

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ENERGY CRISIS—A CITIZEN'S VIEW

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, everyone is properly concerned about the energy crisis with its shortages of gasoline, fuel oil, and gas. There has been much discussion about how best to solve the current problems as well as the provisions that should be made for the future. It has been my view for a long time that certain Government actions have discouraged the exploration for new domestic sources of petroleum. Nonetheless, some have suggested greater regulation of the oil industry.

Mr. W. G. Brotton of Scotland Neck, N.C., recently sent to me a letter to the editor of "The Indian Journal," Eufaula, Okla., which was written by a citizen who believes that such governmental regulation of this industry is not in the national best interest. His thoughts merit serious attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the aforementioned letter be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Mary Rule, editor:

May I answer seemingly unfair criticism of the oil industry in last week's column of "Sherwood Forest Chit Chat." I own no oil production, etc., and have no axe to grind and seek only to clarify the murky waters surrounding the cause of our energy shortage.

The prime cause of our fuel shortage is unwise legislation, prompted by political appeasement of the heavily populated Northeastern states.

The worst legal blunder was permitting the federal power commission to control natural gas prices at the well head. Thus for political reasons, prices of a deluxe fuel (Natural gas) was kept lower than an inferior fuel (coal) which resulted in huge wasting of natural gas by using it in place of coal in large manufacturing plants of the east. It also caused very high unemployment among coal miners but they in turn were taken care of by almost perpetual welfare. (The F. P. Com. is dominated by Eastern states.)

Such regulations also held back industrial development of oil and gas producing states as they were forced to supply it to Eastern factories at a low cost. Without such regulation, gas price would have found its true value price which was much higher than its controlled price and many manufacturing plants would have moved South and West to their source of supply much earlier than they did.

Despite the warnings of wiser heads as much as 15 years ago (including our own late Senator Kerr) of the approaching fuel shortages, such policies not only continued then but still are in effect. This is in spite of the fact that all studies of the oil industry call for the decontrol of natural gas prices.

Sure, I would like gas and gasoline to be sold to me as cheaply as possible but I recognize the fact that without adequate profits of companies for 1973 and see 40 percent to

60 percent increases and blame oil companies for high gas prices. Actually one year proves nothing. The fact is, over the last 10 years the oil industry has had one of the lowest profit margins of any major industry. It is one of the most heavily taxed of all.

Depletion allowance, in a nut shell, simply recognizes the fact that miner leases (and farms) have less value after production has lowered or ended future potential.

The economic fact is that net income is not all net profit because part of it is a return of capital via lower priced mineral rights.

The oil industry needs less regulation, not more, in order to create an environment more suitable for investment of outside funds for exploration, without which, eventually, all production ceases.

Sincerely,

JESSE J. DYAS.

IMPROVED SERVICE TO VETERANS
IN THE SAN DIEGO AREA

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said recently concerning the adequacy of benefits provided to our service veterans and the efficiency and responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration in delivering such care and benefits. With reference to the latter, I believe it is important to give credit where due. While recognizing that improvement is always possible and that we should seek to give the best possible service to our veterans with the least amount of delays and hindrances, I am enthusiastic about a recent development at San Diego.

Just 2 months ago, beginning on February 4, the Veterans' Administration opened a new regional office in San Diego, recognizing the growing veteran population in southern California and also designed to relieve the excessive workload previously being experienced in the Los Angeles regional office. There are some 272,000 veterans living in San Diego, Imperial, and Riverside Counties who will be served by the new office. Of this number, more than 61,000 are Vietnam era veterans.

Obviously, the proximity of the new office will be of great benefit to the veterans of the area. Perhaps even more importantly, the new office is organized under a new concept utilizing a team approach to counseling and services. This is a management improvement that was carefully researched by the VA prior to implementation. In fact, it had been tested on a pilot basis at six regional offices before becoming operational on a full-scale basis at San Diego.

During the next few years, as those who served during the Vietnam period are absorbed back into civilian life, the demands on the Veterans' Administration will be great. It is comforting to know that a continuing effort is being made to improve the capacity of the VA to

meet these needs, including maximum use of computer technology, of course.

In fiscal 1973, some \$1.3 billion was expended in California for VA facilities, benefits, and operations serving veterans and dependents. But dollar totals do not tell the story unless the services provided are as good as is possible. Fortunately, the end of the U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia has brought an increasing number of men and women out of the armed services and given a sudden surge to our veteran population. This Nation has a tradition of honoring its veterans and I am sure we will insist that those of the Vietnam era are accorded appropriate benefits and assistance in returning to peacetime pursuits.

The Veterans' Administration regional office in San Diego will fill a vital role in that function and it is a most welcome addition to the area which I represent.

INTEGRITY IN THE POLITICAL
PROCESS

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, recently I was privileged to participate in the Delaware Humanities Forum at Wesley College in Dover, Del. Because of the general interest in the subject of my talk, "Integrity in the Political Process," I request that it be printed in the Extensions to the RECORD:

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

INTEGRITY IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS

One of the most basic needs of mankind is the need for faith—faith in ourselves, faith in our established institutions, faith in our country and above all faith in a supreme being.

Today up and down the line our faith has been shaken—shaken perhaps as never before. All too frequently our youth have demonstrated a loss of faith and trust in those closest to them. Faith in our established institutions has dwindled and in some cases is almost non-existent. Faith in laws which have guided and protected our system of government for almost 200 years has been eroding, and, alarmingly, faith in God has been under strong attack.

In addition a helplessness, hopelessness, and even fear prevails over our society.

When you add these negative influences in our society today to a morality that the ends justify the means of that results are more important than how you get them you have the matrix for the environment from which came Watergate, Kent State, student riots, looting, burning, and an entire litany of illegal destructive and unethical acts.

Directly affected by this atmosphere, as much if not more than any other established institution, is your government. Its credibility and effectiveness are openly questioned by almost everyone we meet. A recent survey showed that only 21% of the people have confidence in the Congress. And, most significantly of all, as a result of what has happened since the '72 election, the average citizen has some very real questions in his mind about the integrity of his government

and the men and women in it. It is tragic indeed that so many good and dedicated people are having to suffer a lack of public trust because of the immorality of a few.

The type of morality that brought Watergate—one that supports the thesis that the ends justify the means and that you can ignore those laws you don't agree with—should be denounced in the strongest terms just as Watergate itself and those who participated in its execution and coverup should be denounced. Further, those involved should be brought to justice.

Politicians and public servants are, of course, subject to the same laws as every other citizen plus a host of other ones including those to forestall bribery, graft, conflict of interest, and election law offenses. One of my concerns, however, is that the laws have not been strongly enforced in the past. There have been exceptions though, thanks to the diligent efforts of people like Senator John Williams. Lamar Caudle in the Truman Administration and Bobby Baker, former Senate Majority Secretary, are examples.

Despite the legal deterrents to crime in government, you can't put enough laws on the books to prevent it. Watergate proved that.

Simply put, you can't legislate morality. Unlike other crimes I have mentioned, Watergate crimes basically were not perpetuated for personal monetary gain. Instead they were committed for the purpose of power and control and subversion of the democratic processes of government by men who put themselves above the law.

Despite its sordidness, however, Watergate has demonstrated, more than anything that has happened in recent times that our system of justice is working though cumbersome, slow and at times erratic. Events following '72 elections and unfolding on up to the present time show that no one in government is immune from the law, not even the President himself. More than 40 indictments already have been returned followed by several convictions. They reach from the highest echelons in the White House to those who actually carried out the burglary of the Democratic National Committee Headquarters and to those who carried out the dirty tricks. The impeachment inquiry hearings are underway and most recently the Kent State case has been reopened with indictments being returned against those involved in the shooting of the students there. So, like the mills of God, the system of justice in this country grinds slowly yet it grinds exceedingly small. The system is slowly purging itself of wrongs and evils and in doing so it is proceeding in a relatively orderly way. Among other things it has led to the House Judiciary Committee impeachment inquiry now in progress. In that regard it has been my personal conviction that so-called executive privilege does not apply to impeachment proceedings. Since 1972 I have called for full disclosure and an independent investigator and I believe the President has erred in not promptly supplying whatever the Judiciary Committee believes necessary to an investigation.

Should the Committee recommend impeachment and should the House so vote, a trial would be held in the Senate. In that event my responsibility is to uphold the Constitution and to insure that such proceedings are fair and impartial and in the highest tradition of justice. My vote will stand apart from political party or politics and I resent those who attempt to predict how I would vote. I believe it is wrong and contrary to my oath as a Senator for me to take a position before I hear the evidence. Further I am concerned that those who have done so whether for or against will be challenged either in the proceedings or in the Supreme Court.

In our preoccupation with Watergate we all too often lose sight of the strength which sustains this system of government and tend instead to concentrate on its weaknesses.

Yet, it is these very strengths which separate our government from other types and which prevent it from moving too far to the right or left.

Let me hasten to add though that we cannot be complacent. What we need to do is to take whatever steps are necessary and prudent to cut down on the likelihood of future Watergates. We in government must create a framework that will help insure honesty in government. We as public servants must conduct ourselves in a manner that will merit your respect. Moreover no matter how well our governmental machinery works, we must from time to time fine tune and adjust the various parts to be sure they continue to be responsive to changing needs. The time to undertake such a fine tuning and adjustment is now. To eliminate the abuses encountered in past elections we should reform campaign practices and financing. To give Congress the strength it needs to serve as a co-equal branch of government we should take back some of the powers which have been flowing to the executive branch under all of the Presidents since Franklin D. Roosevelt. To make Congress live up to its responsibilities we should reform its procedures. To assure integrity in the use of the taxpayers money we should develop a system to better control the expenditures of your money. Equally important, to assure that we get more honest, capable people in public office, we should exercise more caution and discretion as voters.

There is no better way in my opinion to prevent future Watergates and future attempts to subvert the political process than to bring about true election reform. To accomplish this I have just introduced a package of four bills, whose main purpose is to deemphasize the need for money in election campaigns. One bill will broaden the number of smaller contributions to each campaign and will reduce the need for excessive contributions, through a fifty percent tax credit for contributions up to \$150 for individual returns and \$300 for joint returns. Another would provide free and equal television time for U.S. Senate and House candidates of the two major parties. This bill eliminates the purchase of additional television time and thus a major portion of the rapidly escalating campaign costs. It is only fair that television stations provide this public service because they enjoy a valuable right of use of the airways.

A third bill provides for two free mass mailings for each candidate and limits them to these mailings. My bill would prevent mass mailings of any type 120 days prior to an election for incumbents—except of course to answer constituent mail.

The fourth bill limits out of state contributions to no more than 25% of the total raised in any individual Congressional campaign.

This would help prevent influence from out of state contributors. In addition to my own campaign package I have strongly supported full disclosure, limits on contributions, and shortened campaigns.

Unlike public financing which emphasizes large sums of money and which runs the risk of being tilted in favor of this or that candidate, my approach would deemphasize the use of money. The cost of campaigning has gotten out of hand and it's time we do all we can to bring it back to earth and minimize abuses. Most importantly, my approach would help to eliminate the prepackaged candidate about which we know nothing more than what some high priced, high powered political consulting, public relations, or advertising agency wants us to know. Why I've even heard of some cases where a candidate was removed from the public eye because an agency thought it was the best way for him to be elected. Tricks, gimmickry, and programmed candi-

dates are founded on deceptions and are inimical to integrity in government.

While the abuses in political campaigns and Watergate have made us particularly conscious of the need for campaign reform another essential element to integrity in government is the way in which government conducts its day to day activities.

I have been involved in trying to strengthen the hand of the Congress and to open up the Government since I first went to Washington in 1967. My earliest endeavor was to compile a catalogue of domestic assistance programs, where I immediately ran headlong into the problem of executive branch agencies withholding information from the Congress. But, we persisted and I finally broke loose the information the public needed. One interesting thing we found, for instance, was that while the Johnson Administration claimed 400 programs we uncovered 1100.

Recently I drafted legislation that would grapple intelligently with the difficult issue of executive privilege. The chief proposal before the committee would have cut-off the salary of the official who failed to provide the information needed even though he was obeying the orders of a superior. This was intended to force the employee to go to court to get his back salary and thus provide an opportunity for a court test on whether the information was within the scope of executive privilege. Because this approach was both unconstitutional and grossly unfair I was successful in having the committee and the Senate accept my amendment which would get the information through an innovative subpoena process subject to a quick court review without interfering with an employee's salary.

Senator Sam Ervin characterized my amendment as providing "for the first time in the history of our Nation a way to get the information Congress needs without punishing the poor devil who was ordered to withhold it."

At the same time we correct the abuses of executive privilege we cannot let Congress escape criticism for not opening up and reforming its procedures. I am attempting in several ways to do something about this problem. Working with Senator Humphrey I have attempted to open up all of the Senate's committee business meetings and was partially successful in that each committee now has the option of determining whether or not its meetings will be open to the public. I intend to persist in my efforts to open up these meetings because it's about time that some of these secretive and high-handed tactics of the past be abandoned and the public be brought in on the business meetings of Congress. My latest effort in this regard was successful, however, and I am pleased that we are making progress. When the recently passed budget reform bill was being considered, Senator Chiles and I offered and had accepted what we call a "sunshine" amendment. This amendment provides that the new budget committee open its deliberations to the public.

I have in the past been concerned about the seniority system in Congress and have been a strong supporter of the concept that Chairmen and Ranking Members of Committees be elected in order to assure the selection of able and knowledgeable men. In my view many of the major shortcomings of the Congress can be laid right at the doorstep of seniority. I'm sure too that some of the breaches in ethics and honesty in the past have resulted to some extent from this inefficient system.

Frequently those who are concerned with honesty and integrity in government overlook the one area where, in my view, branches in integrity occur regularly. That is the way in which those who represent you in government spend your money. And, I might add that this free and easy use of your money is

one of the prime causes of inflation. To do something about the waste of taxpayers' dollars, I have been at the very forefront of fiscal reform since I have been in the Senate. I fought hard for meaningful budget reform in the Government Operations Committee and later on the floor of the Senate. The bill which finally emerged claims much but does little. Ceilings are set but like the national debt they can be raised again and again by a simple majority vote and chances are that during an election year the ceilings will be raised when Members of Congress come up with their grab bags of prizes for the voters. My amendment would have made it more difficult to raise the ceilings by requiring a two-thirds vote each time in the event additional revenues weren't found by Congress to fund a new project.

I realize full well that a good deal more must be done to restore public confidence in government and I intend to do all I can to help make the political and governmental processes more honest, responsive, and efficient.

But you and every other citizen and voter also play a role in maintaining integrity in government—and a very important one at that. For you are the ultimate judges of who will represent you at the National level. To assist you in this effort I have developed a voter's list of rules for assuring integrity in government. With your forbearance I'd like to recite them to you now.

1. Beware of the soothsayer who offers panaceas for every problem. For he shall lead you down the primrose path.

2. Be wary of him who proclaims his honesty from the rooftops. For the honest man need not proclaim it so.

3. Consort not with the doctrinaire. For his is frequently the narrow field of impossible dreams.

4. Avoid the faint hearted. For his principles are subject to frequent changes in the breeze.

5. Stay away from the big spender. For he takes from one pocket to put in another.

6. Put not your trust in the dilettante for his is the way of little accomplishment.

7. Work not with the evasive. For you know not where he is going.

8. Beware of the showhorse. For seldom is substance to be found beneath the glitter.

9. Take with a grain of salt him who offers the simplistic solution. For if such were possible it would long ago have been adopted.

10. Be wary of him who sets forth criteria such as these. For he should follow the standards he sets for others.

In attempting to build and maintain integrity in government look beneath the surface and beyond the party label. I'm sure you all know that it wasn't the party label that returned John Williams to the Senate time after time. It was above all else his ability and his integrity, and so it was with Allen Frear and Cale Boggs.

Our system of government in this country will continue to remain strong and self-corrective only as long as we have an effective and alert citizenry, equally strong branches of government, including a strong effective Congress, and meaningful reforms as they are needed.

The faith I spoke of at the beginning of my talk should not be just a sometime thing. It should sustain us constantly as we struggle to meet some of the awesome problems with which we are faced today. Such faith should be buttressed by strong and effective action on the parts of those of us in and out of the government.

Faith and action together are without parallel as a source of the strength we need to maintain integrity in government and to make this a better country in which to live. Without such enlightened faith we can accomplish little. With it we can accomplish more than we can envision at this time.

CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS HAILS JO ANN STRUZIENSKI, WINNER OF SPIRIT OF '76 ESSAY CONTEST

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this week the American Revolution Bicentennial Committee of Kearny, N.J., through its distinguished chairman, Mrs. Walter C. Hipp, announced the winners of its Spirit of '76 Essay Contest. The contest was entered by students from 10 schools in Kearny and 275 students wrote essays as a part of the contest.

The grand prize winner was a seventh grade student from Our Lady of Sorrows School, Jo Ann Struzienski, 358 Schuyler Avenue, Kearny.

Mr. Speaker, Jo Ann's paper is so good that I think it is worthy of the attention of all Members of the House and all persons who read the RECORD. I hope all my colleagues will take a moment and realize just how worthy America's boys and girls are to carry on the heritage of this Nation. I commend Jo Ann, her parents, the good sisters and lay teachers at Our Lady of Sorrows School for a job well done.

The essay follows:

SPIRIT OF '76

(By Jo Ann Struzienski)

I, the Spirit of '76, am a year, a flag, and a people that will always be cherished in memory. During this year a great event happened—America, my Nation, was born. The birthdate, July 4, is to this day celebrated yearly with special parades, displays, and fireworks to honor the people of the past who were so powerful, courageous, and brave. These people had that stick-to-it-tiveness so necessary to get a good job done. Therefore, I am their lives lived, gone, but still remembered. I am their victory, defeat, sadness, and hope.

My beautiful American flag, has spirit in itself. It stands for freedom, liberty, and rights. It represents glory and brought it to this country. It was the first flag for the united regiments of the colonies unfurled on Prospect Hill in Somerville, Massachusetts when the new Army under Washington began its existence. He reported that I was hoisted "in compliment to the United Colonies". Americans respected me then and still do today. This is expressed by the daily pledge made to me in schools, meeting places, and wherever Americans stand together. This promise is an affirmation of the basic principles of America—one nation indivisible, formed and existing under divine providence, and providing liberty and justice for all. In this twentieth century, I am also proud that my flag was the first to be placed on the moon by our Nation's astronauts.

My past era was an exciting one. It was the time of the Boston Tea Party and Paul Revere's famous midnight ride immortalized by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. It was the battles of Lexington and Concord, Bunker Hill, and the suffering at Valley Forge. My staunch spirit went on to live in the men who fought in the battles of Korea, Vietnam, and on the battlegrounds of World Wars I and II. As in the past the responding proclamation of Patrick Henry to "give me liberty or give me death", motivated the stout-hearted colonists, so today, it still continues to spur our great men to heroic action.

Americans, on a visit to historical Phila-

delphia, our Nation's First Capital, have an opportunity to see the famous Liberty Bell, and learn to appreciate their freedom that began with the Declaration of Independence that had been announced by it. When this Declaration's precious document came into existence, many men had already jeopardized their very lives. One of these was Patrick Henry when he declared, "These United Colonies are, and of right, ought to be, free, and independent States". Another, Nathan Hale, echoed the same idea when he stated, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country".

Such was the heroism of the men of the past. Walking in these footsteps have been men like them in our day. They were John and Robert Kennedy, and Martin Luther King. They embodied the "Spirit of '76". And so it is that this spirit still beckons foreign peoples coming to our shores. They kneel in thanksgiving to God as they catch their first glimpse of the Statue of Liberty, that beacon of hope in the Atlantic, welcoming them to the "Home of the Brave".

Therefore, as the citizens of this great Nation prepare for their bi-centennial, it is my burning desire that the "Spirit of '76" continue to direct and guide them in order that future generations would learn to know and cherish the ideals that won for them their liberty under God.

THE RETIREMENT OF MR. CAMILLO DeLUCIA

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1974, the tri-State area of southeastern Ohio lost one of its most popular and familiar voices. On that day Mr. Camillo DeLucia retired as the voice of the Neapolitan Serenade after more than 33 years.

Mr. DeLucia's career in broadcasting has had few parallels. He came to the United States as an immigrant in 1920 with his wife Gilda and settled in Steubenville, Ohio, in 1923. After many years of radio experience in New York, Philadelphia, and Youngstown, he joined WSTV, Steubenville, in November 1940, to become host of Neapolitan Serenade. He was a natural for the job and became instantly popular with the large group of Americans of Italian extraction.

He combined many patriotic and charitable services with his duty as radio host. During World War II the Department of the Treasury presented him with a citation for his efforts in behalf of war bond sales. When major floods struck Europe in 1962 he raised several thousand dollars for flood victims in Italy. For years he has raised money for St. John's Villa in Carrollton, Ohio. These are only a few examples of his efforts.

The honors bestowed on Mr. DeLucia are too numerous to list in detail. They include, among others, special commendations from President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Pope John XXIII, and Alcide D. Gasperi, Prime Minister of Italy. He was awarded the Cross of Solidarity Medal, Grand Cavalier of the Order of Merit by the President of Italy.

Even now that he has retired to spend more time with his children and grand-

children he continues to participate in community affairs and to add to the treasury of memories for his family, his friends, and his neighbors.

**THE CHEEKTOWAGA TIMES CALLS
UPON ELECTED OFFICIALS TO
HOLD THE LINE AGAINST SPENDING
AND INFLATION**

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in a highly perceptive editorial on April 4, the Cheektowaga Times, one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in Erie County, N.Y., the problem of handling inflation was hit head on, with the blame being assigned where it really belongs—"at the door of elected officials responsible for massive Government spending and mounting Federal budget deficits."

The newspaper and its distinguished and dedicated editor, Mr. Willard Allis, are to be commended for bringing this insight—and this candor—to the people and to the debate on this issue. I commend Mr. Allis and his capable staff for having made this important contribution to the need for controlling our runaway budget and the large deficits which have been financed by expansionist monetary policies.

Inflation is the cruelest of all economic phenomena, for it robs all of us of our purchasing power and of future economic security. It is especially severe to those on fixed incomes—principally annuitants, pensioners, and social security recipients.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before on the floor of this House:

Inflation is not an act of God; it is an act of politicians.

As such, it is as susceptible to alleviation and resolution as it was to creation; and, if the elected officials of this country continue to contribute to the causes of inflation, the people should hold them fully accountable and turn them out of office as Mr. Allis so wisely suggests.

The editorial follows:

CORRALLING INFLATION

If a majority of the people, in addition to worrying about inflation, also laid the primary blame for the problem at the door of elected officials responsible for massive government spending and mounting federal budget deficits and gave their support to those who want to bring the federal budget under control, two thirds of the battle against inflation would have been won. Those of us who receive federal benefits either directly or indirectly must be willing to agree that those benefits should not be increased or expanded and should perhaps even be reduced. If this ever happens, the beast of inflation will be corralled. But, as things now stand, we've had to resort to another economic freeze, and it doesn't look like we know for sure even where to get a good hold on the animal.

The Gallup poll never fails to come up with some interesting items regarding the shifting course of public opinion. Quite predictably, inflation's effect on the cost of living is said

to be the number one worry of over 60 percent of the people questioned at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, if the problems of inflation are ever to be sufficiently tackled, it will require a greater awareness among the people—the voters—on the real causes of inflation. To this effort, the Cheektowaga Times has made a valuable effort. I am proud to share it with my colleagues.

SOVIET SHELTER BUILDING

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SOVIET SHELTER BUILDING

(By Joanne S. Gailar, Health Physics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee)

On Christmas Day, 1973, a top-level conference of civil defense staff took place in Moscow. It was presided over by Soviet CD Chief, Col. Gen. Alexander T. Altunin, and was attended by high ranking participants. The agenda included a report on increasing the public knowledge about civil defense.

It comes as no surprise that Altunin, a deputy defense minister as well as CD chief of his country, would back the promotion of CD instruction for the population. It is his stated conviction that "protection against any weapon, even the most modern," is possible "if everyone masters its ways and means."

The Soviet Union evidently has no intention of leaving the important matter of acquiring such knowledge to chance. One step in the process of instructing its citizens is the preparation of high quality CD handbooks, always with a particular audience in mind. The ORNL has published translations of three such Russian handbooks within the past three years: (1) *Civil Defense* (Moscow 1969), a manual "for all faculties of agricultural institutes"; (2) *Civil Defense* (Moscow 1970), a text for students in engineering and liberal arts colleges throughout the land; and (3) *Antiradiation Shelters in Rural Areas* (Moscow 1972), a handbook for the general population.

The most recent handbook is addressed directly to the Soviet people. In the introduction it states:

"Knowledge on the part of the population of the damaging factors of nuclear weapons and skillful application of defensive methods could reduce human casualties by many times in the future war, if it is launched by imperialists."

"Having read this memorandum, you will know not only of the damaging action of penetrating radiation and of radioactive contamination of an area, which follow a nuclear explosion, but will also be familiar with the simplest yet dependable means of defense."

This handbook, forty pages in the original Russian, goes on to impart this life-saving information to its readers. Chapter I, What Each Person Should Know About Radioactivity and Its Damaging Effects, describes the fireball, the shock wave, initial nuclear radiation, and fallout from a nuclear explosion, and indicates the time of arrival of fallout in a specific area in relation to distance from

*Operated by the Union Carbide Corporation for the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. (NOTE: Mrs. Gailar's references available upon request.)

the explosion and wind velocity. It also indicates the fallout duration.

Chapter II, Why It Is Dangerous for People to Be in a Radioactively Contaminated Area, discusses radiation sickness and gives the ranges of the radiation doses at which relatively light, intermediate, and serious illness occur, together with the symptoms at each level of illness.

