and nurture them in the center of political life. It was the gradual erosion of the moral limitations to le-

gitimate power that led to increasing abuse of the necessary agencies for gathering intelligence.

THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE now confronts the awesome task of recommending whether the President of the United States should be impeached. The Constitution does not limit the grounds for impeachment to criminal offenses. The constitutional phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors" almost surely was intended to include some kinds of misfeasance or non-feasance in office that are impeachable wrongs against the people even though not technically indictable offenses. In addition to finding facts, therefore, the Judiciary Committee must articulate standards defining morally unacceptable behavior in the conduct of the presidency. This process of definition involves answering some prickly questions: Is it tolerable or a high offense against the personal security and liberty of the whole people for a President to encourage formation of a force of irregular agents in his executive offices—agents who operate outside the regularizing rules and procedures of established agencies, and who will engage in wiretapping and burglaries in order to effectuate administration policy and political objectives? Clearly, the President has a constitutional duty to see that the laws are faithfully executed. Should we say a President has violated that duty by looking the other way when there is suspicion or perhaps evidence of criminal misconduct—including obstruction of justice on the part of the party's officials and his own senior aides? Is it violation of presidential duty for him to forgo directing and receiving regular reports upon a thoroughgoing investigation and, later, for him to withhold any real cooperation from those conducting such an investigation?

Believe me, I do not imply that the predicates of these questions represent the actual facts. The evidence may show more or less. My only point is that beyond the excitement of possible new disclosures and the drama of deciding whether to impeach or not there lies the arduous task of defining minimum standards of behavior in the conduct of the presidency, the violation of which inflicts too grave a wound upon the health of the body politic to be accepted even from one popularly elected.

It is important that the Judiciary Committee and also we ourselves recognize this fact. The committee's ability to articulate the standards of conduct by which the President's discharge of his duties is to be judged may well determine whether the proceedings are a constructive step in rebuilding confidence in the integrity of government or, contrariwise, fall into the kind of rancorous partisan quarrel that characterized the impeachment of Andrew Johnson. The standards set could well affect the behavior of public men and the people's confidence in our form of government far into the future. Successful performance of the committee's task will require the vision to achieve, and the skill to articulate, a broad, non-partisan consensus.

There are other, simpler steps that can be taken to restore an abiding sense of the moral limits that make political power legitimate. One is the thorough-going reform of campaign financing.

Since our early history, political candidates have relied upon private contributors to supply the financial sinews of a successful campaign. The image that guides us is a picture of voluntary gifts, some large and many small, motivated by loyalty to principle or disinterested concern for good government. At a time when government had fewer functions and relatively little effect upon business failure or success, when there were fewer regulatory agencies and only limited "goodies" to dispense, the image did not greatly distort the truth.

In some cases the image still represents reality. By and large, however, two develop-

ments have radically altered the entire context of election financing.

First, the costs of running for office have multiplied geometrically.

Second, there are more and more business activities vitally affected by government decisions. Hardly anyone can say today that he does not have, and will not have, some matter that will be influenced by government actions. These facts confront both those who raise money and those who give it. Both also know that those who make government decisions involving the donor may learn of the gift, and who can say how the decisions might be affected?

The vice is epitomized by the Milk Producers and ITT affairs. The Associated Milk Producers arranged to contribute a political fund of several hundred thousand dollars to be controlled (if my memory is right) by presidential assistants. About the same time, the support price of milk was raised sharply—a reversal of previous policy. And the attorney general, who had been and again would be the President's campaign manager, twice rejected recommendations for criminal antitrust prosecutions (although he did authorize a milder civil complaint).

An ITT subsidiary gave a large guarantee—certainly one of two hundred thousand, and perhaps four hundred thousand dollars—in order to bring the Republican National Convention to San Diego at the same time as major antitrust suits were pending in the courts and ITT officials were busily lobbying to block government appeals or secure a favorable settlement. The cases were settled. Later, both ITT and government officials went to considerable lengths not to disclose the extent of ITT's contacts with the government and of White House involvement in the handling of ITT's anti-trust cases.

I do not mean to charge bribery or improper influence either directly or by snide insinuation. My point is just the reverse. We do not know in either instance, and perhaps we can never know, what motives influenced the contributions or the government's action. And this is the real evil.

A system of political financing that contemplates contributions made or accepted under such circumstances destroys confidence in the integrity of government, even when decisions are made by men of the nicest conscience. We are too skeptical a people to believe that contributions made by those having urgent business before the government are always made without hope of advantage and always received without some practical appreciation. By the nature of the system, therefore, suspicion is inevitable and universal, both when suspicion is justified and when it is not. To restore confidence in the integrity of government requires a new method of financing political campaigns. The old method was good for its day, but now that government touches so many large donors' business interests it generates public distrust even when untainted by corruption.

The Milk Producers and ITT affairs are not unique. Gulf Oil, American Airlines, Braniff Airways, and 3M are just a few of the corporations that made vast contributions during the 1972 campaign. Nor do the corrupting consequences cease with the risk of improper influence upon government decisions, be it actuality or false but inevitable suspicion. To hide the connection, cash was often used, laundered through foreign accounts. Records were falsified. Sometimes executives actually paid over contributions and were then reimbursed by equivalent cash bonuses from their corporate employers.

The outlines of the remedy are plain enough. As voters we should insist that Congress enact legislation along the lines of the Udall-Anderson bill outlawing private contributions and providing federal funds to finance campaigns for President, Vice President, senators, and representatives.

Enactment would go far to eliminate the occasion for vast contributions by men or

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

companies directly interested in government decisions. Outlawing them would dispel one source of private cynicism and public distrust. Public financing would also help to quiet the growing fear that soon only very wealthy or corrupt men can aspire to public office. The monetary cost would be a trivial fraction of the annual federal budget.

To describe public financing as a handout to wasteful publicity and frivolous candidates is to ignore what we should be purchasing: confidence in the integrity of government decision making, an indispensable ingredient of self-government yet a trust that we cannot share under modern conditions so long as political campaigns are financed largely by those whose business and financial success depends upon favorable action by the beneficiaries of their support.

The objection is sometimes raised that prohibiting private campaign contributions violates the freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment. Money is indeed necessary in order to make speech effective. Those of few or modest means can make themselves heard only by pooling their resources. Even so, spending money is one step removed from speech, and the contributor is a second step away because he is using money to promote not his own speech but another's.

Nor can it fairly be said that ideas would be suppressed or opportunities for speech be restricted. Everyone would be left free to speak and write as an individual. Except for the very wealthy, everyone would be left free to spend money in disseminating his personal expressions. As for parties and candidates, the public subsidy would merely replace the private contributions. The opportunities to travel, to buy space or time in the media, to leaflet and advertise, would remain. The relative size of expenditures by one or another candidate might be affected, but the First Amendment has never been supposed to guarantee those able to raise the most money the greatest opportunity for organized political expression.

There is more difficulty, I think, in making just provision for candidates outside the major parties. The favored solution is to provide funds based upon the minor party's vote in the last election, but there have been presidential elections in which this would have been hopelessly out of proportion to the importance of the new party: 1856, 1860, 1912, 1924, 1968—others might add additional campaigns. New parties are major sources of pressure for change as well as new ideas. Perhaps the opportunity for them to develop could be preserved by providing means to demonstrate potential support, and, therefore, entitlement to public funds beyond what they received in the previous election—and by allowing them alone to seek and spend private contributions. The problem is by no means insoluble. Certainly it is not enough to justify continuing a method of financing elections that contribute so much distrust of government.

Near the beginning I spoke of the erosion of confidence in the institutions of government. Under governmental institutions as democratic as ours the erosion means our loss of confidence in ourselves.

We have indeed learned much about ourselves in recent decades. The quick conquest of a continent and the Horatio Alger story bred a folklore of endless resources and easy success. For all but the unfortunate, technology and industrial organization poured out a seemingly endless flow of material comforts. American might in two wars led us to suppose that our power extended to the farthest reaches of the globe. Recent decades dispelled these illusions. Our cities became uninhabitable. The succession of new cars, new television sets, and new refrigerators proved a wasteland. Our power in the world is limited. We have lost our innocence and have learned our capacity for evil; witness the bombs dropped on Southeast Asia and the gap that still exists between our pretenses

and practices in the treatment of blacks, Chicanos, and American Indians.

It takes honesty and courage to face these facts, but those whose realism leads them to despair suffer their own form of illusion. The men and women who sought freedom across the seas, who crossed the prairies and the great plains to conquer the mountains and build gardens in the desert, knew the costs, the struggles, the defeats, and the disappointments. They knew their fallibility and capacity for evil. But our forebears also had the greater insight for a vision of the ultimate perfectability of man and the greater courage to pursue their vision even when they knew that neither they nor their children nor their children's children could wholly achieve it. Edward Everett Hale voiced the true spirit of the American dream: "I am only one./But still I am one./I cannot do everything./But still I can do something./And because I cannot do everything./I will not refuse to do the something that I can do."

We are here to keep the dream alive.