Chapter III, Learn to Defend Yourself—You Will Save Your Life and Preserve Your Health, explains the meaning of such terms as shielding coefficient and attenuation factor and gives the basic requirements for a fallout shelter.**

Chapter IV, How to Build a Fallout Shelter, gives instructions and drawings for building such shelters as a covered trench shelter, a peak-roofed dugout, a lean-to dugout, a wood-earth shelter, a shelter with a roof made of reinforced concrete slab (one with walls lined with rough lumber and one without wall lining), a shelter made of fascines (bundles of saplings, or of stalks of plants), and a shelter of adobe brick.

Chapter V, How to Behave in a Fallout Shelter, instructs the reader, "Take with you a supply of food, drinking water, and essential items" and "do not forget to take . . . means for light . . . heating . . . a first aid kit, a radio set, and a time piece." Chapter V also lists important rules of conduct while in a shelter.

Chapter VI, How to Protect Water Reserves from Radioactive Contamination, concludes the handbook with instructions and six diagrams on how to protect wellheads from fallout.

**FAIR LABOR STANDARDS
AMENDMENT**

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, last week I was one of the few Members of this body to cast my vote in opposition to the minimum wage legislation, H.R. 12435. I am most concerned that in passing this legislation we have set a very dangerous precedent.

My opposition to this bill was both parochial and philosophical in nature. First the provision that provides overtime pay for firemen and policemen, will force some communities in my congressional district to either raise taxes, reduce services, or terminate employees. My office has already been in contact with several communities who are already estimating the amount of increase in property taxes individual homeowners will have to pay. Ironically, local wages and hours in many small communities are arranged now so many firemen have secondary jobs and income. The Federal Government will force these folks to make a choice they neither want nor can afford.

Second, these overtime provisions may apply to public employees in small communities who must also serve in an "on-call" capacity. Many of these employees wear one hat during their regular work shift and then don another to remain on

**Inadequate ventilation for full occupancy in hot weather appears to be the only serious deficiency in the expedient fallout shelter designs described in this handbook.

call to answer emergency community needs. Having been a small town mayor I can attest to the fact those who have the responsibility of making the hard revenue decisions in communities with less than 1,000 citizens and with very little tax base, are constantly robbing Peter to pay Paul to provide essential services. We have already witnessed the loss of such vital services as emergency ambulance capability due to Federal wage standards as they apply to "on-call" employees whose primary job was in another field.

I would emphasize my objections to this legislation are not based on the obvious need for public employees at all levels to receive a decent wage, especially during this time of ever-increasing inflation. I object to how this is being done and the practical effect it will have. We are not guaranteeing public employees a minimum wage, we are telling local government officials they must meet a Federal wage standard as if we somehow create jobs or money here in Washington. How the local official gets the job done is his problem.

It would appear the time has come in this country, where every community regardless of size or local revenue capability must pay local employees a wage as prescribed by the Federal Government regardless of local circumstances.

More and more, folks in my district are telling me they are fed up with the Federal Government making decisions for them that cause more problems than answers. I have said for some time that we have come to the point where we must spend just as much time protecting folks from what Government does to them as opposed to for them.

I think with the passage of the so-called fair labor standards amendment, we have set a most dangerous precedent. The practical effect of this bill in some of our rural communities will be to increase taxes, decrease employment, reduce services and most ironically, in some cases cause the individual public employee to work longer hours for less overall pay. More important, Congress has taken a significant step in assuming control over local government. I would urge my colleagues to consider the remarks expressed in an editorial within the Kansas Government Journal by that publication's editor, Mr. E. A. Mosher.

The Kansas Government Journal is a widely read and authoritative publication. Just as important, it deals with government in a commonsense manner. I urge my colleagues to read the following commonsense editorial by E. A. Mosher:

WAGES AND HOURS—A FEDERAL AFFAIR?

If elected local governing bodies are not capable of determining the hours and compensation of public employees, what can they do?

This is a basic issue facing Congress as the *Journal* goes to press. The U.S. Senate has passed a bill which effectively brings all public employees under the fair labor standards act. The House of Representatives has passed a similar bill, but excluding police and fire fighters from the overtime pay provisions. And the matter is now in conference committee.

There is more at stake than the millions of dollars of increased property taxes necessary to fund the minimum pay or overtime pay requirements for public employees. Also at issue is what level of government should make such decisions. Should the pay scale and work hours of policemen in the city of Washington, Kansas be resolved in Washington, D.C.? If this is a matter of national government concern—so important that it cannot be entrusted to locally elected officials—what does the future hold? Certainly, the gate is open for other federal controls over local personnel policies; the passage of such pending bills as the national public employee relations act or the national merit system act is enhanced. If Congress is to decide that a city lifeguard must be paid \$1.90 an hour, or that a county truck driver must be paid time and a half for work over 40 hours, what's so different about deciding who can run for the office of city councilman or county commissioner?

Perhaps this cry, shared by many others, is just a voice in the wilderness. A battle may be won if police and firemen are cut out of the overtime provisions of the final federal law, but the war will have been lost, for the principle of federal control will have been established.

All of this seems in strange contrast to the mood of the country, which appears supportive of returning more decisions to the people and their state and local governments. Certainly, it conflicts with the "new federalism" thrust of restoring balance to our governmental system.

LEWISTOWN, PA.—ALL-AMERICAN CITY WITH ALL-AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. E. G. SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, Lewistown, Pa., has the distinct honor this year of being chosen an All-American City—the only one selected from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This outstanding award, presented by the National Municipal League, pays tribute to the courageous and industrious citizens of this central Pennsylvania town. I am indeed proud and privileged to represent the All-American City of Lewistown in the U.S. Congress.

In June of 1972, tropical storm Agnes took its toll on Lewistown when the Juniata River rose to 22 feet above flood stage and destroyed literally millions of dollars of homes, businesses, and other property. It also resulted in the permanent shutdown of Lewistown's largest industry—an industry that provided jobs for 22 percent of the population. More than 2,000 workers suddenly found themselves out of work, with nowhere to turn for new jobs.

At a time when many are content to lean back, prop up their feet, and let Uncle Sam support them, it would have been easy for the citizens of Lewistown to settle back and let Federal and State aid pick up the slack. But the people of Lewistown do not necessarily do things the easy way—they do things the right way. They rolled up their sleeves and went to work.

Through the leadership of a 40-man

industrial development corporation consisting of representatives of local business, industry, and government, reconstruction began. Lewistown now has 11 industries, instead of 1—3 of which are expansion plants. More than three-fourths of the jobs which were lost as a result of the 1972 disaster have been recovered, and if plans proceed according to schedule, the remaining jobs will soon be recovered. The town has a new face, thanks to a major redevelopment effort, erasing the scars of the flood and symbolizing a community-wide determination to look ahead, not back.

One of the most unusual developments was the merger of an osteopathic and a medical hospital—two forms of medical practice that are traditionally separate. Perhaps symbolic of the spirit of community pride and cooperation that has existed throughout the reconstruction period, these two are now working side by side as one staff of one hospital.

I take off my hat to the people of Lewistown, who have displayed the pioneer spirit of our Founding Fathers—a spirit which is all but lost in today's society where "let others do it," or "I don't want to get involved" have become commonplace. The people of Lewistown did become involved, and they did do it—they can now look forward to a bright and happy future, thanks to no one but themselves. In the All-American City of Lewistown, Pa., the people are truly "All-American Citizens."

VIETNAM REVISITED

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, a recent column has come to my attention dealing with the situation in South Vietnam. This article by Peter Hughes, one of the editors of the *Alternative*, points out how well the Vietnamese have been doing in the year since the termination of direct American military assistance. The numerous forebodings of their demise have indeed been greatly exaggerated.

Even since the ARVN forces successfully staved off the major Communist assault in the spring of 1972, the South Vietnamese have been able to effectively deal with the numerous military threats to their survival. As Hughes points out, in the year since the limited cease-fire "the north has infiltrated more than 30,000 troops into the south" in violation of the agreements. At the same time the South Vietnamese Army has been reduced in size so that more manpower will be available for economic reconstruction.

Even with a large standing Communist army in their country and with only limited American economic assistance, the South Vietnamese have been able to attain substantial military and political progress. Popular support for President Thieu is evident from the fact that the government has confidently distributed weapons to most of their popu-

lation knowing that they will only be used for defense against Communist aggressive actions.

The Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists continue to aid the North Vietnamese in their increasingly futile effort to dominate the south. With continued American assistance to the people of South Vietnam a genuine cease-fire may become possible with mutual acknowledgement of the benefits of a stabilized military situation. Despite the years of agony which the war has caused we can receive some gratification from the results thus far evident.

In order to fully understand what has been transpiring in Vietnam, I encourage you to read the report by Hughes which I include as an extension of my remarks:

Vietnam Revisited

(By Peter Hughes)

This writer recently had the opportunity to take a ten-day trip to the Republic of Vietnam. The trip included visits to all four of the country's military regions, meetings with various Vietnamese and American officials, as well as visits to Con Son Island—the location of the so-called tiger cages.

Contrary to the popular belief, espoused by that world-wide movement of alienated intellectuals and progressive opinion, South Vietnam does not have the trappings of a "police state." (Having grown up in Berlin, Germany, and having visited the Eastern European countries, I have had the opportunity to see what I consider to be police states.)

I (as the other visitors with me) was very surprised with the predominant youth of the government officials we met. (Most of the ministers we talked with, for example, were in their early thirties, a striking contrast to the leadership of North Vietnam.) Many of these ministers had had the opportunity to spend some time in foreign universities, and they were clearly in their positions because of their own merits, and not just because of their loyalties to Thieu.

Far from being government interventionists, the ministers I met with were classical liberals to the man, i.e., favoring as little government intervention into all aspects of human life as possible. But with rare exception (South Vietnam's Minister for Information, Hoang-Duc-Nha, has the unique distinction of being able to get favorable press reviews in this country—no small task for a Saigon official) we are led to believe that the leadership of South Vietnam is an anonymous face of military and bureaucratic hacks. This is just not the case.

Throughout my visit to Vietnam no one tried to hide the fact that problems (including problems of corruption) exist. Even Professor Nguyen Ngoc Huy (a leader of the opposition party, the Social Democratic Alliance) and Bui Diem, (a former ambassador to the United States and publisher of the Saigon Post who is held in high regard by opponents of Thieu) were more than candid in their assessment of the cease-fire agreement, America's future role in Vietnam, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of President Thieu, who is generally given good marks.

Hit hard by rampant inflation (estimated at over 60 percent last year) the country, nevertheless, has managed a certain prosperity. The streets of Saigon are filled with motorcycles (Hondas, of course), few policemen, and even less traffic lights (at least that were in use). In the countryside a pacification program (which is moving too slowly for some) is returning farm land to the peasants with the goal of giving them total control over their output, the Vietcong

notwithstanding. But the economy is bordering on crisis and the South Vietnamese are in dire need of foreign aid and investment. All of this can change if oil is discovered, and the prospects for finding the world's sweetest crude oil are considered very real. In the meantime, however, President Thieu feels compelled on the one hand to alert the world to the aggression of the North, but on the other hand he recognizes that by doing so he is scaring off foreign economic aid.

My trip was not confined to meeting with government officials and I had ample opportunity to walk the streets of Saigon alone (without, incidentally, the fear of being mugged). One day I visited (unscheduled) the School of Arts and Letters of Saigon University and found (perhaps ironically) that a student election was being held. The people I met with spoke freely about their problems, which covered the entire spectrum of woes, including the need for political reforms and the price of beer. The latter complaint, I found to be a very healthy one.

Although American troop involvement in Vietnam ended with the cease-fire agreement of January 27, 1973—this concluding U.S. disengagement from the longest war in our nation's history—for the Vietnamese the war continues unrelentingly.

In the year since the cease-fire accord 58,000 Vietnamese soldiers have been reported killed (more than America's total twelve-year loss), and there have been over 335,000 alleged cease-fire violations. In 1973 more than half of the North Vietnamese enemy activity was in the Delta region (the so-called Rice War) as the Vietcong have attempted to capture the rice supplies necessary to sustain their activities in the South. Although no American or South Vietnamese official we met believed the North had the capacity to launch an attack on the level of the 1972 offensive, the Vietcong, for the present at least, do have the capacity to cause occasional embarrassments for the South.

Since the cease-fire agreement the North has infiltrated more than 30,000 troops into the South, bringing its total troop strength (as of December 1973) to 75,000. But the Vietcong political infrastructure in the South is in serious disarray. As a result the Vietcong have had to resort to terrorist activities in an effort to gain control over the civilian population. The North also hopes to rebuild its infrastructure through what has been called the "Third Vietnam" concept. This is a contiguous zone from the demilitarized area to Quang Duc Province, along the Cambodian front where the North is attempting to rebuild its infrastructure by infiltrating 40,000 civilians (men, women, and children) to populate the lowly populated border zones. South Vietnam, however, has steadily increased its control to approximately 85 percent of its territory and 95 percent of its population. (The Vietcong claim to control 12 percent of the population, a modest claim in itself.)

While no one doubts that Hanoi still intends to gain control over the South by force, recent intelligence data indicates that the North does not now consider it the tactical time to attempt any major advances. Hanoi is handicapped by the shortfalls of its own rice crops, as well as its inability to exploit Sino-Soviet differences. The North is also concerned that any blatant violations of the cease-fire accord would bring about the resumption of U.S. bombing. Thus for the time being the North seems content to continue strategic raids in the South, to attempt to expand Vietcong control over both population and territory in the South, and to force Saigon to accept the North's interpretation of the cease-fire accord.

Vietnam is a country that has been at war for more than two generations. And peace, as we understand it, will take at least another generation (precluding the total collapse of

the South)—for Hanoi's present ruling cadre will never give up its aim of taking over South Vietnam. But after visiting the South one has to be impressed with the perseverance of the people, the legitimacy of the Thieu government, and by the very fact that life in that country can continue as remarkably as it does, given the conditions of constant war.

Americans, however, in the aftermath of the Vietnam war, have not adjusted so readily. As Robert Bartley (the Editorial Page Editor of the *Wall Street Journal*) recently wrote: Americans seem to have forgotten that whatever the inevitable outcome of Vietnam may be, "... the fundamentals of our policy in Vietnam were not sinister; the policy was not aggressive but basically defensive. The mistakes did not lie in our purpose, but in failing to understand the enormous difficulties of actually doing what we had in mind. Yet, few of those today who write the history of the Vietnam war remember it that way."

Perhaps even more fundamental for us today is that for young America the moral revulsion that came with the war has come to threaten and cloud the perception of youth with a myopic infatuation of the Hanoi regime. But South Vietnam has a story of its own that deserves to be told and I cannot help but believe that most Americans will at least listen (if they are given the opportunity).

En route to the States I thought of an observation once made by Morton Kaplan on the subject of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Kaplan said: "I know of no more decisive commitment a nation can make than to bring down the President of a friendly country in order to win a war." Thus if the United States were now to withdraw its support of South Vietnam (as many would have us), Kaplan continues, it would be like the man telling his pregnant girlfriend: "No, I made a mistake—let's call a halt to the matter now."

America, if it is not totally to ignore its international responsibility, has a commitment to South Vietnam and it is a commitment worth preserving. For if the Vietnam war taught us not what to do, it should also teach us what we need to do.

IMPEACH IN HASTE: REPENT AT LEISURE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, when I recently—April 3—inserted in the RECORD a paper entitled "Crime as the Sole Basis of Impeachment," written by O. R. Strackbein, I was under the impression that he is a lawyer, and said so. I was wrong.

Now that I wish to insert another paper on the impeachment subject by Mr. Strackbein I should identify him more fully and definitely.

He was a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of Texas; briefly taught economics at Washington and Lee University and then served as Trade Commissioner of the U.S. Department of Commerce in Latin America. He spent 2 years with the Tariff Commission and several years as a member of the Federal Public Contracts Board. Subsequently he was in the management consulting field. In the past 20 years he has

led the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy in Washington.

Mr. Strackbein is also an author of versatility as the variety of his books testifies: "The Anatomy of Civilization," "A Philosophy of Self-Management," "Permissiveness," "American Enterprise and Foreign Trade," "Tyranny of the Press," "The Press, Servant or Master," "The Prevailing Minimum Wage Standard," as well as pamphlets.

He is a member of the National Historical Society, was a fellow of the Royal-British-Economic Society, is listed in the Dictionary of International Biography, and in World Who's Who in Commerce and Industry.

He says his interest in the impeachment issue is that of a citizen and not as a spokesman for any group.

I insert Mr. Strackbein's paper, "Impeachment in Haste: Repent at Leisure," as a portion of my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD:

IMPEACH IN HASTE: REPENT AT LEISURE
(By O. R. Strackbein)

"The accusations which are brought against a public man in his own age are rarely those echoed in after times. Posterity sees less or sees more . . . Time changes much."—Walter Bagehot (1826-77), British economist, essayist and journalist.

Commenting on the hanging of the assassin (Bellingham) who terminated the life of the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Perceval, the same Mr. Bagehot said of the high tension that demanded the hanging, which was carried out:

"In that day there was no more doubt that he ought to be hanged, than there would now be (fifty years later) that he ought on no account to be hanged."

These two quotations from Mr. Bagehot who was noted for his highly perceptive and trenchant observations on British statesmen and British politics mid-19th Century, should warn us of the pitfalls of hasty and ill-considered actions in a field of such gravity as Presidential impeachment.

Much of our Constitutional heritage is British. The history of England therefore has cogent relevance to our own political behavior.

In the days of Queen Anne who reigned from 1702-14 the outstanding Briton was the Duke of Marlborough (John Churchill) a direct progenitor of Winston Churchill. He gained great fame in the continental war when he defeated the French at Blenheim (Germany). As commander-in-chief of the forces of the Grand Alliance, who battled Louis XIV of France, he was a great favorite of England and her Queen Anne. The wife of Marlborough, Sarah Churchill, an intimate of the Queen, however, later came under the Queen's disfavor and was dismissed. Marlborough's enemies pressed their advantage.

Writing in 1932, over 200 years later, Sir John Fortescue, LL.D., D. Litt., in his biography of Marlborough, noted the war had dragged on several years after Marlborough's great victory at Blenheim. The government had fallen and one adverse to the Duke came in.

"Nothing was too base to be insinuated against the Duke", wrote Sir John (Fortescue):

"Marlborough, they said, was prolonging the war for his own ends; he could make peace but he would not; he delighted in bloodshed; and as a climax, he had neither courage nor military talent".

The House of Commons ordered an inquiry into abuses of public expenditure. The "Duke was charged with fraud, extortion and embezzlement".

"The pretext for this accusation was that he had received the commission . . . upon the contract, already mentioned, from the bread contractors, for the expense of obtaining intelligence; the sum total amounting in all to over £63,000 (Some \$300,000). Marlborough proved conclusively that this perquisite was regularly allowed to the Commander-in-Chief in Flanders, for that particular purpose . . . This defence was absolutely sound; but no defence would have been accepted by the faction that then ruled England, and on the 31st of December he was dismissed from all public employment".

The commons voted that the perquisites were "unwarrantable and illegal, and directed that Marlborough should be prosecuted by the Attorney-General". The Ministry then replaced Marlborough as Commander-in-Chief. The Duke, according to the account, left England, "a self-banished man, and repaired as a disgraced Englishman to the low countries".

Within two years the politics of England changed. Queen Anne died, and the House of Hanover succeeded to the kingship (1715).

Marlborough returned and "was enthusiastically received both when he landed and when he reached London". He was reinstated as Commander-in-Chief, but the Peace of Utrecht had been signed in 1713 and the war was over.

The Duke died in 1722 and "was buried with gorgeous ceremonial in Westminster Abbey".

This account of Marlborough's disgrace and relief of command offers an example of Bagehot's observation that "the accusations which are brought against a public man in his own age are rarely those echoed in after times".

Even Bagehot himself fell victim to the defamation of Abraham Lincoln. The circumstance was a quotation by Bagehot of remarks made by Sir George Lewis who was successively Chancellor of the Exchequer, Home Secretary and Secretary of War in the British Cabinet at the time of our Civil War. He referred to our President as "that village lawyer" and asked what he contemplated as the fruit of victory. He (Sir George Lewis) added:

"It seems to me that the men now in power at Washington are much such persons as in this country get possession of a disreputable joint-stock company. There is almost the same amount of ability and honesty."

Bagehot endorsed this observation in his *Biographical Studies*. He said about Sir George Lewis' observation quoted above: "After almost three years of experience it would be difficult to describe Washington more justly."

It may be reflected that Bagehot made this remark in violation of his own historical principle. He spoke too soon. Today, we may be sure, Bagehot would on no account regard Abraham Lincoln as a mere village lawyer although he (Lincoln) may have been surrounded by persons of a kind that would "get possession of a disreputable joint stock company."

The forgoing scant review should produce in us a sobering reflection that the accusations that are today brought against our public men will not all be echoed "in after time". The reason is not shrouded in mystery. In the stress and strain of partisan controversy, in which those of one political party, the one in power, seek to expose as miscreants, evil-doers and rascals highly-placed officials of the other party, public passions are fanned by the most effective means at hand—which means the press and other media—while the members of the minority are left in a position of defensiveness. They are embarrassed by the need to defend what they cannot hope to defend without damaging their own standing. An attorney may do so but not a politician. He will seem to be

defending the indefensible. There is an inherent disadvantage in defending colleagues (for certainly the opposition will not do it for them) against a charge, even if it be ill-founded, because those to whom it falls to perform the defense, shrink, as politicians, from appearing to the public as coming out on the side of sin and corruption. Their principal inducement is party loyalty.

Fateful decisions reached by the majority in such a surcharged atmosphere inevitably carry a high probability of bias; but this may not be recognized at the time. The mind may be inundated by emotion. Years later, when the emotions have subsided, it may be found that emotions generated by partisanship and clash of philosophy, propelled the majority to an unfortunate decision.

The Duke of Marlborough was lucky. A change in the government and therefore a change in partisan composition, resulting from a reversal in party fortunes, lifted his disgrace in his own lifetime. Others are not always so kindly treated by fortune.

UNFAIR WAGE CONTROLS

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unfair pieces of legislation ever formulated is presently being considered. This legislation on wage controls would be most damaging to the vital field of health care and dedicated, often underpaid, workers in our hospitals and other medical institutions.

In substance, the Congress is considering the extension of wage controls on a single industry, that of health care, while all such controls are being removed from other industries.

If such injudicious action is taken, Mr. Speaker, it is not only injurious to the people employed in the health industry, but will rapidly result in a diminution of medical care and services to the American public—the health care consumers.

My concern on this subject was greatly increased this morning upon receipt of a substantive analysis of the subject from Mr. Edward Ford, chairman, district 1199C, Political Action Committee of the National Union of Hospital and Nursing Home Employees of Philadelphia.

I submit this statement for the RECORD today in order that my colleagues may be fully aware of this economic bludgeoning of the dedicated and frequently ill-treated health care workers. We, Mr. Speaker, have more than enough of so-called shortages. Such arbitrary treatment of this particular industry could develop into another drastic crisis, in the field of health care, which would certainly be more deleterious to the ordinary American than our mismanaged energy crisis. In the latter case, people suffered from some lack of heat or fuel for transportation.

This is very minor compared to the possible lack of plasma to fuel a person's body in case of a critical blood transfusion.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ford's statement follows:

The Senate Banking Committee has been urged to extend controls for the health industries and end them for all other industries. Such action has no logical basis. Singling out the health industry for mandatory controls is unjust and places a major burden on those least able to afford it—workers in hospitals and related institutions. These same workers are forced to continually pay higher prices for the things they buy with wages that are being held down by controls.

In addition, it has been found that mandatory controls were ineffective in controlling the prices in the economy. In the past year, prices have skyrocketed approximately 9%. The only success of the Economic Stabilization Act has been to keep down wages. Furthermore, it is unwise to believe that imposing controls on a small segment of the economy such as the health industry will have any appreciable effect on inflation. The fact is that those responsible for controlling inflation do not know how. We do know that no control program can operate if every sector of the economy, except one, is free of constraints.

There can be no effective means of controlling medical and hospital costs. Fees may be controlled to some extent, but costs consist of totality of fees. Anyone who believes that price limitations on medical services and hospital fees really hold down costs is practicing self-deception. On the surface it would appear that costs are being held in check. The truth is that faced with such constraints, hospitals and physicians will reduce the services they provide with the result that there will be a deterioration of the type of medical care and services. Thus, the American public—the health care consumers—will be paying for what they get: inferior medical care.

Furthermore, the proposed controls on the health industry will not control the prices of items which the industry purchases. When hospitals must buy food, linen, medical equipment, drugs and a myriad of other items at inflated prices health care costs will necessarily be driven upward.

The Administration has estimated that the present control program has cost the government (or more properly the American taxpayer) \$200 million in administration expenses. Private sources estimate that the cost of industry and labor in complying with the regulations has been \$721 million to \$2 billion. Considering the results it is highly questionable whether the enormous cost has been warranted.

Wage rates have been getting a large share of the blame for rising hospital costs in recent years because payrolls constitute about 60% of total costs. But it is time to deflate the myth that increases for low wage hospital workers have been the main cause of the rise in hospital costs.

Despite the increases our members have won, the average wages of hospital employees are still relatively low. Hospitals were exempt from minimum wage legislation until 1967, and took advantage of the exemption to pay wages well below the minimum. Even now, many hospitals pay large sections of their employees the minimum of \$1.60 per hour.

The truth is that most hospital employees work at full time jobs at part time pay. For example, the last census reports average wages per year for service workers in hospitals as follows:

Male Food Service Worker.....	\$4, 000
Female Food Service Worker.....	3, 000
Male Cleaning Worker.....	4, 300
Female Cleaning Worker.....	3, 200

The plain fact is that thousands of hospital workers are compelled to seek supplementary assistance from welfare agencies.