RESURGENCE OF THE HOUSE IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be interested in the following article which was published in the March 1974 edition of the Democratic Leader, the official publication of the New York State Democratic Party. It contains my assessment of the increasing importance and effectiveness of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

THE GROWING ROLE OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(By Jonathan B. Bingham)

Item: One of the most important bills passed by the 93rd Congress in its first term was the War Powers Act. The House Foreign Affairs Committee played a major role in the development of this legislation; as worked out in Senate-House conference, the final version of the bill was much closer to the bill as drafted in the House Foreign Affairs Committee than it was to the Senate bill.

Item: On December 4th, the Foreign Affairs Committee reported out the \$2.2-billion military aid bill for Israel by a vote of 31-1 having previously beaten back an effort to cut the authorization some 25%, by a vote of 16-5. The House, and later the Senate, went along with the Committee's recommendation.

Item: In its draft report the special House committee headed by Dick Bolling of Missouri which is reviewing House committee jurisdictions, recommended that the Foreign Affairs Committee handle foreign trade and tariff legislation, instead of the uniquely powerful Ways and Means Committee.

Item: During 1973 several visiting prime ministers and heads of state, including Mrs. Golda Meir, King Hussein of Jordan and the Shah of Iran, met privately with the committee, thus paying their respects.

These four items suggest how far the Foreign Affairs Committee has come since the pre-World War II days when it was considered one of the least desirable committee assignments in the House. By the time I was elected to the House in 1964, Foreign Affairs was already sought after (it took me four years to get the assignment), and today it is even more so. Because of our keen interest in its work, there are four New York Democrats in the Committee, Ben Rosenthal, Lester Wolff, Ogden Reid, and myself.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ben Rosenthal heads the Subcommittee on Europe. His appointment in 1971 was made possible because of a new Democratic caucus rule limiting members to one subcommittee chairmanship. This reform which the Democratic Study Group (an informal but effective organization of liberal Democrats) fought hard to achieve, resulted in the designation of four outstanding younger Democrats to chair Foreign Affairs Subcommittees: in addition to Ben, they are Don Fraser of Minnesota, John Culver of Iowa, and Lee Hamilton of Indiana.

One of my most satisfying experiences since coming to the House was participating in the drafting of the War Powers Bill in the Subcommittee of National Security Policy and Scientific Developments. Several of us on the Subcommittee came to the hearings and then the "mark-up" sessions on this legislation with differing points of view. Chairman Clem Zablocki of Wisconsin originally opposed any attempt to limit the President's power to make war because he feared (correctly) a Presidential veto. Some members felt that the Congress could stop a Presidential war only by "joint resolution," requiring a Presidential signature or the votes to override a veto. My own approach was a bill to provide that either Senate or House could veto a Presidential war. (I had been an early critic of Senator Javits' bill, which had passed the Senate overwhelmingly in 1972 and again in 1973; that bill attempted to define the situation in which the President could start a war—a dangerous undertaking, full of pitfalls—and gave the Congress only one tool to stop the President with an automatic 30-day cut-off of the President's authority to act unless the Congress specifically authorized the war.)

After concluding its hearings, our subcommittee met for several days of "mark-up". Thanks to another reform achieved by the Democratic Study Group, these meetings were open to the press and public, but there was no grandstanding. Instead, through the give and take of open-minded discussion, a new bill was hammered out which most members of the subcommittee could agree on. It was basically this bill which was eventually enacted into law by passage over the President's veto. This bill side-stepped the treacherous business of trying to spell out the President's powers and gave the Congress a second tool with which to stop a Presidential war (in addition to the automatic cut-off after a specified number of days): it provided that such a war could be stopped at any time by passage of a concurrent resolution which does not require the President's signature.

The day of the vote to override was a historic one. Opponents of the bill on prior roll-calls had included some two dozen liberal Democrats, who feared the bill somehow gave a kind of sanction to Presidential wars, as well as over 100 Republicans and southern Democrats who supported Nixon's view that the bill unduly limited the President's power. Along with other subcommittee members, I had concentrated my efforts before the vote on persuading the small liberal group that their fears were unwarranted and they should support the drive to override. In the end most of them did so.

In supporting the \$2.2 billion aid bill for Israel, the Foreign Affairs Committee was responding to a Presidential request. But on another phase of aid to Israel, the committee has taken the initiative, with no assistance from the Administration.

Early in 1972 Senator Muskie in the Senate and I in the House proposed that the United States should provide Israel with substantial help in the gigantic task of absorbing the tens of thousands of Jewish refugees coming from the Soviet Union. To gather relevant data, I headed a mission to Vienna and Israel. The Foreign Affairs Committee and eventually the Congress went along with the idea, and \$55-million was appropriated.

Again in 1973, I initiated action, this time to provide an additional \$35-million and the final foreign aid appropriation bill included that amount.

As I write this article for the Democratic Leader, I am on a 747 jet flying back to the Middle East, heading a fact-finding mission for the Near East Subcommittee. We expect to meet with leading officials in Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia, as well as in Israel. In addition to hearing what they have to say, and getting first-hand the assessment of other knowledgeable people in the area, we will certainly want to convey to Arab leaders the mood of the Congress and of the American people: that the U.S. will continue to supply Israel with the wherewithal to defend herself against Arab aggression, that the U.S. is not going to be deterred from this policy by the Arab oil boycott, and that the U.S. is now alerted to the danger of being dependent on Arab oil and will vigorously pursue the development of other energy sources.

Needless to say, the concerns of the Foreign Affairs Committee are worldwide. One of its major preoccupations has been the scope and direction of U.S. aid for undeveloped countries. This past year the Committee originated a new approach emphasizing training and technical assistance in basic areas such as agriculture, education and health, rather than more generalized economic aid programs. This approach was accepted by the Administration and adopted by the Congress. Hopefully, it will lead to more imaginative and more useful programs which will command wider support both where the help is needed and where the taxpayers must pay for it.

The Committee is also working away at the monumental task of improving the prospects for peace and progress through strengthening international organizations. Our Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, under the chairmanship of Minnesota's Don Fraser, has been leading a fight to restore America's reputation as a nation that lives up to its commitments under international law. One aspect of this fight is to see that we pay our dues to international organizations on time; another is to repeal the "Byrd Amendment" which prevents the President from complying with America's obligation to support the U.N. sanctions program against Rhodesia.

Thus, in recent years, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, under the leadership of its popular chairman, Dr. Thomas Morgan of Pennsylvania, has demonstrated a new interest and a new capability in contributing to the development of U.S. foreign policy, in authorizing the needed funds and overseeing the proper conduct of that policy.

THE GREAT PROTEIN ROBBERY:
NO. 23—THE STUDDS-MAGNUSON
200-MILE FISH BILL

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, support continues to grow for the Studds-Magnuson 200-mile fishing bill. Daily, I receive unsolicited endorsements and testimonials that dramatically point up the need for enactment of the Studds-Magnuson bill now—while we still have fish to protect. We cannot afford to wait for the Law of the Sea Conference to reach agreement on mutually acceptable international fish conservation agreement. We must pass the interim Studds-Magnuson bill now to begin to regulate and conserve the valuable marine resources in our 200-mile offshore waters.

March 27, 1974

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Gloucester, Mass., Daily Times was sent to me by a stranger who is as concerned as I am about the desperate plight of our domestic fishermen. As the editorial points out the purpose is to "Buy time when time needs to be bought." For the further information of my colleagues, I would like to enter this well-written editorial into the RECORD at this point:

[From the Gloucester (Mass.) Daily Times, Mar. 19, 1974]

PROTECTING A NATURAL RESOURCE—FISH

You can intellectualize the issue of a 200-mile limit all you want, and debate its international consequences to death in the process.

But that doesn't make the words of these Gloucester fishermen go away:

"By the time they get anything through both houses of Congress, all the fish will be gone—" fisherman John B. Parisi.

"Some days it's like New York City out there. It doesn't take long with the trawls they make and pretty soon everything is gone—" Capt. Sam Parisi.

"They have smaller mesh in their nets and they get even the little ones—" Capt. Nick Sanfilippo.

What the fishermen are talking about is the overfishing of the offshore fishing banks, Georges, Jeffreys and Browns, from which local fishermen have traditionally taken their catch.

They are being swept clean by the Russians, Japanese, Poles and others, whose fishing methods contrast with our own about as dramatically as a sophisticated stereo contrasts with a windup victrola.

To the fishermen the issue is simple—at the rate the fish are being taken, soon there will be no more for them to catch.

A 200-mile limit, reserving to the United States the management of those natural resources contained within, including fish, is what they see as the answer. But they don't expect such a law to pass.

The reason is that to those schooled in international law the issue is not a simple one. The United States has traditionally rejected any claims to territorial jurisdiction beyond the agreed upon international 12-mile limit.

There is another practical argument advanced by some west coast fishermen and some from the Gulf of Mexico. They often fish in waters within 200 miles of the shores of other countries. So they fear that if this country enacted a unilateral 200-mile limit, others would retaliate with similar limits and the U.S. fishermen would be hurt.

The long-range answer may be a compromise yet to be negotiated by the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention beginning this June in Venezuela.

But that is a 134-nation body and any meaningful compromise will be years in the making and the ratifying.

Meanwhile, the fish are being taken faster than they can reproduce, the haddock, the cod, even the herring on which the other fish feed.

The fish supply, like all natural resources, is finite. It can run out. With the present rate of fishing, it will run out.

International relations, on the other hand, are flexible. After all, the art of diplomacy is to reverse one's self without seeming to, to recognize that which one vows he will not recognize.

Claims to a 200-mile limit are a case in point. The United States does not recognize the claims of any country to 200-mile limits.

The United States government has agreed to pay the fines levied on U.S. fishermen by the governments of Peru and Ecuador, claiming the limits are invalid, but the United States also pays the Brazilian government to police American boats fishing within 200 miles of the Brazilian coast.

Still, that stops short of all-out recognition of a 200-mile limit.

But the Studds-Magnuson bill now in Congress stops short of an absolute claim to 200 miles of territorial waters. It does not prohibit foreign vessels from entering the 200-mile limit, as they are prohibited from entering the 12-mile limit without permission.

Reciprocal claims to 200-mile limits by other countries would not impede the free passage of American naval vessels outside the 12-mile territorial waters of other nations, for instance, unless the naval vessels were fishing as they went.

It does not even prohibit foreign vessels from fishing between the 12-mile limit and the 200-mile limit.

What the bill does is to lay claim to this country's right to manage the natural resources, the taking of fish within 200 miles. Foreign fishermen might well be granted the right to fish in these waters, but by our rules such as to what specie might be taken and with what mesh size.

It's true that the legislation protects the domestic fisherman from the full brunt of competition he cannot meet.

But it is more than just protectionist legislation. It is conservationist, too. It is aimed at conserving fish so that 10 years from now, or 20, there will be fish in the ocean for American fishermen, Russian fishermen, Japanese fishermen, to catch and for the people of the world to eat.

The Studds-Magnuson bill may not be the best solution in the world—it doesn't claim to be more than an "Interim solution." Eventually a specie approach may be judged better and adopted internationally. Well and good.

For now though, the Studds-Magnuson bill appears to be the best short-range solution at hand. It will buy time when time needs to be bought.

VIETNAM VETERANS WEEK

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a continuing concern for helping Vietnam veterans help themselves is needed in this country, and all those that actively support such endeavors are to be commended.

I would like to take this time to congratulate the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors on their combined efforts over the past 3 years to increase our veterans' educational, training and job opportunities. This kind of prompt and effective, worthwhile involvement this year includes a special, nationwide Vietnam Veterans Week, from March 29—designated Vietnam Veterans Day by the Congress—to April 4.

We must note this special week, not only as a time of tribute to the men who have so faithfully served our country in the face of disheartening odds, but as a week of work, planning, and dedication to improving the benefits and opportunities available to our exservicemen.

The Vietnam veteran has put his life on the line for his country. Yet, among the many obstacles facing him has been the adverse public reaction to the Vietnam war, which subsequently has made civilian readjustment more difficult than

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

for the nationally accepted "returning heroes" of World War II.

The returning GI has not received benefits comparable to those offered after World War II, when veterans had a majority of tuitions and fees paid directly by the Federal Government. Today's higher tuition and living cost discourages GI program participation by the neediest veterans. These veterans are often precluded from partaking of some benefits because of the travel or expenses involved.

Measures, such as the program planned by the Mayors' Conference, must be welcomed and supported in an effort to ameliorate many of the hardships inflicted upon veterans. As a member of the delegation from Michigan, a State with 255,000 Vietnam era veterans in 1972, joining three other States with the largest group of ex-GI's, I have supported the bill calling for a 13.6-percent increase in the allowances of all participants in the veterans' programs of education, training and rehabilitation administered by the Veterans' Administration.

I also introduced a bill last year creating a National Cemetery System within the Veterans' Administration, a move fulfilling the dreams of many veterans. Eligible for interment in the national cemetery are all veterans, including personnel dying while in active service, members of Reserve components who die while in service or while undergoing treatment for a service-connected injury, active ROTC cadets, and citizens of the United States who served in the Armed Forces of countries allied to the United States in a war in which the United States participated. The bill also authorizes the VA Administrator to conduct a comprehensive study of the relationship of the National Cemetery System to existing veterans' burial benefits.

I have sponsored concurrent resolutions calling for the withholding of any aid, trade or recognition with Hanoi and the Vietcong until Vietnam peace agreement provisions are adhered to concerning our POW's and MIA's, and also strongly protesting the treatment of U.S. servicemen formerly held prisoners by the North Vietnamese.

Undoubtedly, the time is long overdue to respond to the special needs of the Vietnam era veteran, and we must opt for taking the initiative over mere rhetoric.

During this Vietnam Veterans' Week, mayors across the country will ask for representatives of business, education, service organizations, and recent veterans to form a task force that will plan open houses, speakers, orientation tours and information distribution, and coordinate existing educational and job opportunity programs. During this week, more factual data and helpful counseling will be available than ever before to veterans from coast to coast.

The Vietnam veterans must know they have not been forgotten, and we must lend our support to the Mayors' Conference in the struggle to successfully integrate these able and courageous men back into American society.

THOSE ALTRUISTIC SONS OF THE DESERT

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the October war against Israel caused many a shock in the West, especially among Israel's friends, because so many individuals, organizations and nations turned their backs on the beleaguered Jewish state. A number of harsh accusations have been hurled since then at Israel and her few remaining friends by such sources.

A number of third world-type nations accuse Israel of being imperialist and colonialist, despite her long established, successful policy of modest foreign aid with "no strings attached." Some extremely liberal groups in the United States have taken her to task for not "understanding the plight of the Arab refugees." A few columnists beat dead horses with loud, indignant cries, calling Israel everything from "a Junker state" to "an outpost of colonial aggression."

As one consistently fascinated by the noxious and far-fetched, I find these atrocities against logic intriguing. History notwithstanding, these critics are worthy of study for what they choose to ignore as much as for what they say. The American public, burdened by the highest energy prices on record, might be interested in some facts not featured in the aforementioned columns.

To begin with, the world is paying staggering sums of money to a few nations for Mideast oil. Billions of dollars are being demanded by Arab oil countries from the developed world, and even from nations of the undeveloped world, which, of course, cannot afford to pay. Ironically, a number of these developing states who are being victimized by Arab oil blackmail are those very same nations who turned away from Israel, breaking diplomatic relations with her in hope of Arab favoritism.

The next question is, what is happening to this mass of capital? Are our burnoosed brethren dashing forth from their air-conditioned tents, eager to spread some wealth around to millions of impoverished cousins? Are they practicing that virtue of charity to one's fellows so ardently and forthrightly demanded by a substantial portion of world opinion? Are they at least making substantial contributions to ease the plight of millions of Moslems living on the edge of starvation in that part of the world?

Sad to say, such is not the case. Little of this immense wealth is being used for international aid and development projects. United Nations agencies sponsoring development and refugee projects, largely funded by the United States, report increasingly rich Arab States contribute but a fraction of money being spent on such programs in their own area. Evidently wealthy Arabs do not believe charity begins at home. Most of these funds are provided by nations struck hard by the recent Arab oil embargo. Evidently,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Arab States believe it best to extract vast sums for oil from these nations while allowing them to fund charity work for poor Arabs.

UNICEF, for example, supported entirely by voluntary contributions from governments and private organizations, spends about \$5.4 million a year in 16 Middle East countries. Arab countries contributed \$871,000 to UNICEF last year. Saudi Arabia, world's largest oil producer, accounted for \$30,000 of that. However, UNICEF spent \$500,000 in that same country last year, largely on manpower training programs.

Who could be the largest UNICEF donor? Curiously and surprisingly enough, it is the United States, which gave \$15 million last year.

Another example is UNRWA, a voluntary U.N. organization which aids Palestinian refugees. Its last year's budget was \$63 million, of which \$2 million was contributed in cash by Arab nations. Two countries, Libya and Saudi Arabia, accounted for nearly half the Arab cash contribution. Fifteen other Arab countries gave slightly more than Norway's \$750,000.

There, then, is a fascinating pattern for the average American spending close to 60 cents for a gallon of gasoline to contemplate. When writing out that next check for home heating oil, they might give a passing thought to these poor sons of the desert.

Of course, this state of affairs does not spill over into truly vital areas of need these countries must cope with, such as arms. Many oil-rich nations have gone on military hardware buying sprees, spending hundreds of millions of oil royalty dollars on new military toys. Here we have some fascinating revelations, particularly in the area of French arms sales to such countries. Actually, the Middle East is swarming with French airplanes—one reason the French have worked so hard to undercut the United States in that area.

I support American involvement in charitable and development efforts abroad, but within reason. Surely this state of affairs is tailor-made to make us reconsider our commitments. Surely there is no reason why money-swollen Arab oil countries cannot absorb development project costs in their own areas of the world. Surely the American taxpayer need not bear this burden any longer.