It should be noted that in urban areas most hospital workers belong to minority groups. 80% of the employees in the industry are females.

We are well aware that the current regulations permit the payment of a wage rate of up to \$3.50 per hour without approval. However, the \$3.50 wage rate is not compulsory. Most hospital workers are unaware of the \$3.50 per hour low wage exception. As a result employers are still claiming that they are still limited by the 5.5% guideline.

The Cost of Living Council has recently permitted hospitals to raise its fees. Hospitals also have the ability to increase revenues by increasing the use of ancillary services such as laboratories, x-rays, etc. The only source of income for low-paid hospital workers is the salary which they receive from their employers. To keep their salaries under control when salaries of no other group of employees are controlled and the prices of goods which they buy are uncontrolled is to ask these hospital workers to make a sacrifice which no other group of employees in the United States is being asked to make.

REGIONAL RAIL REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1973

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall that last year we passed the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, which directed the Secretary of Transportation to compile a report analyzing the status of our rail system. Although recommendations have now been made, I feel their implementation would have a devastating effect, and to illustrate this opinion, I recently offered the following testimony. It should be noted that over 200 interested individuals testified at this ICC hearing in Avoca, Pa., the week of March 4 and their combined testimony has, in my judgment, demonstrated the severe impact these recommendations would have on our northeast region.

My testimony follows:

TESTIMONY SUBMITTED BY HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

My appearance before you today is prompted by a deep concern with regard to the Secretary of Transportation's Rail Service Report, compiled as the result of passage of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973. During the course of this week, you will receive detailed testimony from community leaders, rail freight users and other interested parties, so that I shall endeavor to confine my comments to some general observations concerning the very serious implications this report and its recommendations has for our area of Pennsylvania.

We would agree the need for adequate rail service, particularly freight service, has been brought to the forefront by the recent energy shortage. I can appreciate the complexity of strengthening and reorganizing our rail service as mandated by the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, particularly when every decision to abandon or curtail service strikes at the present and future economic life of scores of communities. I support efforts to eliminate potentially excess lines and I do not oppose abandonment where lines are parallel if this can achieve greater efficiency. However, in my opinion,

the Department of Transportation's choice of lines is indiscriminate and illogical, with little consideration given to the special character of the movement of goods and products in our area.

For businesses located along spur lines, elimination of lines in question would seriously disrupt business and in other cases, the manufacturers may need to contemplate relocation because of the nature of the product to be transported. In this context, the case of Kennedy Van Saun Corporation in Danville comes to mind, since railroads are a matter of survival because of the size and nature of the shipments which are received and dispatched. Curtailment of rail service in this instance could jeopardize the future employment of 300 persons.

Heavy Penn-Central curtailments affect service from Elmira to Williamsport; Wilkes-Barre to Sunbury; Lewisburg to Mifflinburg and coal areas solely dependent upon rail transportation. This is of very great concern to me as it will have very grave consequences for our Pennsylvania anthracite coal mines. I understand representatives of the coal industry will be testifying before you at a later time, and I know their presentations will serve to demonstrate in greater detail the seriousness of their situation.

One of the greatest inconsistencies which has come to my attention involves the future of our industrial parks. As we are all aware, a substantial amount of federal financial assistance has recently been made available to our area of Pennsylvania, particularly following the devastation of Agnes, to encourage economic development. Such assistance has come through programs administered by the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Economic Development Administration. Existing rail lines in the 22 county region of Northeast Pennsylvania serve 58 industrial parks and sites composed of over 14,000 acres with 258 firms now in these sites. Available for future expansion are 8,800 acres, to house plants which could generate 45,000 future jobs. Under DOT recommendations, many industrial parks and heavy shippers are located along much of the trackage marked for cancellation and this proposed abandonment would appear to be in direct conflict with the investment strategy initiated with federal financial assistance. Certainly it is not the intention of one Federal agency to negate the accomplishments of others.

It should also be pointed out that the DOT report threatens a total of 1,450 miles of track in Pennsylvania or 18% of the State's total rail mileage. 445 miles of this (31%) is in the 22 county region. Based on such a total abandonment in the State, estimates are that 142,000 carloads would have to be transported on our highways per year. Very serious consideration should be given to the resulting highway deterioration and excessive drain on fuels and other environmental aspects. In my judgment, the present interstate and regional highways, many miles of which need maintenance and repair at the present time, cannot stand such an increased traffic load.

In summary, I believe there must be a much greater effort to determine the effects these decisions will have on the communities involved, particularly the economic consequences. A firm understanding of the special and unique character of the sub-regions within the various zones is essential to any rational undertaking of this magnitude.

I strongly urge that the Railroad Task Force for the Northeast Region commence with a detailed study of this entire problem before any further action is taken to implement the Transportation Secretary's report. They are in a far better position to evaluate the rail needs of our area and I believe this is the only way in which our mutual objectives can be accomplished.

SOCIAL SECURITY COST-OF-LIVING DIFFERENTIALS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, because the average social security payment for a retired American is about \$100 a year below what is needed for basic subsistence in New York and several other major cities, I am today introducing legislation that would provide special cost-of-living increases for older Americans in areas where living expenses exceed the national average.

My bill also would guarantee the elderly a realistic minimum annual income above the current level of enforced poverty. Current law already mandates annual cost-of-living increases for all, regardless of where they live, but it fails to take into account the differences between living costs in major metropolitan areas and smaller communities.

As inflation continues to erode the purchasing power of Americans living on fixed incomes, and rising unemployment reduces job opportunities for older workers, the need to take immediate action to increase the income of our Nation's elderly becomes urgent.

The erosion of the purchasing power of fixed incomes is a relative problem. For \$1,788.64 a year an elderly person living in a nonmetropolitan area of the South can have all the goods and services and enjoy the same standard of living that would cost him \$1,867.88 in Baton Rouge, \$2,195.48 in New York City, and \$2,296.28 in San Francisco. These are the figures set by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the minimum level of subsistence for an elderly individual living in those places.

Yet, regardless of where he lives and what it costs to live there, his social security check is the same—\$2,097.60 a year, for the average retired worker. Many, of course, receive much less.

For the person living in the lowest cost areas, this means social security benefits cover the costs of his minimum needs, with perhaps a few hundred dollars a year left over. But, for a New Yorker, there is no excess. Rather, the social security payment falls short of covering the cost of his basic needs by about \$100. In effect, this means the elderly person is being penalized about \$400 a year, because he lives in New York instead of the nonmetropolitan South.

Mr. Speaker, the 1971 White House Conference on Aging in its final report stated:

The immediate goal for older people is that they should have total cash income in accordance with the "American standard of living."

The cost of living in Baton Rouge or Orlando is not the same as it is in New York or San Francisco. Any federally funded assistance program must reflect these differences.

Since the current level of social security cash benefits does not cover the minimum cost of living in most of our

large urban centers, it is falling woefully short of the "American standard."

To assure that all older Americans are able to enjoy a decent standard of living and to correct the regional inadequacy in social security benefits, I am today introducing legislation to establish assured minimum annual income benefits for the aged.

My bill would:

First. Establish a minimum standard of income for elderly Americans of \$3,850 a year for an individual and \$5,200 for a couple.

Second. Adjust this sum annually to reflect changes in the intermediate budget level cost of living as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Third. Increase benefits for those living in large metropolitan areas where the cost of living exceeds the national average.

This legislation would be financed by a combination of payments from the social security system and appropriations from general tax revenues.

No group of Americans has been hit so hard by the soaring cost of living as those who live on social security. That is because inflation always strikes worst at persons on small, fixed incomes, and nearly three out of every four Americans over the age of 65 have annual incomes below \$3,000, including 2.5 million persons with no income at all.

The elderly have been forced into a precarious position which has become intolerable. Food prices last year rose a record 19.1 percent and wholesale prices hit their highest level in history. The prospect for any relief is bleak.

There is nothing inflationary about giving the elderly a decent standard of living.

Recent increases in social security benefits have fallen short of their intended goal of offsetting inflation. The effect has been that the buying power of elderly Americans has actually been decreasing. This is more true in metropolitan areas than elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of my colleagues would be reluctant to vote for a measure which would appear, on the surface, to give their constituents slightly less money than it would to social security recipients in certain other areas. However, I am confident that after close study of my proposal, they will see the justice in this measure. While the dollar total of benefits may differ from area to area, my bill would equalize the real dollar buying power of social security recipients throughout the Nation, regardless of where they live.

It is important to note that the lower level budget was at least in part developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to provide a benchmark suitable for use in appraising welfare standards. Close examination of the lower level budget in the categories of food, housing, transportation, clothing, personal care, and other consumption reveals a severe limitation on the freedom elderly citizens have in making choices. Nowhere within this lower level budget is there room for individual living standards and spending habits. The Bureau of Labor Statistics acknowledges that its lower budget

for a retired couple "has few, if any, frills."

The low-cost plan provides large quantities of cheap foods that provide high nutritional returns relative to cost—potatoes, dry beans, peas, flour, and cereal—and smaller quantities of meat, poultry, fish, fruits, and vegetables other than potatoes. Menus based in this plan include foods requiring a considerable amount of home preparation. A large degree of home preparation is not feasible because of the physical strain this places on the elderly. Further, the budget allows only about one dinner out per month for the couple.

In the lower budget, 60 percent of the couples are assumed to own their homes and 40 percent to rent. In metropolitan areas, this is not applicable. In large cities there is a much higher percent of renters. A Bureau of Labor Statistics study shows that the lower level budget allowance for rent is so low as to prevent the elderly from living in any but the very cheapest apartments, and the sufficiency of supply is questionable. This then puts further strain on their budgets.

According to the BLS:

Transportation costs in the lower budget were based on the assumption that all couples in Boston, Chicago, New York, and Philadelphia used public transportation exclusively because of the availability of mass transit in these areas:

However, in these and other cities the use of mass transit exclusively is simply not realistic. Often elderly persons are unable to take the stress of crowded trains or buses in which standing is the only available option. Also, the safety of public transportation at all hours is questionable. Most of us here would try to avoid taking subways or buses through various sections of our cities late in the night. Why should we require America's elderly to do it?

Clothing costs are based on replacement rates only, because it is assumed that retired couples are likely to have a stock of basic clothing items. The lower budget limits replacement to "lower quality items at lower average prices." Often replacement of a lower quality item is not realistic. The need for increasingly higher quality shoes for support, for example, becomes more important as people grow older. Here, again, individual needs simply are not being met adequately by the lower budget.

For each of the major categories of food, housing, transportation, and clothing, detailed explanations of the purchasing power available with the lower budget prove not only unrealistic, but demeaning for this Nation's elderly. Limiting food intake to a high potato diet, forcing them to occupy the cheapest sanitary housing available, demanding that they subject themselves to the crowded transit lines we turn away from, and commanding that they replace worn garments with the lowest and cheapest quality clothing available is degrading for them, and shameful of us that we will provide them nothing better. Most of these people have worked almost their entire lives. They deserve much more than they are getting.

This is why it is so vitally necessary

that we increase social security benefits to an intermediate budget level of \$3,850 for elderly individuals and \$5,200 for elderly couples. The final report of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging recognizes this:

We, therefore, recommend the adoption now, as the intermediate standard of income adequacy, of the intermediate budget for an elderly couple prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The conference recognized the need for the adoption of such a proposal in 1971. Because of mounting inflation and increasingly limited job opportunities over the past 3 years, this need has intensified, and it will continue to do so in the years ahead. The longer we delay in adopting a social security program that provides the adequate standard of living reflected in the intermediate budget, the longer we delay in providing the decent and respectable income our elderly deserve. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the passage of the bill I propose today.

Joining me in introducing this legislation today are 26 of our colleagues: BELLA ABZUG, JOSEPH ADDABBO, HERMAN BADILLO, JONATHAN BINGHAM, YVONNE BURKE, HUGH CAREY, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, CARISS COLLINS, JOHN CONYERS, ROBERT DRINAN, DON EDWARDS, JOSHUA EILBERG, HAMILTON FISH, LOUIS FREY, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, HENRY HELSTOSKI, ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN, JIM HOWARD, EDWARD KOCH, RALPH METCALFE, CLAUDE PEPPER, BERTRAM PODELL, CHARLES RANGEL, EDWARD ROYBAL, BOB TIERNAN, and GUS YATRON.

NIXON, LINCOLN, WASHINGTON,
AND YOU

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NIXON, LINCOLN, WASHINGTON, AND YOU
(By W. Clement Stone)

On a vacation I customarily engage in periods of study, thinking and planning time. To stimulate my thoughts in a positive direction, I endeavor to read material that could inspire and motivate me to learn and employ principles that might be applicable to me as well as to those whom I would like to influence.

Abraham Lincoln, Theologian of American Anguish authored by Elton Trueblood and James Keogh's President Nixon and the Press were brought to Acapulco, Mexico by me when Mrs. Stone and I left for a Thanksgiving vacation. (I enthusiastically recommend both books to you.)

These books were particularly desirable because I knew it would be imperative to meet a deadline for this editorial the day after my return to Chicago. As February is the birth month of Presidents George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, I like to refer to one or both in my February editorials each year. And because Washington, Lincoln and Nixon have been achievers and are so similar in so many ways and . . . each experienced great personal anguish from a negative press even in the hours of their greatest achievements as presidents, ideas occurred to me which I

shall share with you and you may wish to share with others. And something more . . .

Success unlimited is dedicated to making this world a better world in which to live for this and future generations through its readers. We therefore endeavor to motivate you to motivate yourself to desirable action by using effective techniques such as recognizing, relating, assimilating and using principles that are applicable to you. You can find them in practically every article in SUCCESS unlimited.

Abraham Lincoln developed the habit of trying to learn from the books he read, the people he met and casual events. These gave him ideas for reflection. And thus he was able to relate, assimilate and use them as his own.

THE POWER OF SUGGESTION

In a conversation with Ralph Newman, one of America's great authorities on Lincoln and owner of the Abraham Lincoln Book Shop in Chicago, he reminded me that in Lincoln's first political speech which was at Sangamon, Illinois, March 9, 1832, he said:

Every man is said to have his peculiar ambition. Whether it be true or not, I can say for one that I have no other so great as that of being truly esteemed of my fellowmen by rendering myself worthy of their esteem.

At an early age, I had learned to recognize principles and formulas and how to adopt or apply them to my own use. Thus when at the age of 12 my mother made a gift of a framed rephrased statement of the above quotation, I adopted it as a prayer that I made daily since then as follows:

Please God help me to be truly and highly esteemed by all my fellowmen. And help me to render myself worthy of that esteem.

The rephrased statement became a form of suggestion. I adopted it in the form of self-suggestion and something more . . . I employ it by using man's greatest power . . . the power of prayer. President Lincoln gained strength and wisdom by using this same power. A statement of his as related by Noah Brooks, a journalist, in Harper's Magazine in July, 1865, quoted Lincoln as follows:

I have been driven many times upon my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seemed insufficient for that day.

"Truth will be truth regardless of any person's ignorance, disbelief or closed mind" is a principle that I have expounded in many of my writings, speeches and counseling interviews where I have endeavored to motivate an individual or audiences to motivate themselves to use man's greatest power daily to develop good physical, mental and moral health as well as to achieve any worthwhile objective that does not violate the laws of God or the rights of one's fellowmen.

In Abraham Lincoln, Theologian of American Anguish, Elton Trueblood wrote: "Thus, in the emotional parting at the Springfield Railroad Station on February 11, 1861, Lincoln rose at least temporarily to a great height.

I now leave, he said, not knowing when, or whether ever, I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being, who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. Trusting in Him, who can go with me, and remain with you and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

THE MEDIA

Because it is important that we don't forget, I am repeating a few paragraphs from my editorial in SUCCESS unlimited of November, 1973, titled Thanksgiving . . . Watergate:

"Publishers and editors of the American press have achieved outstanding service to the nation notwithstanding the following:

THE PRESS

"The President was angry. He complained bitterly that the press was printing lies about his administration and attempting to ruin almost everything that it was trying to do. These attacks by journalists, he said, were 'outrages on common decency.' Members of the Cabinet felt that the press literally was making the President ill. He told his associates that if disregard for 'truth and fairness' and 'willful and malignant misrepresentation' continued, it might become nearly impossible to govern the country. And he brooded about finding some way to give the people 'A clear and comprehensive view of the facts.'

"Was that President Nixon? No, it was George Washington, whose experience with the press offers evidence of how much the relationship between the news media and the President remained the same since it began."

"The preceding is a quote from the book President Nixon and the Press by James Keogh."

IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY

If you were living in the days of George Washington's presidency or that of Abraham Lincoln's, do you believe that in that environment and in those troubled times you would have had a different feeling regarding George Washington or Abraham Lincoln than you have today. Don't forget that the press and the political opponents of each of these presidents were as antagonistic against them as many reporters, writers and commentators are today towards President Nixon. Yet with the passage of time and the evaluation of the achievements during their administrations and the subsequent benefits to the nation because of their leaderships, they are classified as two of our greatest presidents. And with the passage of time, it's possible and even probable that Richard Nixon will be classified among the three of our greatest presidents by virtue of his leadership and the achievements during his administration, regardless of the present attitudes of the media or his political opponents.

Every president has had political opposition . . . an antagonistic press and . . . the negative feelings towards them by those whose personal interests were affected unfavorably when decisions were made for the benefit of all the people. But no president has been faced with the number of serious problems that Mr. Nixon has encountered on entering office and during the term of his presidency. And it's possible that no president could have met all of these problems so successfully.

AN OUTSTANDING ACHIEVER

His achievements will be recorded in history as outstandingly beneficial to the nation and to the world . . . such achievements as: peace on the campuses and in our inner cities . . . neutralizing the war in the Middle East . . . returning over 500,000 American troops and withdrawing from Vietnam with honor . . . helping free nations defend themselves against aggressors without sacrificing American lives . . . neutralizing a catastrophic inflationary trend . . . a transition from a war to a peacetime economy . . . establishing détente with the Chinese and Russians and thus opening the channels of commerce in the future to millions of consumers for American products and services . . . establishing a foundation for a generation of peace and something more . . . advancing programs that can bring health and prosperity to the multitudes by adhering to the basic American philosophy and principles we inherited such as individual initiative and self-help rather than enslavement to the federal government through financial support.

Is he perfect? No. Neither was Washington or Lincoln or are you or I. The essence of perfection is never reached but in striving for perfection, one becomes more perfect and proficient. Mr. Nixon is trying and succeeding in meeting each problem intelligently. And like Abraham Lincoln and George Washington, he has a strong religious faith and employs man's greatest power . . . the power of prayer for guidance.

NIXON, LINCOLN, WASHINGTON, AND YOU

Let's think clearly. Let's look back to the days of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln and try to decide what our feeling would have been and what action or what decisions we would have made in view of the conditions and the antagonistic attacks on the president if we lived at that time. And then let's recognize the achievements of President Nixon. Let's evaluate this man on how he meets each problem and brings about a solution. Let's be realistic and try to determine how in years to come, history will record his worth to the nation as it has those presidents that preceded him. And as citizens, let's you and me remember that he is endeavoring to do what he can for our nation and anything we can do to help him achieve his worthwhile objectives makes us a part of a great man's work and thus an important part of American history.

ELGIN HONORS CHESTER
ALEXANDER

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a time comes in the life of a community when special appreciation is expressed for one of its distinguished and beloved citizens. Such an occasion will occur on Thursday, May 2, when the city of Elgin, Ill., honors the long-time principal of Elgin High School, Chester Alexander.

Mr. Speaker, Chester Alexander began his career in education some 36 years ago, more than 30 years ago he signed on as a teacher at the Elgin High School. Later, he served as principal of Larsen Junior High School until his selection as principal of Elgin High School in 1956. Mr. Speaker, Chester Alexander has been more than an educator and school administrator in the Elgin community. He has likewise devoted a full measure of his time and talent to community service. Included among his interests have been the YMCA where he served as a board member, and the Lions Club of Elgin which he headed as president in 1967-68, and from which he received the Monarch award in 1972.

Mr. Speaker, both Chester Alexander and his wife, Marcella, are active church members in the First Christian Church of Elgin, together with their children. Mr. and Mrs. Alexander and their children are beloved and respected throughout the community, and Chester Alexander's retirement will hopefully not result in the loss of his active involvement in community and civic affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know Chester Alexander during recent years, and together with family and friends, I expect to join in honoring him at the Blue Moon Restaurant in Elgin,

Thursday evening, May 2, when a community appreciation dinner will be held in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident my colleagues in this Chamber will be interested in this record of citizen and community service—which are vital activities to a successful Nation. I am proud to pay this tribute to my friend and fellow American, Chester Alexander.

PIMS: THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY MONITORING SYSTEM OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY OFFICE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Energy Office has been publishing a monthly series of reports on oil supplies and prices that the agency has prepared since last October. The reports, part of the FEO's Petroleum Industry Monitoring System—PIMS—contain information about prices and supplies at various stages in the oil production and marketing process. These reports incorporate data provided by trade associations, Government agencies, and private oil firms.

Federal Energy Office Administrator William Simon has continually stressed the need for a comprehensive, accurate energy information system. At a Senate hearing in February, Mr. Simon acknowledged that both the Government and public are entitled to much more information about the petroleum industry than is currently available. But now that FEO has begun to develop an oil information system, Mr. Simon appears not to be telling anyone about it.

The PIMS reports have not been made generally available to Members of Congress and congressional committees concerned with energy policy. In view of intense public concern about petroleum prices and supplies, it seems surprising that this has been the case.

I have written to Mr. Simon asking for an explanation of the function and purpose of the PIMS reports, details of the collection, compilation, and analysis of the data contained in them, and the extent to which these reports have been used in the decisionmaking process.

I include in the RECORD at this point the text of my letter to Mr. Simon:

APRIL 5, 1974.

HON. WILLIAM E. SIMON,
Administrator, Federal Energy Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMON: On Tuesday, April 2, we received upon request from the Public Affairs Office of the Federal Energy Office copies of ten issues of the Petroleum Industry Monitoring System (PIMS) Reports and supplements.

Publication of the PIMS Reports by the Federal Energy Office, as you know, began in October, 1973. Yet, until this week, to the best of my knowledge, none of the major Congressional committees concerned with oil supplies and prices had seen these reports. The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee received a copy of the most recent supplement on April 3.

We learned of the PIMS Reports from the General Accounting Office, which at our request has undertaken an inquiry into FEO's petroleum pricing policy. Our initial inquiry for copies from FEO's Offices of Congressional Relations and Public Affairs met with unresponsiveness, not from unwillingness to accede to our request, but from lack of knowledge of the existence of these reports.

In testimony before the Senate Interior Committee on February 5, 1974, you stated:

The public has a right to complete and accurate information on the energy situation. . . . Both the government and the public are entitled to much more information about the petroleum industry than is now available. We intend to see that it is gathered and made available.

In view of intense public concern about petroleum supplies and prices, it seems surprising that these reports were not made available.

We would appreciate it if you would explain why the PIMS Reports have not been made available before this to the Congress and the public. We would like to know their purpose and function, their distribution within the Federal Energy Office and within other agencies of government, as well as details of the collection, compilation and analysis of the data contained in the reports. And we would like to know to what extent the PIMS Reports have been used in the decision-making process.

I am sure you appreciate our concern over the need for the Congress and the public to have access to all available data on national energy resources and prices.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. FRASER.

MEDICAL LEGISLATION NEEDED

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing with my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) legislation to provide for the development of a long-range plan to advance the national attack on arthritis and related musculoskeletal diseases. It has long been my desire to initiate a comprehensive program to coordinate and expand our efforts in conquering arthritis, and I believe that the Arthritis Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1974 will mean a significant step forward in this important area.

Affecting more than 20 million Americans of all ages and costing approximately \$2.5 billion a year in medical expenses, arthritis and related musculoskeletal diseases constitute one of our Nation's major health problems. Given the overwhelming impact of arthritis on our economy and the lives of so many Americans, we must move to expand our programs for research, prevention, treatment, care, and rehabilitation.

Through the development of a long-range plan and by strengthening arthritis centers around the country, we can make significant advances in this area. We cannot expect all the answers concerning this crippling disease to be forthcoming overnight, but we can begin now to find those answers in a more coord-

minated fashion. I believe that the Arthritis Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1974 will be one of the tremendously important measures to be considered in the coming months.

IMPEACHMENT

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of the Members were surprised as I was to read statements in the press attributed to certain colleagues in the House and Senate—all highly respected—conveying the impression that there are already enough votes in the House of Representatives to impeach the President.

We recognize, of course, that there are occasions when the comments of persons in public life can be misconstrued or even misquoted. Perhaps this is one of those instances. I personally find it hard to believe that anyone in the Congress has sufficient facts on which to make such a judgment at this time, let alone express a consensus of the House.

On February 6, 1974, by a nearly unanimous vote we directed the Committee on the Judiciary "to investigate fully and completely whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional power to impeach the President." Furthermore, the committee was "to report—such resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations as it deems proper."

In taking this action the House very properly deferred judgment on this question, and for a very good reason. We simply did not have the facts which would make a fair and just appraisal possible. We have not even agreed as to what constitutes an impeachable offense. Clearly a thorough and lengthy investigation was required, and we assigned this task to the Judiciary Committee. The committee has not reported its findings. I do not know—and I doubt the members of the committee know at this point, not having as yet heard one word of evidence from the staff—whether they will recommend articles of impeachment, a resolution of nonimpeachment, or some other action. The evidence is still being weighed.

The Constitution vests in the House of Representatives the sole power of impeachment. It is an awesome power, particularly when it is directed at a President, and not to be taken lightly. Our responsibility is in a sense that of a grand jury. In our system of justice, however, a juror who decided the case before the evidence was formally presented would be disqualified and dismissed. In our system of justice, too, a citizen—even a President—must be presumed innocent until evidence proves him otherwise.