It is worth thinking about, especially when foreign aid pleaders toil on Capitol Hill, asking America to foot the bill for such undertakings.

MATTHEW NIMETZ ON
IMPEACHMENT

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I opened this morning's New York Times and turned to the Op Ed page and found an article authored by Matthew Nimetz entitled "Impeachment and Law." Matthew Nimetz

is an old friend and a scholar. He is presently a partner in the firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, was a staff assistant to President Johnson, and a law clerk to Justice John M. Harlan, Supreme Court of the United States. His brilliance is exhibited in the thoughtful article which discusses the constitutional question of whether the impeachment of a President is subject to judicial review. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 27, 1974]

IMPEACHMENT AND LAW

(By Matthew Nimetz)

An important national debate is now focused on the constitutional phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors," the standard for impeachment.

A broadly accepted standard is needed to give legitimacy to a vote of impeachment and a subsequent conviction of President Nixon, but there is a second reason why care must be taken in formulating the standards and procedures to be applied in impeachment proceedings—to withstand a challenge in the courts.

Little public attention has been paid to the possibility that the standard for impeachment might be resolved in our traditional forum for dealing with constitutional questions, the Federal court system.

Certainly the constitutional language, granting "sole power of impeachment" to the House and "sole power to try all impeachments" to the Senate, does not appear to contemplate judicial involvement. But if the President wishes to fight impeachment with all the legal weapons in his arsenal, an appeal to the courts should be expected.

At this stage one can only speculate about the scope and context of such an extraordinary legal action. Nothing like it would have been conceivable at the time of the Andrew Johnson impeachment, or indeed at any time until the activist decisions of the United States Supreme Court under Earl Warren. For throughout most of our judicial history the courts have tended to stay out of the "political thicket," and impeachment seems, at first glance, to be within the sole authority of the Congress. In fact, the Court of Claims so held in 1936. But today we can not be so sure.

In *Baker v. Carr*, decided in 1962, the Supreme Court held that reapportionment of state legislatures was a matter with which the courts were capable of dealing. Although the questions there were far removed from impeachment, the Court opened the door to judicial involvement in political questions previously thought beyond its reach.

The Court said that even when a decision is constitutionally committed to another branch of Government, the question whether a particular action exceeds the authority committed "is itself a delicate exercise in constitutional interpretation, and is a responsibility of this Court as ultimate interpreter of the Constitution."

Of course, *Baker v. Carr* and its reapportionment progeny are not strictly in point.

A closer case, decided in 1969, involved the House decision to refuse to seat Adam Clayton Powell because of alleged misconduct. The Supreme Court, in reversing a lower court, which refused to hear the case, said that the judiciary should not shrink from deciding whether the House had applied the proper standard to exclude a member.

The issue, the Court held, was really not political at all: It did not involve legislative "policy" but simply required reading a provision of the Constitution and determining its meaning, pre-eminently a judicial function.

The similarities to our present situation are rather striking. Of course, this argument depends on reading the Powell case for all that it might be worth, but this is how constitutional law is often made.

March 27, 1974

If these two cases are unsettling, let us ask why impeachment should not under certain circumstances be a proper subject for judicial review.

Consider an outrageous case: The President is impeached solely because he held prayer breakfasts in the White House. Shouldn't the President be able to seek a declaratory judgment, an injunction or some other relief on the ground that this was simply not an impeachable offense?

This is an extreme example. But once we concede the possibility of judicial consideration of the standard for impeachment or due process in the Congress's procedures, the specter *** real. There are no final answers here. We are speculating about novel questions under our Constitution. But one thing seems certain: If the question whether the judiciary can review impeachment is presented, it can be answered definitively only by the Supreme Court.

Anyone who doubts that had better reread *Marbury v. Madison*, in which the doctrine of judicial supremacy was first enunciated. How ironic it would be if the decisions of the Warren Court helped to maintain President Nixon in office; how even more ironic if the Court under Warren E. Burger were to take the narrow view of its constitutional power that Mr. Nixon advanced in making judicial appointments and refused to review his impeachment and conviction.

AN UNNECESSARY SHORTAGE

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article by my colleague, Congressman CHARLES RANGEL, indicates the effect of the energy crisis on the economy and gives an in-depth analysis of the situation. I insert Congressman RANGEL's article into the RECORD and commend him for sensitivity regarding the energy crisis.

The article follows:

AN UNNECESSARY SHORTAGE

(By Representative CHARLES B. RANGEL)

Harlem-born Charles B. Rangel represents New York's Nineteenth Congressional District, which includes East Harlem and the upper west side, in the U.S. Congress. A practicing attorney since 1960, he is a member of the House Committee on D.C. Home Rule and the House Judiciary Committee—which is currently conducting hearings on possible impeachment of the president. Congressman Rangel won the Bronze Star and Purple Heart in Korea, served two terms in the New York State Assembly, ran for president of the New York City Council, and has held numerous government legal posts, receiving appointments from former Attorney General Robert Kennedy and former President Lyndon Johnson. He is presently associated with many legal and civil rights organizations. An extensive legal background and many years of government service render this Harlem-born Democrat highly qualified to analyze and critique the government's handling of the energy crisis.

This nation's inability to develop a national energy policy is the major reason why we are faced with the current energy crisis. As late as 1952 the National Commission on Materials Policy urged that a national energy policy be coordinated by one agency, which would research and analyze energy needs. However, this agency was never created, and during the two decades and more that have passed since this recommendation was made, the nation's energy policies have been "guided" by various federal agencies with

overlapping and sometimes conflicting powers.

To say the least, the Nixon administration denied an oil shortage was even forthcoming. And it has yet to develop an energy program that is essential to our immediate and long-range well-being.

Such leadership has characterized the administration's mishandling of the energy matter from the beginning. In the past three years, seven different people have been "in charge" of energy policy. And before 1971 no one dealt specifically with energy policy. The Nixon administration refused to implement a mandatory allocation program, even after thousands of independent gasoline service stations and small refiners had to close down because they lacked petroleum supplies. Four years ago a Nixon cabinet task force recommended abolishing the Oil Import Control program. If this program had been abolished, it would have allowed a greater amount of foreign oil to be imported, and it would have lessened the depletion rate of our own domestic reserves. However, Nixon failed to act on this recommendation. So now we have both limited domestic reserves and a limited chance to meet our needs in the world markets.

ARAB OIL

The Arab embargo has not helped matters for us, except to finally alert us to the fact that there is a national fuel shortage in America. It is difficult to determine the exact extent of America's dependency on Arab oil because the federal government does not regularly monitor the amount of Arab oil imported on products that are refined abroad by U.S.- or foreign-based corporations, which do a great deal of business in this country. Estimates do show, however, that about 25 percent of all our oil imports have come from Arab sources, which represents about 10 percent of our total oil consumption. Comparatively, for some European nations and Japan the embargo has spelled potential disaster, since their dependency on Arab oil is greater than ours. (The United Kingdom receives 70-80 percent of their oil from Arab sources, France receives 70-80 percent, Germany receives 70 percent, and Japan receives 40 percent.)

Although the United States makes up only 6 percent of the world's population, it uses 35 percent of the world's energy supply. A significant reason for this disproportionate amount of energy consumption is the enormous demand for goods, including powered appliances, to maintain high standards of living. Americans, however, must begin to realize that it requires large amounts of energy (crude oil and petroleum products) to manufacture all those goods and power those appliances. Furthermore, they must be aware that the point has been reached in which conspicuous consumption of energy must be reduced and some material inconveniences accepted.

The embargo represents a loss of approximately 3 million barrels of oil per day or about 16 percent of our estimated 19 million barrels per day needed to accommodate our average needs this winter. The approximate 3 million barrels per day deficit includes all the nation's primary petroleum needs for crude oil and distillate and residual fuel. The embargo also makes it extremely difficult to acquire additional petroleum, and in places in which stocks do exist prices have skyrocketed. Prior to Nixon's decision in December to boost energy prices, the composite profit of the oil industry showed a substantial 63 percent increase from September 1972 to September 1973.

THE HIGH COST OF REFINING

While oil companies are making tremendous profits during this fuel shortage, the public is being gouged by retail prices, which are set according to the wholesale price increases on all sources of energy. Noticeably,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

wholesale energy prices had increased 47 percent for 1973 as of last November.

The control of the oil industry over petroleum and other sources of energy, through all stages of exploration, refinement, and retail prices establishment, is far too dominant, and is exercised without adequate federal regulation.

According to the cost of living Phase IV guidelines, increases in prices are initiated by the refiners. If the refiners' costs increase, the increase is passed on to the wholesaler, who passes it on to the retailer. Finally it reaches the public. The increase of prices for petroleum products throughout the nation is subject to the increased costs of refiners. Curiously, most refineries are owned by major oil companies. The refiner has two excuses for increasing his prices: the increase in the cost of imported petroleum, or the increase in the cost of domestic crude petroleum. In both cases the refiners could also have taken steps to lessen the increases.