I have been the Republican Whip for the past 30 years and have had much

experience in assessing the mood of the House. I believe the great majority of our Members, on both sides of the aisle, understand the gravity of a vote on impeachment if it should come before the House. I am certain the great majority of our Members will want to reserve judgment until the evidence, whatever it may be, is presented and the report of the Judiciary Committee is available.

Throughout my tenure here I have been called upon to cast many votes on many questions vital to our Nation. A vote on impeachment would rank as one of the most important votes of my 40 years in the Congress. We should realize that this is not a routine legislative question. How we in the Congress discharge our responsibility under the Constitution will not only reflect on our personal integrity as individuals in the eyes of our constituents but the credibility of the Congress as well.

In conclusion, this is no time for loose talk and public speculation on such an important question.

L. B. J. TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR PAPERS MAY HAVE BEEN \$30 MILLION

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of controversy over the deduction that President Nixon received for his Vice Presidential papers. Unfortunately, it has been treated by the press as rather a unique thing, when in reality it was not. Vice President HUMPHREY received a considerable amount for his Vice Presidential papers. Former President Lyndon Baines Johnson may have received a deduction of \$30 million, it was recently stated. The story from the Detroit News of March 3, 1974, relative to former President Johnson follows:

L. B. J.'s TAX CUTS FOR PAPERS HIT \$30 MILLION, AUTHOR SAYS

WASHINGTON.—A historian and author said Saturday there were indications President Lyndon B. Johnson may have taken up to \$30 million in tax deductions for "gifts" of his papers.

M. B. Schnapper, editor of Public Affairs Press, said in a letter to a congressional committee investigating President Nixon's tax deductions that "circumstantial evidence and confidential information" led to his conclusion.

Schnapper, who said he had been studying the gifts of presidential papers to the National Archives and private libraries since those of Harry S. Truman, sent his letter to Rep. Wilbur D. Mills, D-Ark., vice-chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. Nixon has asked the committee to determine the legality of the \$576,000 tax deduction he took for donating papers.

In his letter, Schnapper said: "According to circumstantial evidence and confidential information that has come to my attention, President Johnson's tax deductions on 'gifts' of predominantly official documents to the Lyndon B. Johnson Library in 1965, 1966, 1967

and 1968 probably amounted to at least \$10 million and possibly \$29 million."

Schnapper, who said he had seen all the deeds of gifts of presidential papers, said Johnson informed the General Services Administration on Dec. 19, 1968, that he "anticipated" his "charitable gifts" of documents would "total in excess of 30 million different pages."

The Johnson papers were evaluated by Ralph Newman, a Chicago specialist in the field who did the same chore for Mr. Nixon.

TRIBUTE TO HELEN KAWAGOE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American, Helen Kawagoe. As the city clerk of Carson, she will be honored at a dinner dance on April 19. It is fitting that we, too, should pay tribute to this dynamic civic leader.

A well known figure in the Carson area for nearly 20 years, Mrs. Kawagoe was twice chapter president of the Gardena Valley Japanese American Citizens League. With her help, the membership of that organization has grown from 200 to more than 1,000. Her position in the JACL has advanced as the membership has grown—she was the district governor from 1971 to 1973.

To top off her outstanding record of service with the JACL, she was named "JACL'er of the biennium" at the JACL national convention in Washington, D.C., for outstanding contributions and leadership.

Mrs. Kawagoe has a vast record of civic experience. She is currently the third vice president of the Carson Chamber of Commerce, and a member of the United Way Advisory Council. She is also a Nisei Week Festival Board Member, and the by-laws chairman of the Carson Sister City Committee.

Most recently, Mrs. Kawagoe was elected city clerk of Carson. Her experience with executive duties combined with her knowledge of public relations are sure to make her as successful in this position as she has been in the past.

Mrs. Kawagoe is self educated and here again, her efforts have been a success. She is trilingual, being fluent in English, Japanese, and Spanish. Her strong interest in reading keeps her up with events of importance to the community.

Women's liberation is not new to Helen Kawagoe. She has held many positions in which she has been the first woman on the job. Most noteworthy of these was her election as District Governor of the JACL.

Always active in affairs to help her fellow man, Mrs. Kawagoe has demonstrated a sincere interest in humanitarian causes and Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute to her today. I know my colleagues here would join me in congratulating Mrs. Kawagoe in this tribute for her lifetime of unselfish public service.

A REASSERTION OF THE ROLE OF THE CONGRESS IN THE MAKING OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY:

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Congress should pass constitutional safeguards on the use of executive agreements and treaties in conducting foreign policy. The making of our Nation's foreign policy has historically been viewed as a joint undertaking of the Executive and the Congress.

THE ROLE OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Executive—the President and his agencies and officers—discharges the responsibilities of administering the laws made by the Congress, a great many of which relate to foreign policy and its conduct.

It participates in conferences and negotiates on behalf of the Government of the United States—the essential and important elements of the conduct of foreign policy which often lead to treaties and similar obligations.

The policies of the Government and the rights of our citizens abroad are represented on foreign soil through the Executive—through our embassies, consulates, and legations.

And, of course, the conduct of our armies and navies—which must stand behind any foreign policy commitment—is at the direction of the Commander in Chief—the President.

THE ROLE OF THE CONGRESS

But, the Congress too has its role in foreign policy, perhaps the principal role. It is the Congress which makes the laws which sustain our foreign policy efforts.

It is the Senate which must give its advice and consent to our treaties and the confirmation of our ambassadors and chief Department of State officers.

It is the Congress which must authorize and appropriate moneys for the Nation's Armed Forces and defense, key elements of our foreign policy and moneys for our foreign assistance programs.

It is the Congress which must declare war or states of national emergency.

It is the Congress which must enact the laws which govern our trade relations with other nations and on the terms of that trade.

It is the Congress which must define and punish acts against the law of nations. In summary, the powers of Congress in the subject of foreign policy are extensive.

TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

The Congress has struggled virtually since its first session in 1789 with the problem of international agreements of less than a treaty status. As the United States expanded its international commitments and as it took on a role of increasing world responsibilities during this century, this problem was intensified.

Today, executive agreements—those international agreements brought into force with respect to the United States without the advice and consent of the Senate—are a commonplace occurrence, an occurrence which robs the Congress—the Senate—of much of its constitutional powers in the area of foreign policy-making.

I have today introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States which, I believe, would go a great distance in rectifying this problem and returning the full force and effect of constitutional powers to the Congress. If this measure becomes an amendment to the Constitution, it will preclude further abrogation of the responsibilities of the Senate.

The proposed amendment would prevent treaties and executive agreements from overriding the freedoms and safeguards found in the Constitution. It would also put constitutional safeguards on the use of executive agreements in conducting foreign policy. And, it would be a highly significant step towards the goals which were sought—and I believe history will show failed—in the enactment of the ill-conceived war powers resolution.

The amendment to the Constitution is necessary because of article VI of that document and two major decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Article VI, clause 2, provides that:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

In less formal language, all treaties which meet the formal procedural requirements for enactment are the supreme law of the land, whereas acts of Congress are supreme only if they are in accord with the substantive provisions of the Constitution. Inasmuch as treaties thus stand above the Constitution, the constitutionality of treaty provisions cannot be tested in the courts. The protection of life, liberty and property found in the Constitution is thereby rendered useless. This is contrary to any view of limited government, a view which I hold strongly.

The Supreme Court has broadly interpreted the treaty-making authority under article VI. It has ruled that powers not originally granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution may be created—actually created—by a treaty. In the famous case, *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416 (1920), the Supreme Court held that Congress could exercise legislative power under a treaty which it could not otherwise exercise under the Constitution. This means that a treaty can empower Congress to pass legislation which, were it not for that treaty, would be constitutionally reserved to the exclusive power of the States.

The Supreme Court has similarly given an equivalent status to Executive agreements. In the *United States v. Pink*,

315 U.S. 203 (1942), the Supreme Court held that an Executive agreement between the President and a foreign nation—specifically President Franklin Roosevelt and the Soviet Union—had the same force and effect as a treaty and, further, that the agreement nullified a New York State law forbidding confiscation of private property. This case has been held to mean that the President can override State law by entering into Executive agreements with other nations without even consulting the Senate, since that consultation is not required for Executive agreements.

This amendment is of particular importance today; it is necessary. It would prevent unnecessary—and improper—delegation of power by the Congress to the President.

To those who feel concerned—as I do—that we can become too involved in the affairs of another nation by the force of—or commitments expressed or implied in—Executive agreements, this measure would preclude that possibility. I think we all agree—those who supported and those who opposed involvement in Vietnam alike—that congressional abdication helped lead to our continued involvement in Vietnam. This measure would resolve that problem much more effectively than the war powers resolution ever would.

The proposed amendment would also establish clearly that treaties and Executive agreements shall not take precedence over the Constitution of the United States.

The full text of the measure which I introduced today follows:

H.J. RES. 2929

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to force and effect of treaties.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress.

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

"SEC. 3. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

"SEC. 4. All executive or other agreements, between the President and any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof shall be made only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law. Such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties, or the making of treaties, by this article.

"SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

Mr. Speaker, considering all the treaties to which the United States is now a party, as well as the trend toward greater use of Executive agreements in conducting foreign policy, it is time that Congress moved to reassert supremacy of the Constitution. The enactment of the proposed amendment provides us an opportunity to reassert that supremacy.

DEFENDING THE RIGHT TO LIFE OF THE UNBORN

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to appear this morning before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and offer testimony on behalf of a pro-life constitutional amendment. I believe the Congress and the country owe a great debt to Senator BAYH and the members of his subcommittee for their willingness to hold these hearings.

Abortion is not a popular subject. Feelings run high on both sides of the issue. It is impossible to satisfy the demands of all of your constituents and still keep your integrity. In fact, many Members wish the whole matter would go away. Well, I can promise you it will not. It will not go away at least until every Member of this House has had the opportunity to vote his conscience.

It would well behoove the House Judiciary Committee and its Civil Rights Subcommittee to follow the fine lead set by the distinguished Senator from Indiana. Instead of ducking the issue, I urge them to hold hearings on this side of the Capitol and give the House the chance to work its will. In the meantime, Members who agree that the Congress, not the Supreme Court, should rule in the legislative arena—regardless of their views on abortion—should sign the Hogan discharge petition to permit floor consideration of the amendment.

So that my colleagues in the House may read my Senate testimony, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

DEFENDING THE RIGHT TO LIFE OF THE UNBORN (By Hon. ANGELO D. RONCALLO)

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee today in support of Senator Helms' Constitutional Amendment to protect the rights of our unborn children. It is identical to the Amendment which was introduced originally in the House by Congressman Hogan and to which I have given my unqualified support. It is the proposal which I feel has generated the most interest in the House and which has the best chance of success in a floor vote. For this reason, I have signed the discharge petition which would bring the matter to the Floor of the House for a vote. The consideration of the language on the

Senate Floor will reduce the controversy and focus the debate squarely on the issue involved.

The Supreme Court decision which over a year ago upheld the legality of abortion has placed us in the untenable position of weighing one life against another, when for two hundred years we have acknowledged that all life is sacred. In jeopardy is not only that right which we in this country have considered one of our most fundamental and cherished rights—the right to life. But also at risk in such a situation is a deadening of our moral sensibilities and responsibilities and an erosion of our respect for life. Respect for life should be nothing less than the most precious of our values; it should not be treated lightly. For when it is decided that one stage of human life is of no real value, when its continued existence is considered an inconvenience to others and may be terminated without scruple, then our reverence for life at any and every other stage is compromised. Our regard for the absolute right of each individual to his own life can only be diminished in such circumstances.

Congressional intervention is imperative, for human lives, hundreds of thousands of human lives are at stake. Let there be no mistake; abortion destroys human life. It has become increasingly common for medical authorities to agree that life begins at the moment of conception. To those who assert that human life begins only at birth we can only reply rhetorically: What then is the entity which develops within the mother's womb if not actually a human being? When a child is born prematurely and survives—as he is likely to do given continuing medical advances—is that being more human than one which was forcibly aborted at the same age?

There exists no rational basis for an assertion that the unborn child is a mere appendage to the mother; for medical science has shown us that genetically mother and child are separate individuals from conception. Nor can the developing child's dependency upon the mother provide reason for regarding it as something less than human life. We are all dependent upon others in various degrees at one point or another in our daily lives. Dependence per se, therefore, cannot be judged a valid criterion for determining the humanity of a developing child.

The Constitutional amendment which I have supported would reestablish the birthright of every unborn child. It would do so simply by applying existing principles of due process of law and the equal protection of the laws to all human beings, including the child in the womb. We cannot subscribe to the Supreme Court's view that the unborn child is not a person or does not possess meaningful life. Our reverence for the sanctity of life must allow no exception; it can be nothing short of absolute. The American constitutional guarantee of the equal protection of the law is rooted in such reverence as well as in the ultimate dignity of the individual and the inviolability of innocent human life. Legalized abortion, on the other hand, presents a disturbing reversal of our law's steady progress toward recognition of the dignity, value, and essential equality of human life. It is, as David Louisell and John Noonan in the *Morality of Abortion* have pointed out:

"A negation of the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the law. It is a loveless act offensive to the conscience of our common law tradition. Attempts to justify it on the ground that the fetus is not fully human want for logic. To pick any moment other than that of conception as the starting point of human life is artificial and arbitrary. All human life, whether fetal, infant, adolescent, mature, or aged, is in the process of becoming. Abortion can be jus-

tified only if society has the right to prescribe the conditions of continuing life and to authorize the weighing of the right to life against other values."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks with an observation by Mr. Noonan, who has penetrated to the core of the matter at issue here today in very simple and eloquent terms:

"Simple coexistence with other humans demands that the lives of some not be open to sacrifice for the welfare and convenience of others. If man can be recognized at all in the multiple forms of humanity, the notion of man necessitates respect for the human person's right to live. One person's freedom to obtain an abortion is the denial of another person's right to live."

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that I support the Constitutional Amendment which Senator Helms has introduced into your chamber. We in Congress must not renege on our responsibility and obligation to protect and defend the inalienable rights of all individuals in this Nation. We must diligently hasten to restore the full protection of the law for human life at every stage of development.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

YET ANOTHER AGENCY

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives passed a bill to create yet another agency to add to the 75 independent agencies we already have. Many of our Members seem to believe that the only way to solve a problem is to create another mass of bureaucrats, thus taking more taxes from an already overburdened taxpayer.

Consumer protection is vital and we must do all that we can to help protect our consumers. The question is—how can we best do the job? It seems nonsensical to me to create a superagency to do the job for which we have already created other agencies. The Consumer Protection Agency is just one more layer of bureaucracy.

To create another agency has direct impact on one of the gravest problems facing America today—inflation. We cannot possibly halt inflation by forming more and more agencies; there is no hope of balancing our budget by creating more bureaucracy.

One of my major efforts here in the Congress has been to help put the Government on a businesslike basis. We need to find out how much money is taken in by an agency; how much it spends and what it spends for in order to cut down on waste. Just this session, I cosponsored a bill to audit certain Federal agencies.

The people deserve to know how their money is spent. At the same time, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have directed much of my effort toward ferreting out duplication of programs and spending.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult already for the Congress to properly oversee those agencies which it has created. Furthermore, those agencies were formed to act

in the interest of the public. It would seem to me that we should streamline and revamp some of these agencies we have, rather than creating more of a concentration of power in Washington through formation of this new super-agency. This is clearly another case of Congress abdicating its obligations by creating a new, costly agency.

Mr. Speaker, many here in the Congress are wisely seeking to reform our budgetary process and to control Federal expenditures. Perhaps we should urge our colleagues in the Senate to act in the real interest of the consumer by rejecting this gigantic new agency. To burden the American taxpayer with more taxes; create more spending for the Federal Government; heap more red tape on the small businessman—all seem particularly harsh at a time when we should be cutting Government spending and trying to help our people through a particularly rough time.

Heaping another layer of bureaucracy upon an already overburdening bureaucracy is not the answer. Better improvement of our laws and better management of our current agencies is a better approach.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., AND
ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 4, 1974

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, two prominent Americans—the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Honorable Adam Clayton Powell—died on the same day, 4 years apart. On April 4, 1968, Dr. King was gunned down by an assassin's bullet in Memphis, Tenn. Four years later, on April 4, Adam Clayton Powell, one of the more dynamic legislators of his day, succumbed to cancer.

Mr. Speaker, to attempt to summarize in detail the achievements of both individuals would be an arduous task. The list of milestones which highlight their respective careers is long, and countless Americans are familiar with the admirable achievements of both men.

Instead perhaps to truly commemorate the anniversary of their respective deaths, we should focus briefly on the legacy left by each. During his lifetime, Dr. King was the world's most formidable spokesman for human rights and the dignity of man. As a result his name still inspires faith in those who are reluctant to believe, and compassion in those who tend to forget the sanctity of human tolerance. Mr. Powell, a man of resourcefulness and skill, proved to Congress and to the Nation that the legislative process can be responsive to the needs of all of our people.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, let us pause for a few moments to reflect on what these two men really did for America and its people. Though they were of different dispositions, temperaments, values and backgrounds, they

nevertheless were joined together by a common bond—and that bond was not the color of their skin. It was their passionate and uncompromising commitment to making this world a better place for all people, regardless of the color of their skin.

REPRESENTATIVE EARL LANDGREBE AND MOTOR TRUCKING INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, among the many publications that come across my desk during the course of a week is one entitled "The Fifth Wheel." It is published by the Indiana Motor Truck Association, Inc. In perusing the March edition, I came across an article that pertains directly to one of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives, the Honorable EARL F. LANDGREBE who hails from Valparaiso, Ind.

EARL is one of the motor trucking industry's great disciples. From scratch he started what is now known as the Landgrebe Motor Transport, Inc., which has progressed steadily through the years into a well-known trucking organization.

I take great pleasure in inserting the following information contained in this magazine so that you might know what the trucking industry thinks of my learned colleague, EARL LANDGREBE:

LANDGREBE MOTOR TRANSPORT

Landgrebe Motor Transport (LMT) began when Earl F. Landgrebe (now second district congressman) purchased the A. J. Gratton Motor Service. He did so because of a "love of trucks and motor equipment . . . and a strong belief in the American free enterprise system," said Roger E. Landgrebe, manager of LMT's Moving Division and the congressman's youngest son.

He began as a carrier of general freight between Valparaiso and Chicago with one tractor-trailer and an 11-year old straight truck.

The firm has grown steadily since 1943. LMT drivers now make at least six runs to Chicago daily and also serve other communities in northwestern Indiana. That may not seem like a large area, but the firm's 26 drivers still drive the equivalent of 22½ trips around the globe each year.

Present equipment includes 20 tractors, 27 trailers, six straight trucks, and two pickups. Landgrebe has terminals on Highway 130 West in Valparaiso and in Chicago.

Landgrebe is a common carrier (required by law to provide service for the general public) of general commodities and also has household goods moving authority for the entire state of Indiana and the Chicago area. Since 1948, LMT has been a household goods moving agent for North American Van Lines.

Landgrebe's 47 employees receive an annual payroll of over a half million dollars. Its 26 drivers annually haul 70 million pounds of freight over 588,000 miles.

Most of its 70,000 annual shipments begins with a telephone call to either terminal. A dispatcher relays the necessary information to a driver in the area when the driver makes one of his several daily phone contacts. The shipment is then picked up and brought to the Valparaiso terminal where the goods are separated and placed in vehicles which will

head to the destination. All billing is handled at the Valparaiso terminal.

LMT is also active in community affairs following the belief of its owner that "a businessman must look at something other than the profit and loss statement. He should also be of service to his community."

Earl F. Landgrebe is President and Treasurer of LMT; Helen Landgrebe is Vice President and Secretary. The General Manager is Walter Martin.

RESPECTED LEADERS ON HUMAN RIGHTS SUPPORT JACKSON-VANIK AMENDMENT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues the testimony of two distinguished individuals before the Senate Finance Committee in support of the Jackson freedom of emigration provision to the Trade Reform Act. Sister Margaret Ellen Traxler, chairman of the National Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry, and Mr. Stanley H. Lowell, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, both called upon the Congress to take a leadership role in upholding the long standing American commitment to human rights, and urged favorable action on this legislation.

Sister Traxler told the committee that she was speaking "for the executive committee on the Interreligious Task Force and for thousands of Christians in the United States in stating to you in the most emphatic terms that in the age after Auschwitz, we as Christians are not going to stand by and allow Jews to be persecuted, intimidated or deprived of their rights in any country."

Sister Traxler's eloquent remarks follow:

TESTIMONY OF SISTER MARGARET ELLEN TRAXLER

My name is Sister Margaret Ellen Traxler. I reside at 1340 East 72nd Street, Chicago, Illinois. I am the chairman and one of the founders of the National Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry. I have also served as the president of the National Coalition of American Nuns and as the executive director of the National Catholic Conference on Interracial Justice.

The National Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry is a coalition of men and women representing all of the religious communities in the United States who are determined to extend every possible effort to ameliorate the plight of Soviet Jewry. We are totally committed to the proposition that Soviet Jews should be given the basic human right to live with dignity within the Soviet Union or to be able to leave that nation in an atmosphere of freedom for the nation of their choice. The executive committee of the National Interreligious Task Force firmly supports the Jackson Amendment and believes that this amendment can be a vital factor in aiding the basic aspirations of Soviet Jewry.

In the light of the Task Force's commitment to Soviet Jews, I should like to read to you the Statement of Conscience of the National Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry which was adopted in Chicago on March 20, 1972 at our initial plenary session

attended by representatives of every major religious denomination in the United States. This Statement of Conscience is the foundational statement of purpose for the Interreligious Task Force and remains the seminal declaration which brings our constituency together around this great and crucial human rights question.

STATEMENT OF CONSCIENCE OF THE NATIONAL INTERRELIGIOUS CONSULTATION ON SOVIET JEWRY, MARCH 20, 1972, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

"Thou shalt not stand idly by while the blood of my brother cries out to thee from the earth"

"Let justice roll down as the waters, and righteous as a mighty stream"

The National Interreligious Consultation on Soviet Jewry, meeting in unprecedented deliberation on March 19 and 20 in Chicago, Illinois, calls upon the conscience of mankind to make known its profound concern about the continued denial of the free exercise of religion, the violation of the right to emigrate, and other human rights of the 3 million Jewish people of the Soviet Union and of other deprived groups and nationalities.

For believing Christians and Jews, the denial of the spiritual nature of man and his right to nurture and to perpetuate the spiritual life is to deny the creative power of God in whose image He made man. The discrimination against the Jews by the Soviet Union gives us all reason to believe that, under the pretext of being anti-Zionist, it is the very contribution of the Jews to humanity which is under attack. It is precisely the Jewish testimony in the world that man's identity and freedom are not granted primarily by any state or constitution but are found in the nature of man himself. That is why each human being is threatened in his fundamental right to freedom of conscience when the Jews are persecuted.

Realizing our own failures in racism and in other areas of human rights, we nevertheless cannot remain silent as long as the Soviet Union continues to hamper or strangle the spiritual and cultural life of the Jewish people through extreme and special acts of discrimination. We appeal to the Soviet authorities to grant religious rights to Russian Jewry—the establishment of religious, educational, and cultural institutions for the perpetuation of Judaism and Jewish culture; the lifting of the prohibitions against publishing Hebrew Bibles and prayerbooks and the production of religious articles; the permission to train rabbis and Jewish teachers both in Russia and in seminaries abroad; the creation of a representative body of Soviet Jewry with freedom to communicate and associate with their co-religionists abroad.

We appeal to the Soviet authorities—let them live as Jews or let them leave to be Jews. This consultation is gratified to know that the Soviet government has heard the pleas of millions in many lands and has permitted several thousands of Jews to leave the country for Israel and elsewhere. We urge the Soviet authorities to relent, and to continue to allow the thousands of others who have sought exit visas to emigrate to the countries of their choice—which is their right under the United Nations Declaration.

This consultation is deeply disturbed by the reports of growing acts of harassment, intimidation, arbitrary arrests, and confinement of Jews and dissenters to mental institutions. We appeal to the Soviet government to end this policy of wanton oppression and fear.

This consultation protests against the continued imprisonment under ruthless conditions of prisoners of conscience—Jewish and non-Jewish—and we urge that they be released and be shown clemency.

This consultation protests against the government sponsored campaign of anti-Semitism and anti-Zionist propaganda which constitutes an incitement to hatred and violence in contravention of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights.

This consultation resolves to commit itself to a program of continuous watchfulness and unrelenting efforts in demanding and in championing freedom for all of Soviet Jewry, of Christians, and of intellectuals—all of who suffer for their courage and their struggle for human dignity.

This National Interreligious Consultation on Soviet Jewry consisting of Protestants, Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Jews, authorizes a direct appeal to President Nixon, as the representative of the American people, to convey in clear and forthright terms to the Soviet authorities during their forthcoming conversations in Moscow the expectation of the American people—Christians and Jews, black and white, liberal and conservative—that these discriminations and denials of Soviet Jewry and others be stopped now, and that fundamental human rights be granted—now. We seek the relaxation of international tensions and conflicts between the United States and the Soviet Union, and the surest test of the genuineness of the commitment of Soviet authorities to the cause of universal peace and justice is the granting of justice and freedom to the Jews and other deprived religious groups and nationalities.

I speak for the executive committee of the Interreligious Task Force and for thousands of Christians in the United States in stating to you in the most emphatic terms that in the age after Auschwitz, we as Christians are not going to stand by and allow Jews to be persecuted, intimidated or deprived of their rights in any country. It is on this fundamental principle that the National Interreligious Task Force on Soviet Jewry today voices support for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Washington, Henry M. Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lowell aptly described the Jackson-Vanik amendment as a,

Realistic and effective formula to employ American economic resources and capabilities in securing the fundamental and internationally recognized right to emigrate.

A summary of Mr. Lowell's perceptive statement follows:

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT BY STANLEY H. LOWELL

PRINCIPAL POINTS

1. We support enactment of the Jackson/Mills-Vanik freedom of emigration provision as part of the Trade Reform Act. We believe that this section is a realistic and effective formula to employ American economic resources and capabilities in securing the fundamental and internationally recognized right to emigrate.

2. We support detente between the United States and the Soviet Union, but not unilateral detente where the U.S. provides economic benefits and receives no quid pro quo from the USSR. We are for a genuine detente. Such a relationship must include the right and opportunity for people to move freely between countries. The passage of the Trade Act would result in overwhelming benefits to the USSR economically. It is appropriate for us to seek in return concessions from the Soviet Union in an area vital to all Americans—that is, human rights!

3. The Right to Leave one's country to emigrate is recognized internationally. It is articulated in international covenants such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Convention on the

Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

4. The Jackson amendment, seeking to assist those oppressed minority groups in other countries who wish to emigrate, has substantial historical precedents in American tradition by executive and Congressional action.

5. The Soviet Union could comply with the mandate of the Jackson amendment by internal policy decisions and administrative implementation, within the existing provisions of its own laws and procedures.

6. The strong Senate support and the House action in passing the freedom of emigration provision has already had the positive effect of influencing Soviet authorities to suspend the onerous "education tax" placed on visa applicants with higher education. We believe that enactment of the Jackson Amendment would result in significant improvements in Soviet emigration practices.

7. The emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union has not significantly improved in the last year. The backlog of Soviet Jews trying to emigrate continues to increase. During the first quarter of 1974, the permitted emigration rate has significantly decreased by almost one-third. Harassment of visa applicants has intensified, including geographical and professional selectivity, loss of jobs and continuing arrest and imprisonment.

8. We are deeply disturbed by the Secretary of State's assertion that passage of the freedom of emigration legislation will bring about the termination of Soviet Jewish emigration. Not only is this statement questionable, but it also may well create the danger of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

9. On the basis of Soviet past performance we cannot expect any improvements in their emigration practices, without the prod of American action especially by the Congress.

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for allowing a tiny taint of logic to be inserted in H.R. 11500, the bill to dismember the surface coal mining industry.

As it emerged from subcommittee, the bill required a mine operator in reclaiming the land to permanently establish vegetation on it. Since farm crops are harvested annually, this automatically knocked the land out of the prospect of grain production. Trees are not permanent, either—they eventually die, even if they are not harvested for timber in a generation or two.

Until the committee wised up and took out the word "permanently," I was afraid Congress was about to require the cultivation of petrified forests.

Still, the rest of the bill represents petrified thinking. Time and again it seeks to prohibit production of half our coal supply by imposing impossible requirements. It is as crazy as trying to grow bananas on Pike's Peak, and this one injection of logic does not redeem it.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ABORTION

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing House Resolution 585 to create a select committee to study the impact and ramifications of the Supreme Court's decisions on abortion.

I am especially pleased to add the names of 12 new cosponsors to this proposal: Messrs. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL of Virginia, JOHN DENT of Pennsylvania, JOHN DUNCAN of Tennessee, PAUL FINDLEY of Illinois, JAMES R. GROVER of New York, GILBERT GUDE of Maryland, HENRY HELSTOSKI of New Jersey, WILLIAM HUNGATE of Missouri, JACK KEMP of New York, WILLIAM KETCHUM of California, WAYNE OWENS of Utah, and J. EDWARD ROUSH of Indiana.

This select committee would offer a sound, responsible means of carefully considering the Supreme Court's unprecedented abortion decisions and then taking appropriate action. This course would not be necessary if the Judiciary Committee had taken up the abortion controversy months ago or expressed any credible intention of doing so in the future. But this has not transpired.

I am very hopeful that the Committee on Rules will now take note of this important resolution with its bipartisan sponsorship from every part of the country.

I insert at this point the text of my recent letter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, urging him to take action in his committee on House Resolution 585:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1974.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN,
Chairman, The House Committee on Rules,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to appeal for your personal assistance in securing prompt consideration of various proposals to correct the Supreme Court's decisions on abortion. As Chairman of the Committee on Rules, you are in a unique position to assure that the unborn child is given a fair hearing in the legislative process. As things now stand, the pro-life movement is almost entirely dependent upon your leadership if we are to make any progress in the 93rd Congress.

As you know, the Supreme Court, in two decisions last year, struck down the abortion statutes in every State in our Nation. The Court created an absolute right to procure an abortion during the first three months of a woman's pregnancy and an almost unlimited right to secure an abortion during the remaining six months of pregnancy until birth. These unprecedented decisions rest on the flimsiest of constitutional grounds and they represent an unparalleled exercise of naked lawmaking power by the Supreme Court.

In the wake of these decisions, dozens of Members have introduced proposals to reverse or modify the Court's rulings. You are undoubtedly familiar with the various constitutional amendments introduced by Mr. Hogan, Mr. Zablocki, Mr. Delaney, Mr. Burke, Mr. Whitehurst, and others. Mr. Denholm has introduced an important bill, H.R. 7752; and I have offered another approach in my bill, H.R. 8682. All these propo-

sals have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and to its Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights. They have been languishing in that subcommittee because of the implacable hostility of Representative Don Edwards, the Subcommittee Chairman, who appears determined to prevent their consideration by the other Members. They are likely to remain buried in the subcommittee because of the quiet acquiescence of Committee Chairman Peter Rodino.

There are at least four ways that a pro-life measure could be considered by the House of Representatives in 1974.

First, a constitutional amendment or a bill could be reported out by the Judiciary Committee, subject to a rule being granted. At this point, such a course appears almost impossible because of the disposition of the Committee's leadership.

Second, Mr. Hogan's discharge petition could bring H.J. Res. 261 to the floor. However, a discharge petition requires the signatures of 218 Members, and the Hogan petition is still far from success. As you know, discharge petitions entirely circumvent the hearing process and therefore are little favored and seldom successful. Although there may in the end be no alternative to a discharge petition, this route cannot be viewed as a desirable way to propose an amendment to our Constitution, for it does not provide for the careful study, full debate, and public education that are essential in matters of this moment. A discharge petition is complicated in this instance by a very real uncertainty about the implications of H.J. Res. 261. There is considerable doubt whether one hour of debate can fully resolve these questions.

Third, the Committee on Rules could conduct its own hearings on the pro-life measures and then report one to the floor. The committee used this procedure to report S.J. Res. 185 earlier this year, although the resolution fell within the substantive jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. According to Mr. Eckhardt of Texas, this procedure has been employed at least seven times by the Committee on Rules since 1937 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 7, 1974, at p. 2491), and in one instance a constitutional amendment was involved. Although this procedure is indeed unusual, it has advantage over a discharge petition; for it would permit initial study and screening of a measure by the Rules Committee and it would permit an opportunity for more thorough debate on the floor.

Fourth, the House could create a select committee to study all the implications of the Supreme Court's decisions on abortion and then report out appropriate legislation, if that was deemed desirable. This is the objective of House Resolution 585 which I introduced last October 9, with Mr. Keating and Mr. Roncallo. Since then, this Resolution has been co-sponsored by the following Members: Robert Bauman (Md.), Silvio Conte (Mass.), Marjorie Holt (Md.), Robert Huber (Mich.), William Hudnut (Ind.); Earl Landgrebe (Ind.), Trent Lott (Miss.), Romano Mazzoli (Ky.), William Minshall (Ohio), Don Mitchell (N.Y.), James O'Hara (Mich.), George O'Brien (Ill.), Walter Powell (Ohio); Ralph Regula (Ohio); Robert Roe (N.J.), Fernand J. St Germain (R.I.), Keith Sebelius (Kans.), Dick Shoup (Mont.), Charles Thone (Neb.), Charles Vanik (Ohio), William Walsh (N.Y.); William Whitehurst (Va.); and Antonio Won Pat (Guam). Messrs. Glenn Anderson and Gilbert Gude have sponsored similar resolutions.

The select committee envisioned by these resolutions would be able to conduct thorough hearings exploring all the complex issues with respect to abortion and carefully considering all the various proposals for reform. The Speaker would be able to appoint the eleven committee members and would

thereby assure the balanced makeup of the select committee. The committee could hold public hearings and permit all sides to be heard.

House Resolution 585 was referred to the Committee on Rules, where it has been now for almost six months. There can be no doubt that the Committee is authorized to report a resolution creating a select committee with the power to report legislation, for it has done so in the past. For instance, the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, created by House Resolution. See *Congressional Record*, March 5, 1958 at 3443. I hope your Committee will now act.

Were I to serve in the Congress for 40 years, I could attain no better position than you hold today to advance the pro-life movement. You hold in your hands the power to free pro-life legislation, through either of two different mechanisms, for consideration by the House. I earnestly appeal to you to demonstrate your continuing leadership ability so that the House of Representatives is permitted to work its will.

Millions of Americans are depending upon you to secure legislative action on abortion. History will remember the role you play.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

HAROLD V. FROELICH,
Member of Congress.

INMATE PURSUES EDUCATION

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, in this time of repeated calls for prison reform and inmate rehabilitation, it is most refreshing to find positive action in this area—action that is bringing results. Burlington County College, located in Pemberton, N.J., has recently established a correctional education program for inmates incarcerated at the Bordentown Reformatory. This program is working exceptionally well.

I would like to share an article from the Burlington County Times which describes the success of one inmate who has gotten a new start because of the college program:

MAKES PRISON HIS COLLEGE: LIFER PURSUES EDUCATION, TUTORS INMATES IN READING

(By Joseph M. Donadieu)

CHESTERFIELD TOWNSHIP.—One inmate at the Bordentown Reformatory seems to be testing the limits to see how far he can go and seems to be getting encouragement from the people working with him.

Matthew Sheridan, a 25-year-old inmate in the fifth year of a life sentence on a charge of armed robbery-murder from Atlantic County, has already received an associate degree from Burlington County College, a bachelor's degree from Stockton State College and is now looking for an opportunity to continue graduate studies within the walls of the reformatory.

With the help of a program of college courses offered by Burlington County College, Sheridan said he got a new start on a college program. He completed his work for a bachelor's degree last June with the cooperation of professors from Stockton State College and officials at the reformatory.

Although he has no word yet from officials at Trenton State College or Monclair State College on the possibility of arranging a

course of graduate study in education while he is serving time, Sheridan is still working with professors from Stockton to complete his requirements for teacher certification.

Although he is not enrolled in any defined program at the present time, Sheridan is working on an independent study course in Chinese history under the direction of a professor from Stockton.

Much of his earlier coursework for Stockton was completed in a similar manner with a course of readings, research and writing and discussion with Stockton professors who regularly traveled to Bordentown for his classes.

Meanwhile, he is also working in the reformatory's educational section as inmate-coordinator for Burlington County College's Right-to-Read program and as a tutor in the program as well as teaching in the adult education program conducted by the reformatory.

Since it is impossible to list him on the professional staff of the reformatory, even though he has a college degree and is teaching, E. Calvin Neubert, assistant to the supervisor of educational programs at the Bordentown Reformatory said Sheridan is listed as an inmate para-professional and receives no extra compensation for it.

By his own admission, Sheridan said he got himself in prison through his own "stupidity" and "search for independence."

"I didn't know what I wanted, but I knew I wanted something different. What I was doing seemed to be a safe and easy way to get what I wanted," he said.

A three-month-long series of break-ins ended with an armed robbery and fatal shooting with a subsequent arrest and imprisonment at the age of 20, said Sheridan.

"One thing led to another. Robbery is a monster that can be as addictive as drugs," he said.

Although Sheridan said he was not the trigger-man in the armed robbery, he and one of the two co-defendants charged with the murder pleaded "Non Vult" to the charge. The third man was convicted in a trial by jury, he said.

Following his conviction, Sheridan was sent to Trenton State Prison where he spent two months in 1969 before he was transferred to Bordentown in May.

On his arrival at the Reformatory, Sheridan said he stopped into the library there, but never returned until much later after Burlington County College had begun to stock the shelves with materials purchased with a federal grant.

Before he got into trouble, Sheridan said he had spent two years at Pennsylvania Military College as a cadet, dropped out, and enrolled in a two year college in South Jersey. He was arrested during the first semester he was there, he said.

On the outside, before he got into trouble, Sheridan admits he was not a good student.

"When I got here I tried to get my head together; tried to find out what had happened and decided on where I was going."

"I decided to try to do as much as possible to start over new. I wasn't worried about the time it would take me to graduate, but the way I would graduate," he said.

The beginning of the Burlington County College program at the Reformatory changed the whole atmosphere of the institution, he said.

When he first arrived at Bordentown, Sheridan said he found he could not understand the language of the inmates and they could not understand him, so he had to learn a new language.

He found he could talk with some of the inmates in the section where he was assigned and they as a group enrolled when the Burlington County College courses were introduced early in 1970.

Although there was a little trouble from

some of the guards at first, it soon quieted down. There was no trouble from other inmates because he had been active in inmate programs and was identified as a long-timer.

When the courses were started, "things began to happen," he said.

"Suddenly, a guy who was illiterate wanted to be like those who were enrolled in the college courses, put on glass frames without lenses and started carrying around a large volume from the library," said Sheridan.

"For real. I saw it," he said.

"At first, there was a big interest in psychology," he said.

The reason? "I guess most people have a fear of psychology and psychiatrists and see them as someone who digs around inside of you."

Before the college courses were offered, the main reading done inside the reformatory was mysteries and westerns, but "now the quality of reading has changed and there is more philosophy and history than there was before," he said.

"It showed me there was a new life that I didn't see before. When I landed here, I was lacking confidence in myself, but now I've gotten an opportunity and confidence and I feel I can help other people," he said.

"For the first time there is an inmate teaching others," he said.

But, he has authority he can't realistically use. While a teacher from the outside could threaten to report an inmate who is giving him problems in class, Sheridan, as an inmate, does not see that as a realistic alternative since he must still associate with other inmates and must live with them.

As far as discipline in the classroom goes, he said he tries to make a troublesome inmate make up his own mind about what he's doing.

"I don't see myself as walking any damned tight-rope. I've had problems but not big ones," he said.

His solution is not to call on any sort of inmate-system of enforcement, he said.

"There are other ways to settle problems other than by threats or violence. I couldn't see myself as a teacher or professional if I had to use that type of power play to enforce order," he said.

In addition to his work as a tutor in the Right-to-Read program, as inmate coordinator for the program with scheduling and planning for new sessions and working with personnel sent over from Burlington County College, Sheridan is also captain and coach for the inmate weight-lifting team.

With all of that, and his studies, Sheridan said he is also on call to work in the institutional hospital when needed.

Before he became involved in the college activities at the reformatory, Sheridan said he was assigned to work at the hospital and now would work whenever needed because he would feel he is needed.

According to Neubert, Sheridan is "probably above the norm for men incarcerated at this time of life. I would say he is more than satisfactory or above average."

"He has won the respect of both his peer group, among the inmates, and the professional staff here," said Neubert.

approved a measure that would entirely phase out the present 22-percent oil depletion allowance by 1977. We are informed that such a move by the Congress, if approved, could add some \$3 billion to the oil industry's tax bill in the next 3 years.

I believe the chairman of this committee, Mr. MILLS, and those Members who voted to end that depletion allowance, are to be commended by the House and the American people for such a positive, long overdue beginning on ending accumulated tax privileges presently enjoyed by the domestic oil industry.

Previously, a weaker measure had been approved by the tax-writing committee. The chairman, however, correctly reading the will and indignation of the overwhelming majority of the people of this country, knew the original bill would fail on the floor of this House. The Nixon administration, true to its permanent policy of all-out support for our oil industry, opposed any depletion phase-out. Also due credit are the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee who supported Mr. MILLS, knowing the time has at last come for congressional action in this crucial area.

With oil and gas commanding astronomical prices, resulting in staggering profits to the oil industry, tax incentives for big oil are a fraud upon the consuming public. Depletion allowances of all kinds, with a tiny handful of minimal exceptions, are nothing more than tax gimmicks allowing extractive industries to evade Federal taxes.

Water-down proposals have been advanced by oil industry apologists as a last ditch defense against meaningful tax reform. These would have us believe and accept a meaningless step, labeled enticingly an excess profits tax. The rationale offered for this is that industry should be allowed to keep its huge ill-gotten gains to finance increased production. This can only be termed an assault upon intelligence.

In the past, the vast range of tax preferences granted the oil industry by Congress gained the American consumer nothing, as the recent energy crunch showed so vividly. Big oil went abroad, using American tax breaks to explore and develop foreign oil fields. They also used such tax writeoffs to build many new refineries abroad, writing them off while ignoring growing domestic refinery needs. We all know the result. Most importantly, the American people now have a far broader understanding of what really is going on and what big oil is reaping in profits at the expense of domestic consumers. As the Church committee hearings have shown so vividly, these massive multinationals have no loyalty to the United States, only to tax advantages and profits they are allowed to take domestically by lax tax laws.

That is why special tax privileges saving big oil \$2 billion annually in the form of depletion allowances should be forthwith ended by Congress. It exempts 22 percent of all oil income from any Federal taxation, allowing them to pocket vast sums while the taxpayer, paying the highest energy prices in history, must take up the slack by paying missing tax revenues into the Federal Treasury.

ACTION ON OIL INDUSTRY TAX PRIVILEGES

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House has

Make no mistake. If Uncle Sam isn't getting it from big oil, he has to extract it from the average consumer and taxpayer.

I do not believe Congress should allow any exemptions to the newly approved rule phasing out the oil depletion allowance. Many oil wells have been written off as a result of this gimmick—some of them several times over.

Had we been able to roll back the mind-boggling oil and gas prices presently prevailing in the American marketplace, consumers would have been granted some benefit. Regrettably, the President chose to veto Congress price rollback. Failing that move, the time is now ripe for an end to all depletion allowances for big oil.

Nor should we stop there. The foreign tax credit is and should be the central target of this Congress. Here is where big oil gains most from foreign investments at the expense of the American people. By allowing them to write off, dollar for dollar, whatever they invest or spend abroad, we are subsidizing their richest tax break. With such an incentive, it pays them to put foreign investment first, ahead of new refineries and further exploration at home.

Certain things, thankfully, have changed as a result of the embargo. The public has had a taste of the effects over a long term of giving big oil such accumulated tax preference. Millions of citizens are demanding action by Congress, and Congress should respond. The buck has stopped with us. We have a responsibility to turn a deaf ear to oil lobbyists, who for so long have had things their own way in this city.

A weak measure would not pass. I for one would not go back to my constituency, which has sustained grievous economic and social damage as a result of high-pressured shortages, and claim to have represented their interests if we did not emerge with significant reform. Further, I believe and hope this is a start, rather than an isolated instance of grudging reform under pressure. I shall support and vote for an end to the oil depletion allowance.

As the song says, "The times they are a'changing."

SMALL BUSINESS TAX REFORM

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, late last month I was privileged to attend a presentation made to the House Select Committee on Small Business by representatives of the National Small Business Association. At that presentation were over 100 Members of the House.

Before addressing myself to the substance of the presentation made, I want to commend National Small Business Association for taking the leadership in

aggressively pushing for the passage of the Bible-Evins small business tax simplification and reform bill introduced in the first session of this Congress. The association has brought about such a ground swell throughout our constituencies that I am pleased to announce that my distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, has agreed that his committee will conduct executive hearings on this all-important subject of small business tax reform early next month.

We were parties to the opening shot of a new revolution. Modern-day continental laid fiery words before us and threw down the gauntlet of challenge to do something about our country having been turned over to big business, big government, and big labor. These words were the shots of the revolt sponsored by NSB on behalf of 10½ million small businesses who are losing ground disastrously in market share, assets, and profits. These are the firms who are the economic backbone of our great country—a country which was born of revolution.

The tyranny faced by our forefathers at Lexington, Concord, Boston, Yorktown, and other cherished places was nothing compared to the tyranny under which small business suffers today. These 10½ million firms account for 98 percent of the country's total business units, yet in 1972 a handful of economically powerful giants—only 350—controlled 69 percent of the assets in corporate manufacturing. These same companies, representing less than one-third of 1 percent of the country's manufacturing firms received almost 73 percent of the profits. The Boston tea party was small potatoes compared to this 1972 big business milking party—which still goes on.

How much longer are we going to sit here and allow big business, big government and big labor—to dictate the policies of our great country. Top big government management is run by draftees from big business. They, after directing the agencies and so forth, return to the open and thankful arms of their giant corporation to reap the benefits from the seeds sown while in—and I mean literally in—the seat of government. This is a case where the left hand does know what the right hand does because they are one and the same.

For the past several decades, the "big three"—big business, big government, big labor—have been expanding at a rate outstripping the rest of the economy. The relative diminution of the small business share of the national economy has developed trends which tend to worsen the health of the American system. It is imperative that action be taken to restore and expand the growth and viability of small business before these trends become irreversible.

The economy is now dominated by the "big three". At the same time the "big three" pay lip-service to the virtues of small business, they make certain, by their actions, that primarily only their interests are promoted and protected. The "big three" formulate a national economic policy that, regardless of intent,

discourages, handicaps, squeezes, and often destroys small business. Their actions are counterproductive, incestuous, and self-serving in nature. As a result, only the "scraps on the table" are left for everyone else.

First—a look at big business. In 20 years—1950-70—more than \$65 billion in manufacturing and mining assets were acquired in mergers of companies with more than \$10 million in assets. Almost \$40 billion of those assets were acquired by just 200 companies.

Second—a look at big government. Big government has paralleled the explosive growth of big business. The Federal Government now directly controls the expenditure of about one-fifth of our gross national product. Its annual level of expenditure has gone from less than \$10 billion in 1940 to \$43.1 billion in 1950 to more than a \$300 billion budget for the next fiscal year.

Third—a look at big labor. For small business, true collective bargaining with big labor is now largely a myth. Big business and big labor between them blackjack small business with industry-wide standards throughout the economy. And big government ignores the counterproductive impact of this blackjacking on the consumer and small business.

Why is it that top officials of big government travel twice a year to places like White Sulphur Springs to "brief" behind closed doors big business members of the business council? Is it not only fair that big government do the same for small business—with the doors open?

When big labor sits down with big business to negotiate, why does not the Department of Labor, or at least some Government agency, represent small business, because the "settlements" inexorably bind small business?

These revolutionaries from the National Small Business Association have even laid down a timetable of accomplishment. Each Member has received the association's presentation and its challenge. Let us all realize that we have been served notice that events are happening and a small business declaration of equality has been signed and delivered to us.

The general goal of National Small Business Association may be stated simply: Small and medium-size business needs an effective national policy developed and carried out to restore competitive balance. That policy must produce substantially greater growth for small and medium-size business than for big business and big government.

The NSB specific 15-year program is twofold:

By 1976, our Nation's 200th anniversary of its Declaration of Independence, there shall be adopted and enacted a national policy committed to a "catch-up" for small and medium-size business;

By 1989, the 200th anniversary of our Constitution, there shall have been fulfilled a national policy which, to measure its success, shall obtain, in industry after industry, a doubling of the share of the market held today by small and medium-size business.

There are no veiled threats in these words. There are no implications of bloodshed and violence. There are however positive statements of wants and demands which, if acceded to, will make our country a better place to live in and infinitely stronger. We are not dealing with firebrands but with sensible and practical small business men who for over three decades have been victimized by their "benevolent" big government; its partner in collusion, big business; and the nonvirginal handmaiden of both, big labor. We have a duty to bring equity to our codes and laws as they affect all citizens of America.

We must begin by acknowledging the correctness of the complaints from small business and follow through by seriously studying what these modern day non-violent revolutionaries regard as their rights—equal treatment under our Constitution and laws.

I most earnestly commend to you the National Small Business Association plan to "preserve America through a national policy committed to 'catch-up' growth of smaller business."

WHY CONTROLS SHOULD NOT BE EXTENDED

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to read a very thoughtful and constructive article by Paul McCracken on why controls have not worked and why we need to exercise fiscal and monetary restraint:

SHOULD CONTROLS BE EXTENDED?

(By Paul W. McCracken)

During the weeks ahead the Congress must make a decision about whether to continue wage and price controls. Since the legislative authority terminates at the end of April, even no action (for whatever reason) would be a decision—a decision to jettison them.

This will be a tough decision. What makes economic sense often does not make near-term political sense, particularly in this turbulent election year, and the current question about extending these controls is a good illustration of this tension.

This decision inevitably reflects political as well as economic considerations. This thought will distress some, but it is hardly surprising that decisions made in the political arena will be in part political.

Those making decisions about economic policy can be forgiven for making them on political grounds, providing they are clear-eyed about the economic consequences of their actions. A key question in these deliberations during the months ahead, therefore, is: What have been the results, the consequences, of the controls program?

Obviously these controls cannot be retired on a "mission accomplished" basis, if the mission they were supposed to accomplish was a reasonably placid price level. From August 1971, when the New Economic Policy was inaugurated, to January 1974, the consumer price index rose at the rate of 5.6% per year. And the rate of inflation has, of course, been accelerating. Quarter by quarter

through 1973's phases and freezes the consumer price index moved from a 6.1% per year rate in the first quarter to a 9.9% pace in the three months ending with last December. And the limited information now available suggests that in the current quarter the annual rate will have been in excess of 10% per year.

RISE IN PRICES INDEXES, 1973

(Seasonally adjusted annual rate by quarters in percent)

Type	1st	2d	3d	4th
All consumer prices.....	6.1	8.4	9.1	9.9
Food prices.....	18.6	20.2	24.6	14.5
Energy prices.....	8.2	11.6	5.7	27.0
All other prices.....	2.5	4.1	4.7	6.8
Wholesale industrial prices.....	6.5	15.2	6.5	20.5
Energy prices.....	12.8	41.3	22.2	133.2
Other prices.....	5.9	12.6	4.9	11.3

Moreover, the acceleration was pervasive. Even with the hyperactive eruptions of food and fuel prices excluded from the picture, other consumer prices were rising at an average annual rate of 6.8% by the final quarter of 1973, up sharply from a 2.5% rate in the first quarter.