When the president's task force recommended abolishing the Oil Import Control program in 1970, it should have been done. The program required using our domestic oil reserves, while it limited importation of oil from other countries. But the program would have decreased the oil companies' profits, so Nixon ignored the recommendation. Thus, as long as the oil companies have the president on their side, they will continue to drain our domestic reserves and to reap even bigger profits.

In November 1972 the Department of the Interior sent telegrams to all major refineries requesting that they increase output from 89 percent of capacity to 93 percent of capacity. The refineries refused to do this, although it was well within their ability. This would have diminished the crisis by a large extent.

Obviously, legislation providing for direct federal regulation of petroleum and petroleum processing must be enacted by Congress to prevent future crises, and to guard against the United States' vulnerability to oligopolistic practices by oil companies.

GOVERNMENT INSENSITIVITY

The impact of the energy crisis is affecting and will continue to affect every one of us, in every aspect of our lives. The planning that is underway for dealing with the energy crisis is being conducted without any sensitivity or concern for the special needs, such as heating, of the inner-city poor. The secretaries of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), and the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity should all be present at meetings of the president's energy advisory committees. Essentially, the president has spoken only of actions citizens can take to help during the crisis. He has failed to say what impact the crisis will have on America, particularly the American inner-city poor.

It is in unemployment that the urban poor most strongly feel the result of the energy crisis. They are aware that the decline in per capita industrial production means subsequent dismissals and layoffs for them. Predictions on how high unemployment may go range from 6 percent to 8 percent. In minority communities, in which unemployment is usually at least double the national average, unemployment may reach 20 percent.

Job losses will continue as long as the petroleum shortage continues. The industries hit hardest are those that use steel, aluminum, copper, plastics, and synthetic textiles, as well as travel and travel-oriented companies. This means there will be fewer sales for "mom-and-pop" stores, restaurants, and fast food businesses, which are common in minority communities.

In the health area the oil shortage will take a great toll. Again, the urban poor will be affected. To a large extent, they will suffer because of insufficient heating.

More needs to be learned about the effects of lower temperatures on health. HEW says that lower temperatures will mean—

Increased basal metabolic, heart, and respiratory rates, and increased transmission of respiratory illness from crowding in a small area for warmth:

A need for increased caloric intake;

Schools will close, which may prevent some children from getting their only well-balanced meal;

Increased probability of illness to vulnerable groups such as pregnant women, infants, school-aged children, the chronically ill, the elderly, and the poor, because of nutritional deficiency;

Hazards to personal safety from conversion to alternative heating methods, which might result in suffocation from emissions, explosions, fire, or electrical danger;

Increased mental illness, suicide, serious crime, alcoholism, and drug abuse;

Aggravation of the chronic diseases, the most common being hypothyroidism, peripheral vascular disorders, arthritis, severe constricting chest pains, and diabetes.

CHANGING LIFESTYLE

The effect of the energy crisis on the economy as a whole will be an increase in the rate of inflation. Although the economics of energy and its impact on growth is not widely understood even by economists, it is apparent that as energy shortages continue production will decrease and the prices of scarcer products will increase. For example, making plywood requires a great deal of intensive energy materials. If there are fewer energy sources, plywood production will have to be decreased. Thus, the price of what is produced will increase, and every business using plywood will have to increase its price to account for the increase in the price of plywood. Therefore, the plywood used in the construction of apartment buildings will cost more to buy and will increase the cost per apartment. And the rent for the apartment will also be affected. This kind of price increase chain will affect many industries and businesses, and all consumers.

The environment will also reflect changes resulting from the energy crisis. Abundant amounts of high-sulphur fuels, such as coal, will be used to compensate for the lack of petroleum products for use by industries, office building, schools, and apartment buildings.

In short, everyone and every sector of society will definitely be affected in one way or another by the energy crisis. Such an outcome is inevitable.

NEED FOR MAJOR HEALTH-CARE REFORM FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced major health legislation to reform the medicare program for senior citizens and disabled Americans.

Mr. Speaker, many of us are all too well aware of the drastic need for reform in the health field, especially as it regards the elderly in our Nation. We know, for instance, that the average out-of-pocket health expenditure for those over 65 was \$1,100 last year, or more than twice as much as the average expenditure of \$441 for the total population.

We know also that 85 percent of those over 65 have at least one chronic condition; 80 percent have some sort of arth-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 27, 1974

ritis. Dental problems, hearing and eye problems, and the need for prescription drugs increase dramatically over the age of approximately 60. Drug costs for older Americans run almost three times the price of those for the younger population.

We know that 28 percent of our health care went to our senior citizens, although they make up only 10 percent of the population.

Finally, we know that some 18 percent of our senior citizens live in poverty, including over 600,000 in New York State. Their median income is barely half that of other Americans.

Knowing these things—and more—I do not believe that we can continue to ask our senior citizens to wait—either for a new health system, or for new legislation, or for more band aid remedies, or for any more promises. I believe it is time that we accepted our responsibility to act—not talk—to help those who need help and to guarantee them the right to decent health.

The bill I have introduced (H.R. 13518) would provide health-care benefits to all older Americans as a matter of right. It would broaden the medicare package to meet the many presently uncovered needs of senior citizens and to extend the duration of those benefits which are now limited. It would reduce the out-of-pocket expenditures of those eligible, and would establish a program of catastrophic health insurance protection for senior citizens.

The bill would merge parts A and B of medicare and the State-run medicaid programs into a single comprehensive plan which would cover all Americans over age 65. It would eliminate present premium payments and deductibles; for catastrophic illnesses, it would provide nominal coinsurance payments based on income, for those able to pay, with a maximum out-of-pocket expenditure limit of \$750. Coverage would be expanded to include, among other things, unlimited inpatient and outpatient hospital care, unlimited skilled nursing and intermediate care facility services, unlimited physician and dental services, outpatient prescription drugs, eyeglasses, hearing aids, and other necessary medical equipment, and numerous other services.

I am including, as of possible interest, a factsheet prepared by the National Retired Teachers Association/American Association of Retired Persons on this bill. The factsheet follows:

MAJOR FEATURES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL REFORM ACT OF 1974

I. PURPOSE

To improve and restructure the Medicare program so as to:

Provide health care benefits to all older Americans as a matter of entitlement;

Broaden the benefit package to meet the full range of medical services needed by older Americans;

Extend the duration of those benefits which are limited under the present program;

Reduce the out-of-pocket personal health care expenditures of those eligible for Medicare coverage;

Establish a program of income-related catastrophic protection;

Improve the administration of Medicare; and

Control increases in health care costs.

II. STRUCTURE

A single, integrated program of comprehensive health insurance for the aged and disabled, fully financed through social insurance taxes, comparable taxes on unearned income, and general revenues.

A single, expanded benefit structure (combining Parts A and B of Medicare) with a single trust fund. Requirements for premium payments and deductibles are eliminated. Co-insurance provisions are adjusted so that while persons who can afford to pay will do so up to a predetermined maximum level, cost will not be a deterrent to quality health care.

Provision under the expanded Medicare program of all care and services for the aged presently covered by the Medicaid program.

III. ENTITLEMENT

Extended to all persons 65 years of age or older regardless of insured status under the Social Security or Railroad Retirement cash benefit programs, so long as the individual is a citizen (or national) of the United States or a legal resident alien.

Allows all individuals presently covered under Medicare because of special circumstances (such as disability) the full benefits of the expanded program.

IV. REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

Unlimited inpatient hospital coverage—Includes pathology and radiology services; and

Includes 150 days of care during a benefit period for a psychiatric inpatient undergoing active diagnosis or treatment of an emotional or mental disorder.

Unlimited outpatient hospital coverage.

Unlimited skilled nursing facility services with no requirement for prior hospitalization.

Unlimited intermediate care facility services, effective July 1, 1978.

Unlimited home health services with no requirement for prior hospitalization.

Certain services offered by public or non-profit private rehabilitation agencies or centers and public or non-profit private health agencies.

Unlimited physicians' services, including major surgery by a qualified specialist and certain psychiatric services.

Unlimited dental services.

Outpatient prescription drugs—including biologicals such as blood, immunizing agents, etc.—subject to certain limitations to insure quality control.

Medically necessary devices, appliances, equipment and supplies, such as: eyeglasses, hearing aid, prosthetic devices, walking aids. Also included are any items covered under present law.

Services of optometrists, podiatrists and chiropractors.

Diagnostic services of independent pathology laboratories and diagnostic and therapeutic radiology by independent radiology services.

Certain mental health day care services.

Ambulance and other emergency transportation services as well as non-emergency transportation services where essential because of difficulty of access.

Psychological services: physical, occupational or speech therapy; nutrition, health education and social services; and other supportive services.

V. COST SHARING

No periodic premium payments.

No deductibles.

Initial co-insurance payments (based upon type of service) are as follows:

Type of Service¹

1. inpatient hospital services.
2. skilled nursing facility.
3. home health services.
4. physicians' services.
5. dentist services.
6. mental health day care.
7. diagnostic out-patient services of independent laboratory or of independent radiology services.
8. devices, appliances, equipment and supplies.
9. drugs.
10. ambulance services.