Finally, a look over the shoulder at what has been happening at wholesale prices provides little support for optimism that inflation is on the wane. Industrial wholesale prices were rising at the rate of 20.5% per year in the fourth quarter, and again with energy prices out of the arithmetic, the figure was still 11.3%. And data for 1974 show no clear evidence of deceleration. If these are the price increases which will be moving through to the consumer level during the months ahead, the BLS monthly price releases will not make comforting reading.

What do these prices tell us about the wisdom of extending the control program? Surprisingly little.

On political and economic grounds one could argue either that the controls obviously remain urgently needed or that obviously controls are not effective in dealing with inflation. The key question is not whether the price level was rising. About that there is no argument. The question is whether these price and wage controls were keeping the rate of inflation lower than it otherwise would have been: Were they making a difference?

To draw a circle around that question more is obviously needed than some arithmetic on rates of inflation. And that has been provided by the Council of Economic Advisers in its annual report released last month (which, in terms of solid analytical content, is probably the best report in the council's history).

One argument, frequently made, can quickly be dismissed—namely, that the dam was broken by the shift last year from Phase 2 to Phase 3. Prices of items subject to similar regulations during the two phases (including those not subject to control during either phase) rose at the annual rate of 4.8% in Phase 2, and during Phase 3 the figure was 11.7%. The increases in prices of items for which Phase 2 controls were relaxed (abolished or made self-administered) were substantially lower—2.6% and 5.1% respectively—and the acceleration in their rate of inflation from Phase 2 to Phase 3 was also smaller.

The issue here, however, is not so much one of statistics as one of logic. The key error in much theorizing about public policy actions, including price and wage restraint, is failure to take account of subsequent consequence and reactions. If some prices are restrained from rising, so it seems to some, this just helps that much to hold down the general price level. Eminently reasonable as this superficially may seem, that conclusion does

not necessarily follow at all. Since customers now buy these items for less than they would otherwise have paid, some purchasing power is "left over." What is done with it? There are two possibilities. People could simply save it, spend that much less. This does not seem to have happened. Consumers spent 93.8% of their after-tax incomes in 1973, almost precisely the same as the 93.9% average for the essentially pre-inflation years 1964-1966.

Apparently whatever was "left over" because some prices were held down was spent either on items subject to price control or in other directions.

If so the result would be expected to be an increase in real output, if output could expand. If the economy could not respond with increased output, either because of bottlenecks or a general shortage of capacity, some combination of growing shortages and higher prices would be the result. This clearly has been the result during the last year or so.

Now it is possible that price controls make for less intense spending through holding down incomes. Statistical studies of the effect of these controls on wages is inconclusive, generally suggesting that the impact at best was small and may have been zero. The major change in the distribution of income is that the profits share in 1973 remained substantially below that of the mid-1960s. In 1973 profits were equal to 11.7% of the GNP originating in nonfinancial corporations. This was up from 10.7% in 1971, the year these controls began, but it is well below the 16.1% average for 1963-65. The controls may, therefore, have made some contribution to the shortages of capacity that became apparent last year.

THE DELIVERY BOTTLENECK

Since it is inherent in controls that they tend to create bottleneck shortages, these controls may have aggravated the rate of inflation by limiting the ability of the economy to respond to strong demands with increased supplies. While different measures of operating rates support widely varying conclusions about whether our economic capacity generally was under pressure, we do know that the unemployment rate for the year was 4.9%, and even with allowances for age and sex changes it was not abnormally low. We also know, however, that one measure of the difficulty of getting deliveries, the proportion of companies reporting slower deliveries, was just over 90% in the second quarter of 1973—a level exceeded only once, in the third quarter of 1950 at the time of the Korean conflict.

With severe supply constraints controls could not have had much effect in restraining general inflation unless they were accompanied by further fiscal and monetary restraint; with that restraint, a more moderate rate of inflation would have been a reasonable expectation in any case.

An alternative measure of the effect that these controls have had on the rate of inflation comes through statistical estimates of the rise in the price level that price-making forces could have been expected to produce compared with what actually happened. These studies also suggest that the extent to which the controls program has limited the rise in the price level is quite small. Some studies indicate no discernible effect, while others suggest that without the controls the rise in the price level during this period might have been two or three percentage points larger than the 14 1/2% that actually did occur.

Those in the political arena confront an inevitably political decision about whether to extend these controls. There will be the usual jockeying to reflect different interest groups, and between the two ends of Penn-

sylvania Avenue for political position. Economic analysis has nothing to contribute to these political struggles.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS' CONTRIBUTION

Economic analysis does, however, have something to contribute when it comes to questions about the economic consequences of this decision. If the decision, either overtly or by default, is to let the controls program expire, two major consequences can reasonably be expected. One is that the overall rate of inflation will not be markedly affected. Some individual prices may change significantly as the pricing system comes into better balance, though even fears about this are easily overdone. The chaos created in the form of waiting lines, shortages, and gray or black markets when prices are held by brute force at an artificially low level almost always gives an exaggerated impression of how much these prices would actually have to change to restore orderly markets. The other reasonable expectation is that the economy could then gradually move toward higher operating and employment rates as bottlenecks, shortages, and choke points fade and markets generally come into balance.

The question that will be facing the Congress is, therefore, a difficult one. Are the immediate political brownie points that might be derived from extending controls worth the cost of a program that would do little to restrain overall inflation, and through dislocation would cause unnecessarily high unemployment and low operating rates, and possibly in the not-so-long run, therefore, would cause further problems of confidence in our political processes?

THE TWO-CAR STRATEGY IS UNWORKABLE, IMPRACTICAL, AND UNWISE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last December, in the long tedious hours of debate on the energy emergency bill, one of our colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. LOUIS C. WYMAN) was successful in bringing to a vote an amendment to the Clean Air Act that would establish a form of what has been called a two-car strategy. The House, in its wisdom, rejected that amendment by a recorded vote of 180 to 210. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised that 180 Members of Congress voted for this amendment, but since it appears likely that the issue will once again be before us, I feel obliged to comment on it.

The theory of a two-car strategy has much appeal. Supporters claim that fuel economy is improved with the removal of smog devices, that only a very few areas are impacted by automotive related air pollution, and that there is not much difference between this proposal and the California waiver granted in the 1970 amendments to the Clean Air Act. Mr. Speaker, I submit that all of these statements in support of the two-car strategy are wrong. In addition, the Wyman amendment would be administratively unworkable, result in further deterioration in air quality throughout the country, and probably cost the con-

sumer and the general public more dollars than a uniform auto emission standard would.

The California waiver to the Clean Air Act applied to the entire State of California. The Wyman amendment would only apply to five metropolitan areas in California, and this would cause havoc in California's air pollution control programs. The California situation is also unique because of the geography of the State, separated as it is by mountain ranges and large enough to be a viable market. Very few other States are in a similar situation, and the State of California rejected the two-car strategy in any case. It is also important to remember that the waiver was granted to allow stricter air pollution standards; not to evade the law.

The administration of a two-car strategy would be a nightmare. New auto registration mechanisms would have to be implemented. Those cars without emission controls could not go into areas where controls are required, which would restrict the movement of the owners. The owner would also need to retrofit or replace his car if he moved, and sale of the car would have similar restraints. Even these restrictions might appear acceptable, until one looks at the relative percentages of controlled versus uncontrolled vehicles. One study being funded by the National Science Foundation estimates that 70 percent of the autos would need controls, while 30 percent would not need them. However, the autos in the 30 percent would be under the limitations described above. The Environmental Protection Agency, whose job it is to evaluate these questions, estimates that 85 percent to 90 percent of the automobile population would have to be controlled. I am inclined to agree with the EPA's figure, but the magnitude of the problem is the same.

Mr. Speaker, there are others who are more knowledgeable on this subject, than I. This is an issue that has been given a great deal of attention by two rather divergent groups, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the National Clean Air Coalition. I respectfully ask that the following analysis of the Wyman amendment by the Environmental Protection Agency and a separate analysis by the National Clean Air Coalition be printed in the RECORD.

The analyses follow:

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY FACT SHEET—WYMAN AMENDMENT

Passage of this measure would not result in significant energy savings, but would have serious environmental implications.

ENERGY IMPACTS

Supporters of the bill state it would result in fuel savings of 17-20%. This claim is inconsistent with fuel economy facts.

1975 catalyst equipped cars (60-70% of 1975 new car sales) will have approximately the same fuel economy with or without catalysts.

GM and EPA estimate potential fuel economy increases from decontrol of 1973-74 model year cars in the range of 5-7%.

However, to check feasibility of decontrol, EPA asked 8 garages to remove emission controls from a group of tuned-up cars and a 3.5% loss in fuel economy resulted. Auto-

mobile manufacturers also stress the importance of proper performance of decontrol.

Average fuel economy penalty of control devices on 1968-72 cars is much less than current models—approximately 5%; of this penalty it is estimated that at most 2-3% is recoverable by decontrol.

Assuming that 100% of the vehicles are successfully decontrolled, a fuel economy savings of about 3% might be obtained, rather than the 20% savings claimed by some supporters of the bill.

AIR QUALITY IMPACTS

The bill limits designation of regulated areas to 13 cities. EPA data show that 66 cities will experience violations of health standards for carbon monoxide or oxidant without emission controls. These cities contain roughly two-thirds of the automobiles and population in the nation (see attached list of cities). The only effective enforcement system would have to be Statewide, for each State containing one or more of the 66 cities. This would then cover 85-90% of the U.S. population. (See next page.)

In "clean" cities, pollutant concentrations of both CO and oxidants would double by 1977 under Wyman bill provisions.

There would be a strong incentive to buy dirty cars, even in heavily polluted areas. Ambient air concentrations of CO and oxidants would rise 10-15% from normal household relocation movements and even more due to imperfect enforcement.

The bill would greatly expand the need for transportation control measures and restrictions on new emission sources to counteract decontrol of auto emission devices.

While fuel savings from this measure are minor or non-existent it is clear that the air quality impact is significant.

ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS

The Wyman amendment as presently structured is unenforceable. This problem is heightened by the incentive for urban residents to buy dirty cars that are cheaper.

The bill requires States to develop an enforcement program in 60 days. From previous experience, EPA projects a minimum of 15 months is needed to adopt new registration procedures and laws for implementing, enforcing and administering these procedures.

Since a State enforcement effort could not be put in place until the effective expiration date of the bill in 1977, Federal enforcement would be necessary.

Even under Federal enforcement, every controlled area would have to establish a mandatory vehicle inspection program and meet other requirements which could not be put in place within 60 days.

It would be necessary to prohibit new car dealers in polluted regions from stocking or selling the exempt "dirty" cars, rather than expect dealers to enforce. Such a prohibition would lead people to travel a few miles to buy the cheaper car—with possibly disastrous impacts on the city dealer's business.

The only feasible enforcement strategy which could be implemented quickly is on a uniform statewide basis, using Statewide auto registration systems. States with problem cities would have clean cars throughout the States—as California does now. States without areas violating health standards would be decontrolled. Under this system 85-90% of the vehicle population would have to be fully controlled. Thus, the only quick enforcement mechanism of Statewide uniformity would allow decontrol on only 10-15% of the nation's automobiles.

AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURER RESPONSE

The feasibility of a two car strategy has been studied by EPA and it was found that the complexity of manufacturing, marketing and distribution of automobiles increased significantly with more than two control areas.

Manufacturer production plans and EPA

certification of 1975 models is well under way. No significant decontrol of these models could be expected until February of 1975.

This strategy causes special problems for smaller manufacturers—American Motors stated that it could not accommodate more than 10 control areas.

Ford maintains there is a tenfold to twentyfold increase in marketing complexity when controlled areas are extended outside California. The probable marketing cost increases have not yet been estimated.

Manufacturers expressed doubts as to the adequacy of service and availability of parts for controlled cars outside the designated areas.

It seems unreasonable to require nationwide distribution of unleaded gasoline under a 2-car strategy, yet without nationwide availability, the mobility of the clean car driver is severely restricted.

TABLE 1.—AQCR'S EXCEEDING CO AND OXIDANT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

AQCR	CO	Oxidant
Albuquerque	X	X
Atlanta	X	X
Atlantic City	X	X
Austin	X	X
Baltimore	X	X
Beaumont	X	X
Birmingham	X	X
Boston	X	X
Buffalo	X	X
Charleston W. Va.	X	X
Charlotte	X	X
Chicago	X	X
Cincinnati	X	X
Cleveland	X	X
Columbus	X	X
Corpus Christi	X	X
Dallas	X	X
Dayton	X	X
Denver	X	X
Des Moines	X	X
El Paso	X	X
Fairbanks	X	X
Fresno	X	X
Honolulu	X	X
Houston	X	X
Indianapolis	X	X
Indio	X	X
Jacksonville	X	X
Kansas City	X	X
Las Vegas	X	X
Los Angeles	X	X
Louisville	X	X
Memphis	X	X
Miami	X	X
Milwaukee	X	X
Minneapolis	X	X
Mobile	X	X
Monterey	X	X
Nashville	X	X
New York	X	X
Norfolk	X	X
Oklaoma City	X	X
Omaha	X	X
Paducah	X	X
Philadelphia	X	X
Phoenix	X	X
Pittsburgh	X	X
Portland, Oreg.	X	X
Providence	X	X
Richmond, Va.	X	X
Rochester, N.Y.	X	X
Sacramento	X	X
St. Louis	X	X
Salt Lake City	X	X
San Antonio	X	X
San Diego	X	X
San Francisco	X	X
Seattle	X	X
Spokane	X	X
Springfield, Mass.	X	X
Syracuse	X	X
Tampa	X	X
Toledo	X	X
Tulsa	X	X
Wichita	X	X
Washington, D.C.	X	X

¹ Transportation controls required.

FACT SHEET: THE WYMAN AMENDMENT

Representative Louis Wyman (R-N.H.) has introduced legislation to suspend the federal auto emission standards and permit the removal of emission controls on vehicles in use through June 30, 1977, throughout the United States except in the Boston, Wash-

ington, New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New Haven, and the Phoenix-Tucson metropolitan areas and in five metropolitan areas of California. NCAC opposes the Wyman amendment for the following reasons:

1. Removal of emission controls by most garages will result in a fuel penalty rather than a fuel economy gain. The Environmental Protection Agency had numerous garages including those specializing in the removal of emission control devices remove the emission controls from various 1973/74 automobiles. The resultant change in fuel economy was an average fuel penalty of 3.5%.

2. The Wyman amendment would mean huge increases in air pollution for most cities and communities in the country. For the next three years new automobiles would be allowed to be sold without emission control devices in all but a few cities. Coupled with the removal of existing control devices the adoption of the Wyman amendment would mean a huge increase in auto pollution for many cities and lead to violation of the health related air quality standards in some sixty six cities according to EPA estimates.

3. Removal of emission controls can void auto warranties. Changes in carburetor air/fuel ratio, ignition timing, compression ration, and exhaust gas recirculation can cause mechanical durability problems including valve and piston failure. The five year, 50,000 mile Clean Air Warranty for emission controls will also be void.

4. Emission controls do not necessarily cause fuel penalties. Cars weighing less than 3,500 pounds have actually gained 3% in fuel economy due to better carburetion to control emissions. According to General Motors, 1975 vehicles equipped with catalytic converters will gain 13% in fuel economy. Recent certification tests have been shown a fuel gain of over 25% in some models. Other emission controls such as fuel injection also improve fuel economy. Fuel efficient alternative engines like the stratified charge meet the emission standards without fuel penalties.

5. The Wyman amendment would also lead to further degradation of air quality in cities with very serious auto pollution problems e.g. Los Angeles which Representative Wyman claims his amendment is not intended to affect.

a) Cars registered outside the excluded metropolitan areas make a substantial number of trips within the boundary of those metropolitan areas.

b) It is extremely difficult if not impossible to control the resale of automobiles without emission control devices in cities with major automobile pollution problems. California with ten years experience in this problem has been unable to effectively control the resale of cars.

c) 1975 model vehicles which will be using catalytic converters require non-leaded gasoline. Unleaded gasoline and repair parts for these model years might become scarce in areas where cars without emission control devices were sold. This would cause substantial problems for urban travelers.

6. The average fuel penalty associated with emission controls is small in comparison with other factors. Increased vehicle weight causes the largest fuel penalty. A 2,500 pound car gets twice the gas mileage of a 5,000 pound car. Since 1962 standard size passenger cars have gained about 800 pounds and suffered a 16% fuel penalty (1 to 2% for each 100 pounds). Air conditioners cause a fuel penalty of 9 to 20%. Automatic transmissions cause a fuel penalty of 2 to 15%.

7. Auto owners must pay for the removal of the emission controls—\$25 for the average car according to an Environmental Protection Agency Survey. If the owner subsequently moves to an area where emission standards are enforced he or she must pay at least \$25 more to have the emission controls reinstalled.

INFLATION MUST BE CONTROLLED

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, every American has been touched by the extreme rate of inflation during 1973. The Consumer Price Index increased 8.8 percent, the highest rate of increase since 1947. The Wholesale Price Index jumped 18.2 percent, the largest increase since 1946. For most consumers, it has brought a lowering of living standards and in many cases actual suffering. It is no exaggeration to say that inflation was the single most important economic problem consumers faced in 1973.

At this time, we are looking straight down the gun barrel of continuing inflationary forces and we therefore must have some mechanism to protect the public. This is why I voted in the Banking and Currency Committee on Friday April 5 against the tabling of all consideration of wage-price controls. The committee's action in tabling all such consideration came as a major disappointment to me. I fear that the American consumer is going to find himself faced with a tremendously increased rate of inflation after April 30, when the Cost of Living Council is dissolved, and I feel that we must have some controls to protect the public.

In 1973, prices in the United States rose faster than any other time since 1947. The cost of food rose 22.1 percent, gasoline and motor oil 18.6 percent, and fuel oil 44.7 percent. Consumers are quite correct in their perception that the 1973 inflation was quite widespread among essential consumer commodities and services, with food, housing, clothing, transportation, and fuel increasing at unprecedented rates.

Consumer purchasing power has not kept pace with inflation and the cost of living during 1973, with all measures of real purchasing power falling throughout 1973. Lower income consumers, and those on fixed income, have been hurt the most by the 1973 inflation because a high proportion of their purchases are concentrated in food, housing, and fuel, items which were particularly susceptible to increased prices.

There is no indication that the rate of inflation at this time will moderate in the coming months. Rather, the real purchasing power of consumers is likely to further decline. A point of fact, the Government wholesale price index rose by another 1.3 percent in March. This latest jump was the second largest monthly increase since 1951. Yet in this same period, the buying power of the average worker dropped six-tenths of 1 percent to a level almost 4.5 percent below that of a year ago.

As I have already indicated, food prices in 1973 soared to a 22.1 percent increase, almost eight times the average annual rate of increase since the 1960's. Increases in meat prices were the most single cause of this food price spiral, with vegetables and fruits the second most important area of food price inflation. It

should be noted that food was the major area of inflation during 1973, contributing 51 percent of the overall inflation measured by the CPI. The difference in a trip to the supermarket today as compared to a year ago is staggering. Bread has gone on a national average from 25 cents a loaf to well over 32 cents, an increase of well over 28 percent. Hamburger has gone from a national average of 78 cents per pound to well over \$1. Substitute staples for meat, like dried navy beans, a rich source of protein, has proven of little solace for the besieged consumer in that it has risen almost 600 percent in the past year alone. A dozen eggs has gone from 74 cents per dozen on a national average to over 93 cents per dozen. Most tragically, the figures that I am discussing today will already be out of date by the time this speech is reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Accordingly, we must have some controls. The fixed-income retiree, the blue-collar wage earner, and even the relatively affluent white-collar worker, all are suffering the ravages of inflation, ravages from which they must be protected. That is why I was so disappointed at the action taken April 5 by the Banking and Currency Committee.

BUCHWALD ON THE GREAT CUBAN CIGAR EMBARGO

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Art Buchwald, the renowned chomper of cigars, has dared to question U.S. policy regarding one of his favorite brands. His daring is characteristically indirect. Yet it manages to shed light, at least a small orange glow, on a much greater and very serious subject: the insanity of continuing American persecution of Cuba at the same time we are considering which of the Communist giants, Russia or China, to bless with most-favored-nation economic and trade status.

I commend Mr. Buchwald's vignette to the attention of my colleagues:

CIGAR EMBARGO A SMOKESCREEN

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—I went to Canada the other day and was shocked to see that the Canadians were selling Cuban cigars.

"How can you sell Cuban cigars," I asked a friend in Toronto, "when the United States, your closest ally and friend, has an embargo on them?"

"What's wrong with selling Cuban cigars?" he asked.

"What's wrong with selling Cuban cigars?" I said angrily. "Don't you know that Cuba is a Communist country?"

"So is the Soviet Union," he replied. "That doesn't seem to bother you in selling Pepsi Cola to them or in buying their vodka. Just out of curiosity—what good is the embargo on Cuban cigars?"

"It's our way of showing Cuba we will not stand for military dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere," I said.

"What about the military dictatorships in Brazil, Chile and Paraguay?" he asked.

"They don't make Cuban cigars," I re-

torted. "It seems to me that Canada should be as concerned about communism as the United States."

"Well," said my friend, "if you're so concerned about communism, how come you keep sending Kissinger to China?"

"One-third of the people in the world live in China. We can't ignore them even though we don't agree with their system of government. Besides China is a long way from the United States. Cuba is just around the corner."

My Canadian friend was not convinced.

He said, "Do you know who buys most of the Cuban cigars in Canada?"

"Who?"

"Americans. The Americans come up here and smuggle them back into the United States."

"I don't believe you," I said. "No American would smoke a Cuban cigar while the embargo was on."

"It's true. Cuban cigars are much too expensive for Canadian tastes. Besides, we don't buy them here because they're too easy to get. But it's a big deal for an American to get a real Havana. By the way, do you want to smuggle back some Cuban cigars with you?"

"How much are they?" I asked.

"The cheapest Monte Christos are a dollar apiece."

"All right, I'll take back one box with me just to show the people in Washington how fickle our friends in Canada really are."

AID TO DISABLED VETERANS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing corrective legislation remedying a critical oversight in present regulations regarding payments to disabled veterans.

Under existing statute—section 360, title 38, United States Code—a veteran who, as a result of a service-connected disability loses the use of one eye, an ear, or a kidney and later, through a nonservice-connected disability loses the use of his other eye, ear, or kidney, not the result of the veteran's own willful misconduct, is eligible for compensation as if both disabilities were service-connected.

It has recently come to my attention that this rule does not apply to a veteran who loses the use of an arm or a leg by reason of a service-connected disability and subsequently loses the use of his second limb or extremity.

The existing law applicable to the loss of an eye, ear, or kidney acknowledges that the loss of one limb imposes excessive stress and strain on the remaining limb, making the remaining limb more susceptible to malfunction and loss of use.

Accordingly, the legislation I am introducing today provides full disability payments for those veterans who are double amputees, having lost one leg or arm in a service-connected disability and their other leg or arm at a subsequent date without any willful misconduct on their part.

If a disabled veteran is fully compensated for the loss of a precious organ

such as his eye, ear, or kidney, it is only equitable to fully compensate veterans who have lost an equally precious arm or leg.

Mr. Speaker, evaluating needs, few can deny that our disabled veterans deserve the highest priority. While we can never fully compensate these men for their selfless patriotism, we must do whatever we can to provide for their welfare.

Several of my colleagues including Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. WOLFF have joined me in introducing this legislation. I welcome their support seeking to correct this blatant inequity and invite my colleagues to join us in this endeavor.

CONTROVERSY ON RAIL REORGANIZATION ACT

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, ever since the effects of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act started to become obvious to the many parties concerned, there has been a great deal of controversy about the act and the report of the Secretary of Transportation that was mandated by the act. I opposed the act last fall when this Congress approved it. Now, when the consequences of the act are apparent, there seems to be more opposition than there was last fall.

I would like to place in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Public Service Commission of Indiana regarding the Transportation Secretary's report. I believe that the acts of Congress in the field of transportation are in dire need of a critical review.

RESOLUTION OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF INDIANA

Whereas, A Report By The Secretary of Transportation of the United States entitled "Rail Service in the Midwest and Northeast Region," has been published and has resulted in extensive public hearings on the recommendations contained therein; and

Whereas, said Report recommends major restructuring and abandonment of many miles of railroad trackage in the State of Indiana; and

Whereas, the implementation of the recommendations contained in said report will cause irreparable damage to the growing economy of the State of Indiana; and

Whereas, the Public Service Commission of the State of Indiana, a body created by law and charged with major responsibilities in the area of railroad regulation is opposed to the present set of recommendations and wishes to be of record in the current hearing proceedings as in opposition thereto.

Now therefore be it resolved by the Public Service Commission of the State of Indiana that the statement of position attached to this formal resolution and made a part hereof be forwarded to the Rail Services Planning Office to be made a part of the record of the official proceedings of the hearings conducted on the Report in the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, from March 11, 1974, through March 15, 1974, by the assigned examiner Mr. Paul Fitzpatrick, from the Interstate Commerce Commission, and further that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to all members of the Congress of the United States

representing the citizens of the State of Indiana.