Co-insurance Payments²

1. \$5 per day.
2. \$2.50 per day.
3. \$2 per visit.
4. \$2 per visit.³
5. 20% of approved charge.⁴
6. \$2 per day.
7. 20% of approved charges.
8. 20% of approved charges.
9. \$1 per each filling or refilling.
10. 20% of approved charges.

VI. CATASTROPHIC PROTECTION

The Co-insurance payments are subject to a catastrophic protection feature related to family income categories. Initial income ranges are as follows:

Income class	Single individual	Family of 2	Family of 3	Family of 4 or more
1.	0-\$2,110	0-\$2,730	0-\$3,340	0-\$4,280
2.	\$2,111-3,160	\$2,731-4,090	\$3,341-4,460	\$4,281-5,340
3.	3,161-4,740	4,091-5,450	4,461-5,570	5,341-6,410
4.	4,741-6,330	5,451-6,810	5,571-6,980	6,411-7,480
5.	Above 6,330	Above 6,810	Above 6,980	Above 7,480

Persons in income class 1 not subject to coinsurance.

Persons in income classes 2 through 5 subject to nominal coinsurance payments (based on type of covered service) up to determined out-of-pocket expenditure limit for each income class.

Initial maximum liability limits are as follows:

Income class and out-of-pocket expenditure limit

- 1—no payment.
- 2—\$125.
- 3—\$250.
- 4—\$375.
- 5—6% of annual income or \$750 whichever is less.

Individual can claim out-of-pocket payments for the last quarter of the preceding year in calculating the annual out-of-pocket expenditure limit for the current year.

Any expenditures incurred for services furnished in excess of the coverage limit for certain psychiatric and skilled nursing facility services can be credited, along with co-insurance payments, in determining an individual's out-of-pocket expenditures.

NOTE.—Income ranges for the different income classes and out-of-pocket expenditure limits are subject to annual revision in accordance with the Consumer Price Index.

VII. REIMBURSEMENT POLICIES

Payments are made only to a "participating provider" (one that has filed a participation agreement with the Secretary of HEW) except for emergency services.

"Providers" include not only institutions

¹subject to statutory definition.

²recomputed each year on formula cited in section 1824.

³payment for combined multivisit as in the case of surgery or obstetrical care would be 10% of approved charge.

⁴no payment for oral examination and prophylaxis including fluoride application, X-rays and other preventive procedures.

but also independent practitioners and suppliers of drugs or medical appliances.

An institutional provider is treated as the provider of all institutional services to its patients.

Reimbursement to a participating institutional provider based upon a predetermined schedule of patient care charges.

Schedule of charges must be based on a system of accounting and cost analysis in conformity with prescribed standards.

Periodic interim payments will be made to institutions during the accounting year on the basis of cost projections, with final adjustments based on the approved schedule of charges.

Reimbursement for services of physicians, dentists, optometrists, podiatrists, chiropractors and other non-institutional services of licensed professional practitioners will be paid in accordance with annually predetermined fee schedules for their local areas.

Fee schedules will be established through negotiations among representatives of government, providers and consumer interests.

Final fee schedules to be established only after public hearings.

Participating providers must agree to accept the Medicare payment (plus any co-insurance payment) as the full charge for their service.

The Secretary of HEW is required to make public for each local area the established fee schedules and the names, professional fields and business addresses of participating practitioners.

Payments to health maintenance organizations are retained as provided for in the 1972 Social Security Amendments.

The definition of HMO is broadened to include medical foundations.

VIII. FINANCING

A single trust fund will be established by merging the two trust funds under the present program.

In addition to hospital insurance taxes and returns from trust fund investments, a government contribution can be authorized for whatever amount is estimated as necessary by the Board of Trustees of the trust fund.

Pending Congressional action on the appropriation, the Managing Trustee of the trust fund is empowered to borrow from the federal treasury.

THE PROTECTORS: HOW PEOPLE ARE RESCUING THREATENED WILDLIFE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, many individuals are participating in the various preservation programs to save endangered species and the staff of the April-May magazine, National Wildlife, as published by the National Wildlife Federation, has compiled the following informative report on these conservation efforts:

THE PROTECTORS: HOW PEOPLE ARE RESCUING THREATENED WILDLIFE

(By the staff of National Wildlife)

From Maryland to the Rocky Mountains, from the wilderness of northern Minnesota to the sunny shores of Florida, hundreds of Americans are doing more than just talking about endangered species. They are working hard to save them. Some of these individuals are employed by a government agency or affiliated with a university; the work of others is supported in some measure by public or foundation funds, and some go it alone. In

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

any case, rescuing wildlife is far more than just a job to individuals like the scientists profiled on these pages. It is a lifelong personal commitment.

THE PRAIRIE CHICKEN PEOPLE

It is the hour before dawn on a crisp April morning in central Wisconsin, and out in 50,000 acres of Buena Vista marshland near Plainfield, the volunteers stir restlessly in their cramped blinds. Their muscles are sore, their toes are numb and their eyes are strained from peering through spotter scopes into the night. Then, from deep in the grasslands comes a low cooing sound, followed by another, and another. Suddenly, the occupants of the blinds are oblivious to their aches and pains, intent instead on the stirring and rustling of creatures only vaguely discerned in the gathering daybreak. From all points now, a murmuring and gobbling swells, punctuated by an occasional whoop. All at once, the booming begins: a ragged volley of hollow mating calls that roll out across the prairie for miles.

Some observers have compared the sound to a musical jug or an octarina. Others liken it to the low notes of an English horn. But although it bears some resemblance to all three, the unmistakable booming of the male *Tympanuchus cupido pinnatus*—the northern greater prairie chicken—has no equivalent in the natural world. It is a vigorous, melodious, hauntingly clear cry. And no matter how seasoned the spectator in the blind, hearing those first robust boominings of spring is always a renewed thrill.

As it happens, about 6,000 observers have experienced that thrill in the Plainfield area during the past 25 years or so. Biologists, housewives, farmers, hunters, businessmen, doctors and students, they have worked together to collect field data on the prairie chicken that is needed to help prevent its disappearance. For *Tympanuchus cupido* is one of the nation's threatened species—a classic example of how habitat loss leads to animal depletion. Thanks in large part to two resident Wisconsin scientists, however, the flamboyant bird's future now seems safer than it has in many years. Fran and Fred Hamerstrom, biologists, crusaders and rugged individualists, are the nucleus of the remarkable public mobilization that has made that prognosis possible.

To conservationists the world over, the Hamerstroms are known simply as "the prairie chicken people." There is something appropriately irreverent about that designation. At a time rife with doomsday prophecies, the movement to save the prairie chicken in Wisconsin has consistently been marked by a refreshing strain of gentle self-mockery. After all, an unavoidable hint of "the little old lady in tennis shoes" shadows this improbable alliance of ordinary folks and barons of industry. But no one mines the eccentric vein more profitably for humor than the prairie chicken people themselves. "Good works," Fred Hamerstrom is fond of saying, "don't have to be done in a sepulchral atmosphere."

Certainly the Hamerstroms themselves do not work in such an atmosphere. Although they are products of proper Bostonian upbringings, Fred and Fran have remained determinedly unconventional ever since they migrated to the Midwest some 40 years ago. Both were already strong conservationists by the time they fell under the spell of the renowned naturalist Aldo Leopold at a conference in New York in the early 1930s. Not long after, they followed Leopold back to Wisconsin, where they eventually signed on with the state's pioneering conservation department. They have remained in Wisconsin ever since.

Surrounded on three sides by prairie chicken grasslands, the Hamerstroms live in an unpainted farm house that was partially built before the Civil War—and never quite finished. In that rustic setting, they have nourished owls, marsh hawks, flying squirrels, golden eagles and two children. There,

they have also conducted the landmark research studies that provide many of the underpinnings for effective management of prairie chickens today.

Once, *Tympanuchus cupido* thrived not only in Wisconsin but all across the lush sea of grass that covered the entire midsection of America. An excellent gamebird, it was found in such abundance a century ago that market hunters shipped their kills back East by the ton. But it was farming, not hunting, that altered the bird's habitat and left just scattered local populations on the midwestern prairies. The lesser prairie chicken is even more obscure than the northern greater bird; small populations are found only in arid regions of the southern plains. Another subspecies of the 14-inch bird—Attwater's greater prairie chicken—is listed as an endangered species and only several thousand are left on the coastal prairie of Texas.

In the nineteenth century, as intensive agriculture swept westward, the particular combination of grasslands required by the northern greater prairie chicken in Wisconsin disappeared. For nesting and rearing cover, the female needs a mixture of broad-leaved herbaceous plants; for male booming, on the other hand, and to facilitate sexual display and mating, open space and short cover are necessary. In pursuit of this dwindling habitat, the prairie chicken population moved northward, where lumbering and fires had created suitable new rangeland. But as reforestation moved down from the north in Wisconsin, and as farming steadily moved up from the south, the chicken was trapped in the pockets of marshland that remained in between. Theoretically, however, as long as the marshland is not entirely destroyed by agriculture or forestation it will continue to provide suitable habitat for the 1,000 or so prairie chickens left in Wisconsin. That is the proposition to which Fran and Fred Hamerstrom have devoted the better part of their lives.