Done this 22nd day of March, 1974, at the office of the Public Service Commission of the State of Indiana.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID WITHERS
GAVIN

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago my home State of Mississippi and the Nation lost a pioneer in the field of journalism and radio broadcasting with the untimely death of David Withers Gavin, of Quitman, Miss. He became associated with the family owned Clarke County Tribune in 1921 and became editor of the newspaper in 1936 and remained as such until his recent death. He became owner and manager of Radio Station WCOC in Meridian, in 1930, and affiliated with CBS, an affiliation which was honored by the Columbia Broadcasting System at a banquet in New York for 30 years of continuous service. Mr. Speaker, what I regret most is the loss of a close and warm personal friend. Withers Gavin's sage advice and counsel served me well over the years. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family and many friends in Mississippi. I would also like to share with my colleagues the announcement of his death as it appeared in the Clarke County Tribune:

DAVID WITHERS GAVIN

(By Bea Huff)

The editorial pen of David Withers Gavin was suddenly silenced last Wednesday morning by a heart attack which struck following the performance of his duties preparatory to publishing The Clarke County Tribune. This initial attack occurred as he was leaving the Tribune office. He was rushed to the Quitman hospital where the fatal attack occurred Saturday afternoon at 2:40 o'clock.

Mr. Gavin was born in Yantley, Alabama. He attended Corinth High School and Mississippi A & M College (now Mississippi State University) and received a Bachelor of Oratory degree from Chicago Musical College.

He began his newspaper career in 1921 in association with his father, R. S. Gavin, who was then editor of the Tribune, and this association continued until his father's death in 1936. From that time to this, Mr. Gavin has been actively engaged as editor and owner in the publication of this newspaper, and in so doing has commanded high respect as a citizen of a town and county which has always been very dear to his heart.

His career also carried him into the fields of radio and television. He was owner and manager of Radio Station WCOC in Meridian from December 1930 until October 1973, and began the operation of one of the first television stations in Mississippi, WCOC-TV, in 1952.

His service to the CBS network of which Radio Station WCOC was a part, was recognized and acknowledged when the nationwide network carried a special tribute to him for his 30 years of continuous affiliation with CBS. A banquet was held in his honor in New York City on this occasion. Unable to attend himself, his coveted gold microphone was accepted on his behalf by Bob Dickerson, well-known CBS personality. When he sold his Radio Station in Meridian last year,

Arthur Godfrey also paid tribute to him for his service.

Mr. Gavin was considered quite influential and prominent in political circles and served as a colonel on six gubernatorial staffs. He was named to his place of honor by Governors Thomas Bailey, Fielding Wright, James Coleman, John Bell Williams, William Waller, and was twice-honored by Hugh White.

He was a member of the Mississippi Press Association, the Mississippi Broadcasters Association, the Meridian Rotary Club, and the First Baptist Church in Meridian.

In his more than fifty years of active publication of the Clarke County Tribune, his contributions to his profession and the community he loved so dearly have been numerous and precious and his passing will be felt in all walks of life, but his words of praise for Clarke County and her citizens will remain paramount in the minds and hearts of those who knew and loved him best.

Funeral services were held Monday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock from Wright's Funeral Home in Quitman with Dr. Beverly Tinnin, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Meridian, and Rev. Selby Alsworth, pastor of the First United Methodist Church, Quitman, officiating.

He is survived by his beloved wife, Mrs. Maude Carter Gavin, his constant companion through the years; and two aunts, Miss Bessie Brock and Mrs. Kate Powell, both of Yantley, Alabama. Interment was in Magnolia Cemetery in Meridian.

Withers Gavin is dead. He has signed -30- to life's final stanza, but his good works are indelibly written on the countless newspaper columns he left behind.

YOUNG CHAMPION

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, a champion returned to her hometown in Greenwich, Conn., last week to receive the well deserved cheers and praise of those who claim her as their own. At only 17, Dorothy Hamill has skated her way to the U.S. figure skating championship and earned a silver medal in the World Figure Skating Championships in Munich, Germany. I think it only fitting that the Congress of this Nation, which she represented so well, join the people of Greenwich in paying tribute to Dorothy Hamill—one of the finest figure skaters in the world today.

The sacrifices that Ms. Hamill made in achieving her goal serve as an inspiration to young and old alike who seek to obtain excellence. At the age of 12 she was ready to quit in frustration over the painfully slow process involved in developing into a championship skater. But after moving to Colorado to train year round, Ms. Hamill spent long hours of daily practice perfecting the skills and techniques which gained her the U.S. championship and a second place finish in Munich. Even now, she plans to continue training and enter the national competition next year, despite her automatic qualification for the world events due to her outstanding performance this year.

In Greenwich, thousands of admirers lined the streets and packed the high school gymnasium to award her a \$2,000 scholarship, a lifetime pass to the town's recreational facilities, dedicate the local skating rink in her name and permanently commemorate April 5 as "Dorothy Hamill Day."

I would like to join her family and friends in congratulating Dorothy Hamill for her outstanding accomplishments and wish her a long reign as the queen of American figure skating.

DÉTENTE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

DÉTENTE

From the edge of the crowd the woman nervously moved forward, patiently listened to me respond to several questions, and then blurted out her question: "Are the Russians our friends or our enemies?" Her question reflects the doubts and the confusion over one of the slipperiest words in circulation—"detente."

In the lingo of the diplomats, detente refers to the easing of tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Detente was born in the 1960's and translated into concrete agreements in the 1970's. It sprang from a mutual desire for more harmonious relations, rests not on trust but on equilibrium of power, suffers from differing views about it, and is today at a critical juncture.

The accomplishments of detente, not much talked about in these days of a renewed sense of rivalry and frustration, are nonetheless worth remembering. The ideological fervor and the high-pitched rhetoric of antagonism that earlier marked Soviet-American relations have subsided, and the atmosphere has improved. The President went to Moscow in 1972 and Communist Party leader Brezhnev came to Washington in 1973. The German question has been substantially settled and the 1972 agreements regulate the competition for offensive nuclear weapons and virtually eliminate the defensive weapons. Since 1971 U.S.-Soviet trade has jumped sevenfold.

The failures of detente are also important and have caused many Americans to have second thoughts about a policy of detente. The conferences on mutual and balanced force reductions and European security are deadlocked; the strategic arms limitation talks could not get off dead center even with Kissinger's trip to Moscow; the two superpowers compete now for influence in the Middle East and soon will be competing in South Asia; and the U.S. does not like certain domestic policies (e.g. emigration of Jews) of the Soviet Union.

President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger, who are the chief architects of the policy of detente, argue the necessity of it because of the unacceptability of nuclear war, and contend that only such a policy serves the long range goal of evolving more normal and responsible conduct by the Soviet leadership. The prevention of war is the capstone of the policy of detente. Part of this policy has been a refusal to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Soviet Union, for example by not condemning Moscow's repres-

April 10, 1974

sive policies toward the Jews or the Soviet author Alexander Solzhenitsyn. Their view is that, although they do not approve of such measures, American foreign policy cannot transform the domestic structure of the Soviet Union, and the best way to change Soviet policy is not by confrontation, but by quiet diplomacy seeking ever-deepening cooperation and making progress wherever possible. In the long run this cooperation will be a more effective liberalizing influence in the Soviet Union than isolation and lack of contact.

The critics of the President's detente policy complain that defining detente only in terms of preventing nuclear war is too narrow, and that a true peace can only be built on a moral consensus. They insist that the U.S. demand Soviet liberalization as a price of detente. The place to begin is to link trade with the Soviet Union to Soviet action in allowing Jews to emigrate. This view argues for a "morality" in our foreign policy, and claims that the U.S. is paying an unnecessarily high price for a limited and unstable detente, with the Soviet Union getting credits, wheat and strategic arms advantage.

My view has been to support the policy of detente, even though the balance sheet on detente is mixed, and the contradiction between progress and setback cannot be fully resolved. It is best to keep in mind that the American-Soviet relation will continue to be tense, competitive and unstable, with some cooperation and some conflict, elements of the "cold war" and elements of "detente," and, even as we reach out for more dialogue and expanding cooperation, we must keep our guard up.

It is a mistake, then, to expect too much from detente. Some persons have come to think that it signaled the end of all the old enmities. But the recent failures of detente have brought out the cold fact that detente, although not a move that is wrong—indeed it makes all kinds of sense—does have limits. At this stage it cannot be expected to block Russian efforts to pursue advantages at our expense.

We will have a more realistic perception of that slippery word "detente" and a better understanding of our complex relations with the Soviet Union if we understand that detente has not really altered the nature of the Soviet Union, but rather is a painfully slow process, extending over many years, with successes and reversals, whose central purpose is to reduce the danger of nuclear wars by dampening down military competition and encouraging restraints. We can expect some dangerous curves in the road to accommodation.

AMNESTY

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current debate over amnesty for draft evaders and deserters, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of our colleagues a statement which I issued on this subject on February 28, 1972.

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Third District Rep. Jack Brinkley says that he is definitely opposed to amnesty for draft evaders and deserters "whether in Canada, Sweden or Timbucto."

"A counter-tide is now running," Rep. Brinkley insisted, "to the new-lefts' clamor for amnesty."

The Columbus lawmaker pointed to a Sense of Congress Resolution that he and other congressmen are co-sponsoring which provides:

"... that no pardon, reprieve, or amnesty be enacted by the Congress or exercised by the President with respect to persons who are in violation of the Military Selective Service Act because of their refusal to register for the draft and/or their refusal to be inducted, or being a member of the Armed Forces, fled to a foreign country to avoid further military service..."

In discussing the legislation Rep. Brinkley said, "Although the Vietnam war is an unpopular war, I believe that any proposal to grant amnesty involves a moral issue that has nothing to do with the arguments concerning the justification of this tragic conflict."

"Amnesty would be grossly unfair to the hundreds of thousands of American men who met their responsibilities as citizens and served their country with honor," he explained.

Rep. Brinkley averred "that amnesty would undermine our Democratic system because it would reward those who deliberately violated the law of the land and shirked their duties to their country."

The Brinkley co-sponsored legislation has been referred to the House Armed Services Committee—of which Rep. Brinkley is a member—for consideration.

As an honorary member of the Kiwanis Club of Columbus, Ga., I have taken special note of a resolution which it passed expressing opposition to general amnesty. The views of this outstanding organization are remarkably similar to mine and provide an added perspective from level-headed citizens. The remarks of Mrs. Ruth Wall contained in the letter of transmittal are also very relevant to the high degree of concern that justice be done, under the law.

KIWANIS CLUB OF COLUMBUS,
Columbus, Ga., March 30, 1974.

DEAR JACK: Never in all my experience have I seen a resolution passed so quickly and with so much enthusiasm. There was only one vote against it.

Our membership at this time is 188, and there were approximately 145 in attendance on the date the resolution was adopted.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH WALL.

MEMORANDUM OF RESOLUTION ADOPTED

At the regular meeting of the Kiwanis Club of Columbus, held March 26, 1974, the following resolution, expressing opposition to granting general amnesty for draft evaders, was presented and adopted by the general membership:

"Whereas, the fighting in Vietnam and Southeast Asia has changed its pattern and prisoners of war have been released and amnesty is now being advocated by some for draft evaders and deserters; and

"Whereas, millions of young Americans have served honorably in the armed forces under extremely difficult conditions and many of these were wounded, injured or killed, or are still missing, and the hard duty that the draft evaders and deserters avoided was and is being performed by other young men who accepted their responsibility and duty to their country; therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Kiwanis Club of Columbus, in regular meeting assembled, declare its opposition to any action by the Congress of the United States or any other body or person which would grant general amnesty to those who have unlawfully avoided military service or have deserted therefrom."

Motion was made, seconded and carried to send a copy of said resolution to the sena-

tors and representatives in Washington, D.C., and to each of the local civil clubs for their information and guidance.

KIWANIS CLUB OF COLUMBUS,
CAREY O. BRINSON,

President.

REPORT ON HEART DISEASE "FORGOTTEN" FOR A YEAR AND A HALF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare last week released a report on health diseases which reflects, I think, the low priority which health has in this administration.

Despite the fact that this report came from a Presidential panel and deals with recommendations on how we may better fight heart disease, which is the Nation's No. 1 killer, the report was released a year and a half after it was completed.

According to the story, an HEW spokesman said the report was delayed because it had been forgotten. Although HEW does not agree that the National Heart, Lung and Blood Act should be funded at the levels established in the law by the Congress, I find it hard to reconcile how something as important to the health of the American public could have been forgotten for more than a year and a half.

Because the report recommends more activity than HEW thinks is necessary, I wonder if the report was not repressed.

I would like to include in the RECORD the story on the panel's report.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1974]

PRESIDENTIAL PANEL'S REPORT CALLS FOR AN EXPANDED EFFORT AGAINST HEART DISEASE

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—The report of a Presidential study panel calling for a much expanded national effort against heart disease was made public today a year and a half after it was completed.

A spokesman for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare said the 130-page report by the President's advisory panel on heart disease had simply been forgotten during most of last year. Before that, he and other Government officials conceded, publication was delayed because some of the report's recommendations conflicted with Administration policy.

A major issue appears to have been the nation's needs for trained manpower to cope with heart disease, the group of illnesses that kill more Americans than any other cause of death.

The panel recommended Federal funding for a research professorship in heart and circulatory system studies at each of the roughly 100 medical schools in the United States. It also recommended funding for 50 professional research groups each consisting of several scientists, and expanded Federal support for the training of young scientists.

LOWER FUNDING LEVEL

Last year, while the report was under consideration, the Administration was seeking to eliminate Federal support for the training of medical scientists on the ground that there was already a surplus. Under

Congressional pressure, medical research fellowships and traineeships were reinstated, but at a lower funding level than in recent years.

Another important issue appears to have been that of the total cost of the program outlined in the advisory panel's report. No over-all figures were given in the report, but the total cost would clearly have been substantially greater than the roughly \$300-million appropriation level of the National Heart and Lung Institute, the Federal Government's main agency for research and related efforts in this field.

In answer to a question, Dr. John S. Mills, chairman of the advisory panel, said his group did not try to define the over-all costs of the program because they did not have time to do so in the six months allotted for their study. The first complete draft of the report was submitted on Sept. 1, 1972, and the final draft a month later, he said.

Dr. Mills is president of the National Fund for Medical Education, a philanthropic foundation. His panel consisted of 20 physicians, many of them nationally known in the fields of heart disease and other related subjects.

NECESSITY FOR ACTION

They advocated an integrated program to increase scientific knowledge of heart disease, to facilitate the translation of that knowledge into medical practice and its delivery into patient care and the training of adequate numbers of professionals and allied health personnel to serve the nation's needs in heart disease research, treatment and prevention.

Noting that more than a million Americans a year die of heart disease and that about a quarter of the deaths occur before age 65, the report said there could be no doubt of either the necessity or the urgency of action. The panel said, however, that need was not the only basis for its call for "vigorous action."

"The principal basis is the firm belief that we stand at a particularly important point in the history of biomedical science and of the practice of medicine," the panel report said. "Never before have the odds for achieving major advances seemed so favorable nor the opportunities so challenging."

About the time the panel submitted its report, Congress passed a law calling for a major effort against heart disease and instructing the heart institute to draw up a national plan for that effort. The plan, delivered to the Administration in the spring of 1973 and to Congress in July, overshadowed the effort of the President's advisory panel, but many of the panel's recommendations were incorporated in the national plan.

That plan, which totaled 10 volumes in its printed version was criticized sharply by the Administration for advocating the spending of more money on heart disease than was called for in the President's budget.

Asked earlier this week about his panel's report, Dr. Mills said he had no idea why its release had been delayed so long.

"I was highly curious," he said.

NEW VA HOSPITAL

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in October of 1972, a new VA hospital was dedicated in Tampa, Fla. We were all glad to have this addition to the Tampa Bay community, as the veteran population in Florida has been growing each year.

George Hiskey was named Director of this fine new facility.

Getting a new hospital going is always a difficult chore. However, I believe the Director and staff of the Tampa VA hospital have done an exemplary job in serving the veterans of America.

Since its dedication in 1972, the hospital has grown. It serves a geographical area extending across Florida from the Gulf of Mexico to the Atlantic coast. There are over 250,000 veterans in this area who rely on the Tampa VA hospital for hospitalization and/or outpatient care. For example, in 1973, the Tampa hospital had approximately 80,000 visits and anticipates about 120,000 visits in 1974.

Recently, two veterans, Richard Vale and John Boutya of Tampa, have written to me to tell me of the sympathetic and efficient care they received at the Tampa VA hospital. Following are the texts of the letters they wrote.

At this time, I want to personally commend George Hiskey and his entire staff for the fine service they give the veterans of America.

The letters follow:

TAMPA, FLA.,
April 4, 1974.

Congressman SAM GIBBONS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Recent newspaper articles which report deficiencies in the Veteran's Administration prompt me to comment on my personal experiences with the V.A.

In September 1967, I retired from the Air Force and immediately enrolled as a freshman at U.S.F. I applied for the V.A. educational benefits and after a reasonable delay started receiving the monthly allowance. After receiving the first check, they came regularly until I graduated in August 1970.

During the time I was at U.S.F., I met many ex-servicemen who were receiving V.A. benefits. I can recall but few instances of griping over the services and these instances were usually due to a change in student status: i.e., a change from "full-time" to less than full-time attendance, which requires a recomputation of the monthly allowance.

In August of 1969, I sought medical aid from the U.S.A.F. Hospital at MacDill A.F.B. for correction of a hemorrhoidal condition which first occurred while on active duty with the Air Force. I was refused treatment of any kind.

During October 1973, I sought medical aid for the condition at the V.A. Hospital here in Tampa. After an earnest attempt to correct the condition with medication, I was admitted to the Hospital and the surgery was performed.

I have since been released from the V.A. Hospital after successful surgery. A critique of the services that I received and the attitude and efficiency of the entire staff would receive an A-plus rating.

I am writing this letter to you because I know it was through your efforts that the V.A. Hospital was located here, and if the critics gang up on you at least you have one defender.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. VALE,

MARCH 23, 1974.

DEAR SIR: Recently I had an operation at the V.A. hospital in Tampa. I received very efficient and courteous treatment from the staff!

All I ever hear is complaining statements about the V.A., but when the chips were down they came through; and this is one

former serviceman who deeply appreciates what they did for him!

Maybe the head V.A. man in Washington should know that some of us can also say "thank you"!

My best to you and your family.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. BOUTYA.

LET US BRING NATO UP TO DATE

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on April 4 NATO celebrated its 25th birthday amid high acclaim from both sides of the Atlantic. But the most eloquent testimony to its triumph is the silent witness of the strength and prosperity of the family of nations it has served, which 25 years before had lain divided, prostrate and virtually defenseless before the active threat of Soviet aggression.

Today the Atlantic community forged by NATO stands as a credible counterweight to Soviet strength in Europe. From this strength has been fabricated important and promising beginnings toward an end to bipolar confrontation.

The success of NATO does not mean that the need for a strong alliance is over, but the transformation it has helped achieve does demand that we look anew at the goals and mechanisms forged so long ago, in order to see that they meet the realities and prospects of today. It was this realization which prompted the abortive efforts of Secretary Kissinger to articulate a new declaration of principles to guide the Atlantic alliance. It is this realization which lies behind the effort which I support to reduce the level of U.S. troops committed to NATO today.

I do not call for a troop reduction because I believe that NATO has outlived its usefulness, or because I feel the threat of Soviet aggression is past or has been met, or because I no longer value as primary the importance of our relations with the nations of western Europe. I do so because I firmly believe that unless the alliance is restructured to reflect current realities and the contemporary strengths and interests of member countries, NATO will become progressively weakened and divided and unable to fulfill the objectives to which we have contributed so much in the past.

For this reason I have viewed with increasing concern the narrow perspective and lack of vision of those who for so many years have told us year after year that the United States cannot reduce its troops in Europe without undoing past years of progress, without emboldening the Soviets to new aggression, sapping the resolve of our European allies, and undermining current and future efforts at détente. These fears display a lack of faith in the strength and understanding that NATO has so solidly established and a failure to recognize that unless the purpose and structure of our relationships meets the current goals of all

to realize that our lead in advanced technology—a lead that produced a favorable balance of trade stronger than in any other general area of export—cannot be maintained without a positive and meaningful commitment. What we must also recognize is that other countries throughout the world are no longer willing to take a back seat to the United States in terms of technology advance.

What does this mean in terms of our Nation's space program? Throughout most of the past decade this country has held a clearcut lead in space. We all know of the benefits we have enjoyed in terms of more economical long-distance communications and more accurate weather forecasting, not to mention the many technological spinoffs which are in everyday usage. But what are we doing to provide for continued growth in the field? How are we guaranteeing our future advance? That is my concern.

Let us look, therefore, at some of the major accomplishments of our space program during the past year. Perhaps the most important event of last year was the highly successful Skylab program. The initial unmanned mission and three subsequent manned missions yielded a wealth of information on the Earth, the Sun, and on man in the environment of space, as well as countless data from experiments conducted in space. The three Skylab crews together traveled a total of over 61 million nautical miles, and orbited the Earth 2,475 times in their orbital workshop. While the Apollo project extended man's reach to the Moon, Skylab added near-Earth space to man's domain by confirming that human beings can live and work effectively in space for long periods of time.

As Skylab was demonstrating the importance of near-Earth space, Pioneer 10 was opening up a new era of space exploration of the outer planets. As it swept past Jupiter on December 3, Pioneer 10 made hundreds of scientific measurements of the giant planet, its inner moons, and its famous and mysterious red spot. These observations yielded surprising new data about the largest planet in our solar system and its moons. Pioneer 10 was the first spacecraft to fly beyond the orbit of Mars, the first to penetrate the asteroid belt, and will be the first manmade object ultimately to escape the solar system.

Last year also marked the coming of age of the Earth Resources Technology Satellite (ERTS) program. ERTS-1 has acquired and relayed to Earth over 100,000 multi-spectral scenes of our planet, covering more than a billion square miles. Some examples of the operational values of remote sensing from space are: rapid and accurate measurement and assessment of major floods; snow and water resource management; new geological exploration and mapping important to mineral and petroleum prospecting; first-time surveys of less-developed areas; better management of range, forest, agricultural, and urban lands; rapid environmental surveys of dams, ponds, and strip mines; and lake and waterway pollution monitoring.

One series of ERTS images has even revealed what appears to be a large

wooden structure on the side of Mount Ararat in Turkey, believed by many to be the site where Noah's ark came to rest. Several expeditions are being organized to investigate the structure at close range. The full benefits of the ERTS program have not yet been tallied, but a current study being conducted by the Department of Interior is indicating that very significant returns can be expected from our continuing Earth resources survey program.

Another major milestone of 1973 was the confirmation of our agreement with nine European nations on the development of the Spacelab. Confirmed in September, this agreement states that the Europeans will develop, at their own expense, the laboratory module to be used with the Space Shuttle. This also marks the achievement of a new high level in international cooperation and cost sharing, and will provide a key piece of equipment for the Space Shuttle.

There are some troublesome notes, however. The design and development of the Space Shuttle itself has had several budgetary setbacks. The first manned orbital flight of the shuttle is now expected to occur in the second quarter of 1979, instead of at the end of 1978, a delay of from 4 to 6 months. A firm schedule is extremely important in a large-scale, complex development program like the Space Shuttle and it is this type of setback therefore which must be avoided. We cannot invest time, money, and valuable manpower in a program, only to reduce its funding in midstream. Realizing the importance of rigid time schedules in space research and development, we should be all the more committed to lending our support to the space program through funding authorizations. Even within their budget constraints of recent years, NASA has carried out an aggressive, highly useful, and exciting program in space and aeronautics, fully deserving of congressional as well as national support.

Let us not abandon this program and reduce the steady flow of benefits by forcing even tighter financial restrictions on the Agency.

I know that my colleagues will recognize the shortsightedness of anything less than full support of the NASA authorization. Our space program, as it is addressed to meeting the needs of our "spaceship" Earth, deserves our unqualified vote of confidence.

INFLATION

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the country is in the midst of the worst inflation in a number of years, and our gross national product is dropping sharply, leading many of us to the conclusion that a depression or recession is in the making—even if the President's economic advisers will not admit it.

Despite this distressing picture, the only cries of alarm coming from the administration have resulted from Congress' attempt to roll back oil prices and

provide special unemployment compensation for workers affected by the energy crisis.

This is all the more shocking as the true picture of what is happening unfolds. While the American consumer has been waiting in long gaslines and wrapping up in sweaters at home, the big oil companies have been salting away more and more money.

Exxon earnings for the first quarter were \$705 million, compared to \$508 million last year, for a gain of 38.8 percent.

Texaco enjoyed a percentage gain of 123.2 percent, with earnings jumping from \$264 million to \$589.4 million.

Standard Oil of Indiana reported a profit increase of 81 percent for the quarter, while Gulf Oil Corp. said its net earnings increased 76 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this happened because the administration allowed it to happen.

The President vetoed the emergency energy bill on the grounds that we had to allow profits to oil companies to induce further oil productions. Mr. Speaker, these companies have been able to take care of themselves down through the years, and I just cannot believe we now have to double their profits to keep them in business. And so far they have not increased domestic production. Even the companies themselves seem somewhat embarrassed about the situation.

To add insult to injury, the Federal Energy Office is warning that the already outrageous gas prices may go up another nickel—taking more money out of the pocket of the American consumer.

Where will it stop? Well, it will not stop unless the Congress quickly passes legislation that will roll back prices to a reasonable level. I know efforts are being made in that direction, and I urge this body to move swiftly.

ASSASSINATION OF CUBAN EXILES BY TERRORISTS IN OPPOSITION TO NORMALIZING U.S. RELATIONS WITH CUBA

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the 5th of April, Raul Castro, head of the Cuban Armed Forces, speaking in Cuba said:

The young fighters of the Revolutionary Armed Forces and of the Ministry of Interior are working inside the belly of our enemies, are protecting our interests.

Castro was undoubtedly talking about Cuban Communist activities in the United States as well as in other places. There are many who believe that the two Cuban exiles recently killed, one in Miami, shot through the window as he sat in his living room with his wife looking at television, one in New York, were killed because of their militant opposition to Castro and communism in Cuba. A letter was delivered at the funeral of one of these men to his successor that 11 more Cubans residing in the United States were marked for death.