Early in their investigations, funded by the state, the Hamerstroms concluded that a good modern equivalent to natural prairie chicken habitat is open pasture for springtime booming, unmowed grasslands for nesting and cornfields, sedge pockets and small brush patches for wintering. The Buena Vista Marsh could have provided both in abundance. By the early 1950s, however, intensive farming once again began to squeeze the chickens out. And it was during this period that the National Wildlife Federation began sponsoring annual prairie chicken conferences in the dozen midwestern states where the bird is found. At the same time, the Hamerstroms realized that it was "now or never" for *Tympanuchus*. But the bird was still too obscure to elicit widespread public concern.

Even so, the Hamerstrom's research had produced a formidable body of facts about the bird's comings and goings. In a period of a dozen years, the hardy couple and cadres of volunteers had banded more than 2,000 prairie chickens and plotted countless maps defining booming grounds and brooding areas. Frustrated by the difficulties of identifying banded birds, Fran even adapted a new technique from falconry known as "imping"; after trapping a cock, she cut off a tall feather near the base, dipped a brightly-painted substitute in glue and slipped it into the hollow shaft of the old feather. All the while, the Hamerstroms continued staffing their canvas blinds in the marsh with volunteers, who took detailed notes on the behavior of the chickens in the fields.

As a result, the Hamerstroms were able to show that prairie chickens are territorial creatures whose mating and survival needs are ill-served by intensive grazing or plowing, and also by uncontrolled brush growth. With that evidence in hand, the Hamerstroms and their research associate, O. E. Mattson, proposed that the state conserva-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tion department proceed to acquire grassland reserves scattered throughout the Buena Vista and Leola marshes. Then, the Hamerstroms embarked on a campaign to mobilize public opinion—and private money—to facilitate acquisition of land which could be leased to the state and managed for the prairie chicken.

At first the public's reaction was indifference, but when one organization in Madison known as the Prairie Chicken Foundation started purchasing hundreds of acres of grassland, the tide began to turn. Two years later, in Milwaukee, a group of wealthy industrialists formed the *Society of Typanuchus Cupido Pinnatus, Ltd.*, a deceptively jocular foundation that in short order added more than 3,000 acres of grassland to the prairie chicken reserves. With that, the movement began snowballing in Wisconsin and, by now, more than 10,000 acres have been set aside at a total cost of more than \$500,000. In recognition of the Hamerstrom's central role in the movement, the National Wildlife Federation named them "Conservationists of the Year" in 1970.

The prairie chickens do not realize they have been given a new lease on life, of course. But most of the observers who flock to the marshlands around the Hamerstroms' farm each spring do. Listening to the ebullient booming, they are filled with a sense of wonder. And watching the cocks strut magnificently across their individual territories, whirling, displaying and thumping their feet, the Hamerstroms, too, are still awed by it all.

"After the cocks blow up their great air sacks and erect their tail and ear feathers," Fran Hamerstrom enthuses, "they stand up very straight and strut around like little mechanical dolls. When the hens finally come out, they act extremely demure—as if there were no cocks around. At the peak of the breeding season, the spectacle is tremendous. You're surrounded by this symphony of booming. The sun is just coming up. And there's a mist over the marshes. . . . It's really incredibly beautiful."

TRACKING THE GREEN TURTLE

Silently, ponderously, they have been forging their way across vast stretches of ocean water for millions of years. Through a mysterious combination of navigational skill and strength, the enormous Atlantic green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) are able to negotiate monumental annual migration routes that stretch, for many, as far as the coastal waters of Brazil to Ascension Island some 1,500 miles away. It is one of the most mind-boggling phenomena in the natural world. And no one understands it better than Archie Carr, a professor of zoology at the University of Florida and a leading advocate of international cooperation to save the imperiled green turtles from extinction.

A disciplined scientist and an eloquent writer—most notably in his acclaimed book on the green turtle, *So Excellent A Fish*—Carr first became captivated by deep-sea turtles one night many years ago. It was then that he watched a female hawksbill haul herself ashore and, glistening in the light of a half-moon, methodically proceed to lay her eggs. In the years since, Carr has been preoccupied with finding out how such creatures manage to get from place to place.

Back in the 1950s, Carr warned that although the green turtle was then in no immediate danger of extinction, it will support no resurgence of the turtle fishing industry. It seems almost certain that, with modern means of refrigeration and food preservation, the pathetic remnant of the once-teeming hordes will be pursued until the animal is "back against the wall." Tragically, his prediction has long since come true. Today, the green turtle is in serious trouble. In Florida, the insatiable demands of the restaurant industry for soup compounded of the green turtle's delectable meat has all but wiped out the state's offshore turtle colony.

Throughout the Caribbean—where only 15,000 breeding females are left—and in the turtle's other nesting colonies off the coasts of the Guineas, Ascension Island and Australia, the hapless reptile is under attack from commercial industries.

When Carr first became involved in the turtle's plight, the gaps in man's knowledge of the animal were so great that few people even realized its survival was threatened. Over the years, though, Carr's intensive long-distance tagging and recovery studies have revealed much about the turtle's natural history. Still, the facts come painfully slow. Except for the brief times when they are hatching and laying eggs, the green turtles spend their entire lives in the water. They feed on the fast-growing submarine vegetation found offshore. They even breed in the water. And their longevity is such that it takes decades to follow one female long enough to determine her cyclical breeding habits. Consequently, it will be some time before Archie Carr can draw many definite conclusions about the navigation systems that guide the green turtles, again and again, to lay their eggs on the same beaches where they themselves were hatched.

Happily, Carr's crusade to focus world attention on the turtle's precarious condition has reaped more immediate dividends. His thesis is simple enough: the Atlantic green turtle's only hope for survival rests on international concern and cooperation. "No turtle can be given a sure survival outlook merely by protecting it within the frontiers of one country," he stresses.

The first effort to generate shared multinational responsibility was undertaken by the Caribbean Conservation Corporation, a non-profit foundation headquartered in Costa Rica. Under its auspices, a dozen countries and islands joined hands 16 years ago in "Operation Green Turtle," a joint effort to restock green turtles in their natural colony areas. "The green turtle poses one of the most complicated survival problems of all—including the blue whale," Carr cautions. Though no dramatic results have been realized, Carr remains hopeful—but wary. "The huge problems of international commerce make regulation and enforcement almost impossible," he says. "And, with habitat disappearing and markets expanding, the protective efforts must be accelerated." Perhaps, Carr adds, "with the signing of the International Endangered Species Treaty of 1973, they will be."

BUGGING THE COUGAR

In the rugged cattle country of the American west, many stockmen and sportsmen still damn *felis concolor* as a "nuisance" and a "varmint." But for the better part of a decade now, Maurice G. Hornocker, 43, has dedicated himself to keeping the fabled western cougar, or mountain lion—once the most widely-distributed mammal in the Western hemisphere—from joining its eastern cousin on the endangered species list. Frequently with only a veteran hunter and two red bone hound dogs as companions, the wiry leader of the Idaho Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit at the state university in Moscow has logged thousands of miles in pursuit of the secretive predator which is still hunted in some states. He has weighed, measured and examined nearly 300 cougars in a campaign to obtain data that is needed, Hornocker says, "if this species is to be preserved and intelligently managed."

As part of his intensive studies of the mountain lion's solitary way of life, Hornocker and his colleagues frequently "shoot" the cats with tranquilizers—and then bug them with small radio transmitters. After recovering from the effects of the drugs, the lions again roam freely, though much of the time they are electronically tracked on foot (often by snowshoes) or from airplanes.

Eventually, perhaps, Hornocker's elaborate studies will provide the kind of objective evidence that is needed to eliminate, once and

March 27, 1974

for all, the frontier hang-ups that still pin the "bad guy" label on this most magnificent of American cats.

THE WOLF MAN

They do not call him "the wolf man" without good cause, for 37-year-old L. David Mech specializes in tracking timber wolves throughout northern Minnesota's remote Superior National Forest. Since 1968, he has pinpointed the location of nearly 80 radio-tagged wolves in a dozen different packs more than 3,000 times.

The intensive population studies have enabled Mech and his associates in the Interior Department's Endangered Wildlife Research Program to keep close tabs on the whereabouts, pack sizes and hunting habits of the 400 or so threatened wolves remaining in the wilderness area. Somehow, Mech has also found time to write more than 100 books, monographs and articles (including one for National Wildlife, February-March 1968) about his favorite subject.

One of the country's few genuine experts on the timber wolf's feast-or-famine existence, Mech has had a firsthand look at the process of "survival of the fittest." In both Minnesota and the Isle Royale National Park in Lake Superior, he has watched wolf packs track down hundreds of prey, ranging in size all the way up to deer and moose.

First, the wolves run their target into the ground. Then, they close in for the kill. Finally, Mech says, they settle down for an orgy of eating that can last two days or more and add as much as 20 pounds in weight to individual wolves. But Mech's examination of wolf kills prove that the young, the aged and the infirm are the primary targets of the much-maligned predators. In some parts of the country, pressure to restore wolf bounties in order to "save the deer" is still strong. Mech remains convinced, however, that "the wolf is a natural foe of the biggest deer hazard of all—overpopulation."

TRANSPLANTING TROUT

He is definitely not your average holliday trout fisherman. Instead of taking fish out of a stream and popping them into his creel, ichthyologist Robert Behnke helicopters them from one stream to another. It's all part of a concerted effort to save several species and subspecies of endangered trout in the mountains of the West.

From their vulnerable concentrations in a few fragile creeks in the Rockies, Behnke and his co-workers have successfully transferred populations of Greenback, Apache and Gila trout into some two dozen other waterways. By thus dispersing the exotic fish, the scientific samaritans have significantly reduced the chances of their extinction, and enhanced the prospects for increased reproduction. Stationed with the Colorado Cooperative Fishery Unit at Colorado State University in Fort Collins, associate professor Behnke, a 43-year-old native of Connecticut, has studied fish as far afield as Russia and as close to home as the Mianus River, which flows right past his hometown of Stamford.

WHOOPERS' STEPFATHER

After working for nearly 30 years as a wildlife biologist, Ray Erickson is one of the foremost pioneers in a field that, even now, is considered "new." In 1942, he was on the team that began the landmark trumpeter swan restoration project at the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge in southeastern Oregon. Then, in the mid-1950's, Erickson became alarmed over the plummeting population of the whooping cranes that wintered in Texas. Through experiments with the whooper's close relative, the sandhill crane, Erickson and his fellow researchers demonstrated that they could take eggs from the nests of wild whoopers in Canada and hatch them artificially at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in Maryland. Today, their "egg napping" program promises to help the cranes avert extermination.

Currently, as assistant director in charge of endangered species research at Patuxent, the 56-year-old father of three is involved with many different kinds of endangered species. But his first love remains the whooper. And without any doubt, the future of that regal bird is brighter now than it was when Ray Erickson developed his special commitment, nearly 20 years ago.

FEDERAL FINANCING OF ELECTIONS WRONG

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the renewed debate over public financing, the following column by Richard Wilson, which appeared in the February 24 San Diego Union, is particularly apt. There is no question that campaign reform legislation, to prevent a reoccurrence of the abuses of the 1972 campaign, is urgently needed. It is important, however, that we weigh all the ramifications before we seriously consider asking the American taxpayers to foot the bill for Federal election campaigns. I urge my colleague's careful consideration of Mr. Wilson's observations:

FEDERAL FINANCING OF ELECTIONS WRONG

(By Richard Wilson)

The big money is already assembling—\$23 million of it so far—and the prospective presidential backers are rallying (meeting with Sen. Edward Kennedy, among others) for another go at multi-million dollar politics.

The time has come to head off the big blowout through the federal financing of election campaigns. Right?

No, absolutely wrong, notwithstanding the proposed reforms of Common Cause, the League of Women Voters, and AFL-CIO. This is one instance where liberal wisdom collides with fairly impressive scholarship to the contrary.

It seems so simple. Ambassadorships are "sold." "Milk money" in large sums goes to politicians who will fight for higher prices.

High officials are caught in sleazy deals to win favors for generous contributors. A big corporation seeking favor at the highest level finances a national political convention.

This is enough to show, it is argued, that political money and public policy have become so adhesive that they must be ripped apart once and for all if decency and honesty are to be restored to politics.

A complex scheme for public financing supported by Sen. Kennedy and others died in the closing days of Congress last December. It would have established a new system of federal campaign subsidies for candidates in congressional elections and presidential primaries, and broadened existing law to make public funding mandatory for presidential nominees.

Now a new attempt is under way in the House and Senate to revive the legislation making the public generally foot the bills for presidential and other federal campaigns. President Nixon, doubting if Congress will finally act on such a broad proposal, is understood to be preparing a new campaign reform program.

Sen. Kennedy has not placed all his faith in the prospect for a federally financed presidential election in 1976. He has met with a California real estate developer who is a kind of informal spokesman for well-to-do liberals who provided funds for both Sen. Eugene McCarthy in 1968 and Sen. George S. McGovern in 1972.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

These are the people who financed the anti-war politics of the '60s and the '70s, and the fact they are becoming active again is good illustration of why public financing of presidential campaign won't work.

A number of scholars of politics in the academic world have pointed out that rich patrons find ways to support causes, and there are many ways to advance the cause of Kennedy without organizing a formal campaign for him.

The same is true of organized labor. It is in a position to contribute highly valuable "volunteer" services without violating any campaign spending laws, existing or planned.

If federal financing is made the law, the advantage will go to him who can command the most "volunteer" support, which organized labor is better able to provide than any existing campaign organization.

Second to that powerful force come the cause-oriented organizations capable of mobilizing manpower and creating publicity—supporting candidates with whom they agree, and with or without direct political participation.

Fundamentally, there is a fallacy in the argument of those who argue that good causes and campaigns collapse for lack of money. More often it is the other way around; strong causes and candidates attract money.

Contrary to the liberal wisdom, there is no showing that money has been decisive in presidential elections.

COLLEGE REFORM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the role of the Federal Government in education continues to grow. Many private institutions of higher education depend on various types of Federal aid to keep their doors open. When the issue of reform of higher education is raised, it is often discussed in terms of more Federal tax dollars going to the various colleges and universities which usually results in a further compounding of the original problems.

Jeffrey Hart, a professor at Dartmouth College and a syndicated columnist, has suggested four areas in which universities could reform. In his words—

If these reforms were instituted, the colleges and universities would not only balance their books, they would be better educational institutions.

I do think Professor Hart's suggestions merit the attention of those concerned with the problems of higher education. It is time for some new approaches.

At this point I include in the RECORD Professor Hart's column "Colleges Need Reform" from the *Bellevue Gazette* *Bellevue, Ohio* of February 7, 1974:

[From the *Bellevue (Ohio) Gazette* Feb. 7, 1974]

COLLEGES NEED REFORM

(By Jeffrey Hart)

The dire financial plight of numerous private colleges and universities recently percolated to the front pages, the news being that a sudden leap in fuel oil prices had pushed a number of prestigious institutions even more deeply into the red.

But the financial problem have been endemic for years. Not surprisingly—think of Weimar, or the French exchequer under Louis XVI—they are but a reflection of deeper issues that are not economic at all.

William F. Buckley has just published a fine book proposing Four Reforms for the nation; more modestly, I propose four that just might save many colleges and universities.

ANY SUBJECT AT ALL IS SUITABLE

1. Drastically cut the number of courses offered.

Since World War II, the college course has metastasized to the point where virtually any subject matter at all is now deemed suitable for B.A. credit. This has occurred for several reasons.

First of all, the elective system itself has a built-in relativistic bias. In the not too distant past, Western culture had a fairly clear idea of what an educated person should know and be, and the liberal arts curriculum reflected that image. The elective system, which in many or most institutions allows you to take just about what you want, is but one symptom of the fact that no governing idea shapes the modern curriculum. No principle of exclusion appears to exist. Swahili or moviemaking gets the same B.A. credit as American history or the study of Latin. Things that not long ago would be considered mere private hobbies now become the subject matter for college courses, and, naturally, courses therefore proliferate.

Frankly, I see no reason why a liberally educated person in 1974 should not be firmly required to study the classical and Christian roots of Western civilization, and then—so that he can have some sort of intelligent grasp of the world he lives in—be required to take certain courses in history (including the history of science and technology), economics, and modern languages.

Another cause of course proliferation: During the last decade or so, faculties began to be absurdly coddled. One friend of mine, teaching on the undergraduate level, took it into his head to offer a course in Moliere and Shakespeare, with French as a prerequisite. He taught it to two students, I think: an exhilarating experience, no doubt, but since he was making around \$20,000 a year, wildly luxurious. Much less valid courses have proliferated under the banner of "relevance."

I propose that departments offer a core curriculum of basic subjects, things that anyone in that discipline should know. The whimsical stuff could very well be pursued by faculty and students meeting informally and on their own time.

STOP THE SCHOLARSHIPS

2. Second reform. Partly because they are competing for the best high school graduates, and partly for humanitarian do-good reasons, the better institutions have been handing out scholarships in a big way. This should largely cease. No one should in effect be paid \$5,000 a year to go to college. Scholarships should to a considerable degree be converted into long-term loans.

3. Third reform. Cut back on academically irrelevant programs of all kinds. Universities have tended to become cultural and community centers, much to the gratification of their sense of self-importance. But these programs are expensive. Also, it may be illuminating for a student to spend a year in a slum doing social work, but it is not clear that he should do it on university time.

4. Fourth reform. Cut back drastically on administration. The average institution of higher education has five or six times the administrative staff it had 25 years ago, often without an increase in student body. On the typical campus, several deans now function as lay psychoanalysts and hand-holders. Others manage ethnic relations, and so on. All this is fact, and should be dispensed with.

If these reforms were instituted, the colleges and universities would not only balance their books, they would be better educational institutions.