I have alerted the FBI here to this threat and asked that it be investigated. I have also alerted the staff of the House

financial problems are far from limited to students who opt for a university with a historic name. The cost of attending many run-of-the-mill private colleges now runs to more than \$4,000 a year. These staggering figures are the culmination of more than a decade in which tuition rates at private schools have risen at an annual rate of 6.9 per cent.

The situation is a little better if you live in a state like California, Michigan, Wisconsin, or New York, where you can send a child to a leading state institution for something closer to \$3,000 and not sacrifice much academic prestige. But take a look at the dilemma facing a typical family that has only two children in college (one attending a private school, the other enrolled at the state university). Suddenly they must come up with about \$11,000 in additional income (enough to produce \$8,000 after taxes) to absorb these yearly college costs.

And there is little way most families can get off the hook. Since the era of the immigrant push-cart peddler working 14-hour days to put a son through medical school, parents have been expected to sacrifice to provide the best possible education for their children. This assumption is widely shared by college scholarship offices, middle-class parents, and educational economists (who call these payments "inter-generational transfers"), but the implications of these parental responsibilities are rarely discussed. Children are never asked whether they want parents who scrimp and save to put aside money for their college educations. A father who settled for a much smaller income in order to spend more time with his family probably feels rather guilty about not providing for the educational future of his children.

What is so galling about the financial problems of upper-income families with college-age children is that they are not really recognized by the legion of non-profit "think tanks" who unendingly study the funding of higher education. These analyses (typical is *Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Benefits? Who Should Pay?* issued last year by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education) have two major concerns—the financial problems of the institutions themselves and the plight of the disadvantaged student. Rather than providing any succor for the middle-income—but frequently hard-pressed—parent, the Carnegie report recommends "charging higher tuition to those who can afford to pay it" and using this money to "provide more aid to students from low income families." The Carnegie Commission's quaint notion that only the poor have trouble affording higher education may stem in part from the way they understate college expenses by dealing only with aggregate figures and average costs. Even so, they should have suspected that something might be amiss when they discovered that the median cost of attending a private university in 1972 was a hefty \$3,354.

TRAPPED BY YOUR CHILDREN

As we have observed more than once in this magazine, contemporary America is filled with thousands of white-collar workers trapped in jobs that provide little fulfillment or satisfaction. It is easy to mock the eagerness with which these people seize upon the perquisites of their position—be they glorified titles, Danish modern office furniture, or salaries over \$25,000. Yet many of these people are genuinely afraid of what might happen to their families if they ever stepped out of their secure little niches. The problem is more than just finding a personally rewarding job that would put food on the table and gas in the car. It is also worrying about how they can afford the things that really matter in life—things like paying for the college educations of their children.

For many breadwinners, the fears begin long before the first child is ready for college. Some efforts at saving for college are often

made rather early in the game. But 15 years ago, even the most doting of parents was unlikely to have anticipated that four years at an Ivy League school would today cost more than \$20,000. As a result, many career decisions are undoubtedly premised on the need to produce that additional \$11,000 a year by age 40 to send two children to college. It is difficult to quantify the impact these educational costs may have on the attitudes that many Americans bring to their work. But one can see why a parent would avoid taking any serious risks knowing that Johnny will be starting college in the fall. Employers who have tried to recruit talented people for challenging assignments that involve some financial sacrifice recognize all too well the sincerely meant refusal that begins, "I really would like to do it, but with David at Oberlin and Sandy in high school. . . ."

Obviously, scholarships and loans alleviate some of the unfortunate side-effects of high college costs. Although half the student body at some schools may receive some form of financial aid, it is easy to overstate its impact. It has often been observed that the efforts of many colleges and universities to increase minority group enrollment tightened the availability of scholarship money for other students. Moreover, the size of scholarship funds has not kept pace with the steady increase in college tuition. A new study, *Paying for College*, by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, examines scholarship funds available at nine private colleges (including Harvard, Princeton, MIT and Mount Holyoke) and concludes that even these well-endowed institutions will find it impossible to boost financial aid to meet any future tuition increases. Instead, the report suggests that these limited scholarship funds be supplemented by an increased reliance on federally supported student loans.

Yet an examination of the student loan program indicates that it provides only a limited amount of relief for middle-income parents. The maximum a student can borrow while an undergraduate is \$7,500—just a fraction of the total cost at private and many public institutions. Families with an adjusted income of between \$11,000 and \$15,000 a year are finding it difficult to demonstrate sufficient "need" to qualify for any federally-subsidized loan (repayment is deferred until the student leaves school and the government absorbs all interest above seven per cent.) Although there is another federally guaranteed loan program for families who do not qualify for the interest subsidy, the massive paperwork it requires makes it extremely unpopular with the private lenders who provide most of the funds for government loan programs. Even reform of these programs will provide scant comfort for many middle-income families. New legislation expected to pass Congress this year will do little to help students from families with an adjusted income of more than \$15,000.

FROM MERITOCRACY TO ARISTOCRACY

Underlying the Sloan Foundation report is a sobering message—a generation of democratization at our leading colleges and universities may be at an end. Although the admissions offices at selective Eastern schools used to give strong preference to prep school graduates and the offspring of blue-blooded alumni, by the mid-1960s, even schools like Princeton were making strenuous efforts to admit a significantly broader cross-section of students. With tuition levels and room and board costs considerably lower than they are today and scholarships often available, it became possible for a number of schools to boast, "We make sure that no student we admit is unable to attend because of financial difficulties." Despite the continued commitment of admissions offices to social pluralism, economic realities have begun to swing the pendulum in the other direction. With aid

programs increasingly targeted at the disadvantaged student, the offspring of many middle-income families may no longer be able to attend the more selective private universities, limiting the pool of potential students to the poor and the very comfortable.

Although we are often reluctant to admit it, where you attend college may be almost as important as *whether*. In any economy where there seem to be considerably more talented college graduates than challenging jobs available (especially in such "glamour" fields as publishing and television), it is difficult to deny that an elite degree gives a job applicant a certain edge. (I suspect that if most of us encountered a Harvard graduate driving a taxi, we'd assume he was doing it out of choice, not because he couldn't get a better job.) Banks like the Chase Manhattan have two types of training programs for college graduates. Alumni of New York area schools such as Fordham and Brooklyn College are channeled into the program designed to produce branch managers—a job analogous to running an A&P—in remote sections of Queens. The other program—where three-piece suits and an Ivy League pedigree are the *sine qua non*—is, of course, the training ground for future bank vice presidents.

Public higher education fosters its own elitism as well. A study just released by the admissions office at the University of Michigan revealed that the average undergraduate comes from a family with a yearly income between \$20,000 and \$24,000. One-third of Michigan's class of 1977 come from four upper-income Detroit suburbs which contain less than two per cent of the state's population. Many other states follow some variant of the California model, with a three-tier system of state university campuses, state colleges and community colleges. Since residential institutions are significantly more expensive than commuter schools, it is not surprising that in 1971 about 60 per cent of the students in the University of California system came from families making more than \$12,000 a year, while 60 per cent of the community college students came from families earning less. This means that the wealthier students are the prime beneficiaries of public higher education, since it has been estimated that the state subsidy per student was roughly 250 per cent greater at the University of California than at the community colleges.

SPECIAL PLEADING PURE AND SIMPLE

Since the expenses of attending public and private colleges will continue to rise, there are only two ways that these costs can be absorbed without accelerating the current trend of sorting students out based on their ability to pay. One approach would be to decrease the percentage of an institution's budget that comes from student tuition. The other would be to develop new scholarship or loan programs to offset the inevitable increase in the cost of obtaining a college education.

As a rule of thumb, tuition provides a little less than 20 per cent of the cost of educating a student in a public institution. This 80 percent "tuition gap" is usually made up by appropriations from the state government. For a public institution to roll back tuition (or to even hold the line while costs were rising) would require an increase in this governmental subsidy. Although this solution is not very realistic in an era of tight state budgets, it appeals to many liberals who argue that a college education benefits society as a whole, as well as the individual student. (The foreword to the Carnegie report began with the assertion, "Benefits from higher education flow to all, or nearly all, persons in the United States directly or indirectly. . . ." In contrast, Milton Friedman has said, "I have tried time and again to get

those who make this argument to be specific about alleged social benefits. Almost always the answer is simply bad economics." The conservative economist has labeled this emphasis on these amorphous public benefits as "special pleading pure and simple." According to Carnegie Commission figures, an increase in the public subsidy for college education would disproportionately benefit students from high-income from all but token repayment obligations if they fail to make a certain base amount (say, \$8,400 a year), these loans would not force people to alter their career aspirations (or nonaspirations) to meet the responsibilities of educational debt. Some conservative economists believe that this kind of loan program would enable educational institutions to begin moving closer toward "full-cost tuition" (that is, a system whereby colleges and universities could reduce the gap between tuition and the cost of really educating a student) without limiting college enrollment to just those from high-income families. Such a program would allow state and federal governments to reduce their subsidy of higher education, which disproportionately benefits the upper middle class.

Needless to say, any movement toward full-cost tuition is anathema to orthodox liberals who are wedded to the concept that society is a major beneficiary of college education. However, as a graduate of the University of Michigan, I personally would be hard-pressed to explain to an auto worker how he has benefited from my attending college thanks in large part to his tax payments. This whole question of who pays for college seems to illustrate the basic conflict in liberal philosophy between a genuine concern for lower-income groups and the belief that most societal institutions should be publicly supported. In this case, blue-collar workers lose out as their tax money is being used to fund a highly stratified system of higher education.

COMMUNITY VEGETABLE GARDENS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia is embarking on a program of encouraging community vegetable gardens on vacant city property.

The program, started at Mayor Rizzo's suggestion, will have the added advantage of eliminating unsightly vacant lots in various neighborhoods. Private organizations and firms are cooperating in the program.

The program was designed with the idea of assigning families to certain plots to develop the vegetable gardens. It was actively studied after Mayor Rizzo suggested that a useful way be sought to get rid of eyesore vacant lots.

The program includes instructional sessions in the art of gardening so that the families will be successful in their efforts.

A demonstration was staged Friday, April 5, at 1246 West Harold Street in North Philadelphia, when representatives of the Philadelphia Committee, Garden Clubs of America, joined with recreation department employees to plant trees, shrubs, and flowers on a former vacant lot.

The horticultural society will provide

seeds and plants and the herbs society, herbs and information. Both the horticultural and herbs societies also will participate in the instructional programs for the families.

The Philadelphia Committee of the Garden Clubs of America will assist people when they plant the vegetables and fruits. They also will provide permanent plants and shrubbery for the locations in the fall.

The Pennsylvania State Extension Service plans to develop 4-H clubs from the program. The recreation department is doing some fencing.

The vegetables and fruits that could be planted are many and varied and include such items as beans, beets, collards, carrots, corn, cantaloupes, cucumbers, kale, lettuce, okra, peas, peppers, peanuts, potatoes, pumpkins, spinach, strawberries, tomatoes, watermelons, and herbs, Crawford said.

In addition to the city sites, the horticultural society also is cooperating with some privately owned locations. Crawford said this is the first time the city ever has entered into such a project and he anticipates that the program will be a rewarding experience both mentally and physically for the participants.

SUPPLEMENTARY SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, a new Federal guaranteed income program for the aged, blind, and disabled was instituted across the country in an effort to systematize the various State welfare programs, and remove the social stigma that welfare recipients have unfortunately had to face. This supplementary security income program—SSI—administered by the Social Security Administration, is a major advance in the social legislation of this Nation. Approximately 3.1 million elderly, blind, and disabled citizens who are living far below the poverty level and who are too proud to take what they consider to be demeaning welfare assistance, are now able to receive a guaranteed monthly cash assistance payment with the dignity and comfort to which they are entitled. However, as could be expected with any new program of this complexity, the machinery is not working smoothly yet. As the gears grind and do not mesh properly, tens of thousands of defenseless poor people are faced with hardship, inconvenience, and loss of income. Some of these problems were anticipated, such as the crush of newly eligible applicants who swamped social security offices all over the country in the last few months. Others, such as the reductions in income many people received and the number of checks which never reached their proper recipients, were not expected beforehand. Both kinds of kinks have got to be worked out, and soon, for millions of these people are living well

below the poverty line and every benefit dollar is desperately needed.

I am joining with a number of other Members of Congress from New York in proposing a package of reforms to the SSI laws. I am confident that the House Ways and Means Committee will give them careful and speedy consideration.

The following is an explanation of the bill's provisions: First, it would provide cost-of-living increases in basic SSI benefits, now \$140 a month for a single person living alone, and \$205 for a couple, parallel to the cost-of-living increase provisions of social security. No one today could doubt the necessity of including cost-of-living increases in major income maintenance legislation. From December 1973 to February 1974, the month for which the latest Consumer Price Index statistics are available, the cost-of-living has increased by 2.2 percent. Even if this rate of inflation gets no worse, an unlikely prospect, it would mean that the cost-of-living will increase this year by 12 percent. Cost-of-living increases of such magnitude place the greatest financial burden on those people who live on a fixed income, like SSI, and Congress must help cushion their impact. In those States like New York, California, and 28 others which supplement this basic benefit because of regional cost-of-living differences, the bill would require a similar increase in those State supplement payments. Under present law, only those States which do not supplement the Federal benefit level are entitled to realize such cost-of-living increases, even though these 30 States have fully one-third of all SSI beneficiaries. The concept of providing gradual increases only to those States which do not use their own money to supplement the Federal payments is patently discriminatory and must be changed. If States like New York are using their own tax dollars to try to insure a decent living for SSI beneficiaries, they should not be penalized by having to cope with inflation alone. Surely, in this day of rising prices, the intent of Congress to provide uniform level of benefits across the country cannot be interpreted as an intent to reduce, in effect, the income of SSI recipients in States which supplement the Federal portion, while other States are allowed to catch up. Cost-of-living increases, whether they are automatic or legislated, are in response to an economic need, and should be reflected in the monthly benefit of all SSI recipients. The cost-of-living rises in every State, not only those that fail to supplement their SSI benefits.

Second, the bill would provide food stamps for all SSI recipients, eliminating the option to give cash benefits instead of food stamps. Those States which are currently "cashing out" would have an 18-month transition period.

From October 1972, when the authorizing legislation for SSI was enacted, to February 1974, the cost of food in this country has gone up 26.6 percent. In the 2-month period between December 1973 and February 1974, the increase has been 4.2 percent. In Public Law 93-86, Congress authorized the Department of Agriculture to begin a semiannual review of food prices to reflect changes in

the prices of food as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Food stamps will have been increased three times as a result of the last three reviews, with the third to occur in July 1974. Yet in the five States which are giving SSI recipients the "bonus value" in cash of food stamps, there has been no increase since 1972. Food stamps are more responsive to the food needs of the elderly, blind, and disabled. It is noteworthy in this regard that the Department of Agriculture disregards income and assets of SSI recipients in determining their eligibility for food stamps.

Third, the bill would prevent increases in social security from being counted as income in the computation of SSI benefits. Under current law, SSI benefits are based on other income, so that increases in other income sources produce corresponding decreases in the SSI benefit. Thus, the social security recipient whose benefits are so low that he or she also receives an SSI supplement is faced with a "catch-22" situation whereby the increase in one check is subtracted from the other.

The present computation procedure results in discrimination against approximately 3.4 million senior and disabled citizens, according to HEW estimates. By fiscal year 1976, HEW estimates that 71 percent of the aged SSI recipients, and 29 percent of the blind and disabled recipients will also receive social security. A cost-of-living increase in SSI benefits as provided for elsewhere in this legislation does not substitute for unrealized social security increases, since SSI payments only represent a portion of the individual's income.

Fourth, this legislation would provide emergency replacement of lost, stolen, or undelivered checks. SSI recipients who are listed on the active payment rolls who do not receive a check, although the Social Security Administration records show that their check had been issued, receive no emergency financial assistance. By what means are these people expected to pay their monthly bills, including rent and utilities, during the minimum 7- to 10-day interim—which in practice usually extends to 2 weeks—while their claim for a check replacement is investigated? They are not likely to have other resources or they would not be on the SSI rolls. An emergency check replacement procedure similar to that which was in effect in New York during the first month of the SSI program must be reinstituted by the Department of the Treasury and the Social Security Administration. According to the officials at Treasury, the replacement procedure that was used at that time was exceedingly effective.

Fifth, the bill would repeal the requirement in present law that SSI checks for alcoholics and drug addicts be sent to a third party when the chief medical officer of the institution where such an individual is undergoing treatment certifies that the payment of benefits directly to such individual or spouse would be of significant therapeutic value, and there is substantial reason to believe that he would not misuse the funds.

Sixth, the bill would require that ap-

plications for SSI benefits be acted upon within 30 days in the case of aged and blind individuals, and within 60 days in the case of disabled individuals.

Seventh, the bill would authorize the Federal Government to repay States which administer benefits to those SSI applicants for disability benefits who are awaiting a decision on their eligibility. Current law prohibits the payment of any benefits to an SSI disability applicant who is not presumptively disabled before his disability is officially determined. If he is found to be disabled, he is paid retroactively to the date of his initial application. The process of determination could take months, during which time the applicant has little or no income. If a State, through its State welfare organization or through some home relief program, provides a basic monetary supplement to that individual and if that individual is later declared to be eligible for SSI, the amount that that person receives from the Social Security Administration would reflect a reduction equal to the amount that was paid to him by the State agency by the Federal Government. Thus, the Federal Government would lose no money, and States would be encouraged to provide such interim service.

Eighth, the bill would provide that a married person separated from his or her spouse would be considered an eligible individual—rather than an eligible spouse—for purposes of SSI benefits immediately upon separation. Presently, a married couple which separates must wait 6 months after the date of separation in order to apply for individual SSI benefits. Until that time, they have to split the benefit that they were receiving at the time of their separation.

Finally, the bill would provide that factual determinations on SSI benefits and eligibility made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be subject to judicial review.

With the above amendments to the SSI law, we will be much closer to providing an equitable guaranteed income floor for our senior, aged, and blind citizens.

NORWOOD IMPEACHMENT PETITION

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently a number of my constituents in the town of Norwood, presented a petition urging Congress to impeach the President.

While I was unfortunately not able to attend the meeting at which the petition was offered, I was represented by my aide, Paul Trayers, who promptly turned the petition over to me.

The petition is signed by 342 persons, mostly residents of Norwood. It represents a spontaneous and wholesome effort by people who take their citizenship seriously and I am, therefore, pleased to take this opportunity to place their petition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PETITION FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF RICHARD M. NIXON

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, believe that Richard M. Nixon's conduct as President has been such as to warrant a full and immediate public inquiry by the Congress to determine if he should remain in office as President. We are therefore exercising our constitutional right to petition the government, and request the House of Representatives to begin the impeachment of President Nixon.

We support resolution H. Res. 513 which has been introduced in the House reading: "Resolved, That Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, be impeached of high crimes and misdemeanors."

At this point, I wish to thank my constituents for taking the tremendous time and energy this petition represents to take an active role in trying to cleanse the American political system. I would like to pay my particular respect to Mr. Jay Dixon, of Norwood, who organized the drive and presented the petitions to my staff.

Mr. Speaker, I lay my constituents' petition before Congress along with my own heartfelt commendation. When this matter reaches the floor of Congress, I will join my neighbors in Massachusetts and vote to impeach the President.

Sufficient evidence is now before the public and the President is already on trial in the newspapers and on the streets of Norwood and a thousand towns just like it. Now the trial must move to the Senate and the terrible drama can come to an honorable close.

LITHUANIAN CATHOLICS SUPPRESSED

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the Soviet Union continues to want trade concessions from the United States and continues to pursue "détente" on an external basis, the severe repression of the various nationalities that go to make up the Soviet Union continues as severe as ever. A recent article in the Christian Science Monitor of April 2, 1974, pointed out that even the Vatican is carrying on its own version of détente during an especially severe period of Soviet activities against the Lithuanian Catholics and other Catholics within her boundaries.

The article follows:

LITHUANIANS SUPPRESSED AS VATICAN,
SOVIETS TALK
(By Paul Wohl)

At a time when Vatican diplomacy continues to push for détente with the Soviet Union, additional arrests and house searches for religious literature are being reported in Lithuania.

The account comes in the latest issue (No. 8) of the underground periodical "Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church." Now that the Russian and Ukrainian underground chronicles have been successfully terminated, the KGB or Soviet secret police seems to be zeroing in on the religious Lithuanian underground periodical.

"Ten bags of religious literature, three typewriters and several issues of the chron-

icle were seized at the home of the pastor of the town of Smilgial. The search was conducted by 15 KGB officials. The altar where the Holy Sacrament is kept was combed; everything down to the toilet paper was checked."

SEVERAL PRIESTS ARRESTED

Several priests were arrested and nearly 30 civilians "crudely" interrogated. Students who stood up for their beliefs were dismissed from school.

This new wave of religious repression is not limited to Lithuania. "Members of the Byelorussian Catholic hierarchy also were reprimanded." Byelorussia with a population of about 10 million has many Roman Catholics.

Lutherans in the Western republics of Estonia and Latvia were molested, the report continued, and underground presses which turned out prayer books were confiscated.

In addition, party spokesmen once again are attacking "malicious anti-Soviet clerical elements," a phrase which has not been used for some time.

But while all this goes on, the Vatican continues to work for detente. In February, Pope Paul VI received for the fourth time Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko in a private audience.

WIDE-RANGE DISCUSSION

The Italian Communist daily L'Unita said the talks dealt with "normalization in the Middle East," including a plan for the internationalization of Jerusalem, with the security conference in Geneva at which the Vatican is represented, and with "the situation of the Roman Catholic Church on the territory of the U.S.S.R."

The Vatican hoped that its condoning of the progress of East-West detente, the improvement of the Vatican's relations with Poland, and the shelving of the Hungarian Primate Cardinal Mindszenty would please Moscow.

Earlier Vatican concessions in the Ukraine hint that it will follow a similar course of noninterference in Latvia. Rome temporarily deprived the Ukrainian Uniate Cardinal Slipph of a Vatican passport after he served for years in a Soviet concentration camp.

The Vatican needs Soviet aid to bring about a definite agreement between church and state in Poland, possibly even a concordant, and secure conditions for the Roman clergy in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany.

A body which calls itself "Representatives of Lithuanian Catholics" has begun to accuse the Presidium of the Lithuanian Soviet Republic of "terrorization" and "harassment" of people who collect signatures for protests against attempts "to impose by force an alien ideology."

Signature themselves are no longer published, but according to the Lithuanian Chronicle one statement requesting the cessation of discrimination against religious students had the backing of 14,604 signatures; another statement decrying the shortage of religious publications was signed by 16,800 Lithuanians.

The previous issue of the Chronicle (No. 7) conveys a surprising spirit of defiance on the part of students, parents and priests.

REFUGEE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE REVIEWED

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in the supplemental appropriation we are con-

sidering today is \$49 million to support refugee programs in South Vietnam. Certainly, no one is opposed to the objective of refugee relief programs; the people we are trying to help have become the human debris of over 20 years of unfettered bloodletting on the Indochinese peninsula. We do, however, have a responsibility to see that the programs using our money to assist these unfortunate victims of war do in fact render assistance. Recent accounts in the press raise the possibility that this is not what is happening.

I hope that my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee will examine these allegations closely before committing themselves to a large budget for refugee relief in fiscal year 1975. I would like to insert at this point in the Record an article from the Boston Globe of May 8, 1973, and a letter to the editor of the Washington Post of February 11, 1974, which address the problems of refugee programs in South Vietnam.

[From the Boston Globe, May 8, 1973]

HOW IT IS THESE DAYS WITH THE PEOPLE OF MY LAI

(By Frances Fitzgerald)

Not far from Quang Ngai City, the Muc Tien refugee camp lies on a sandspit on a river. Some 20,000 people live in the congeries of tents and tin-roofed shacks, each tent sheltering 10 or more families, and each family with only the space for a bed and a bundle of belongings.

In April, the heat is intense and the breezes that bring some relief sweep up sand and lodge it in cooking pots, clothing and children's runny noses. Still, even the heat of the dry season is preferable to the floods of the monsoon. Since last November the Americans at regional headquarters have been planning to improve camp conditions, but owing to the usual bureaucratic delays and the usual corruption, the camp has remained much as it was a year ago.

The tents are crowded all day long. Bands of children run and shriek in the alleyways while the women and old people simply sit and stare out through the barbed wire. For there is nothing to do. Jobs are scarce, and there is no land to cultivate. People simply sit and wait for the occasional hand-out of rice, salt, and cooking oil.

Left to themselves, they would leave the camp and walk the 10 or 15 kilometers to the site of their old villages. But the Saigon authorities will not let them since they come from an area not fully controlled by the Thieu government. The police and village officials regard the people with some suspicion, believing them to be "dangerous elements" or "VC sympathizers." They may be right, for the camp, as it happens, contains the people of Son My village and the survivors of the My Lai massacre.

A month of so ago a team from Senator Kennedy's Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees visited the Muc Tien camp on its mission to study the possibilities for American postwar relief and rehabilitation aid to Indochina. But, as the team members soon discovered, their mission was premature. For the war continues in Vietnam, just as it does in Cambodia and Laos, and there is still no question of "purely humanitarian" aid.

As always, American aid to refugees in South Vietnam resides within the larger framework of American aid to the Thieu government and aid to a counter-insurgency program in which military considerations take precedence over the needs of the civilians. Still, the Paris accords have brought about a new situation, and one that demands a reconsideration of American relief projects. In the context of a cease fire that works to

some degree the question is whether American refugee aid does not actually work against the interests of the people of Muc Tien and of the hundreds of other camps like it in South Vietnam.

According to official figures, there are currently some 650,000 people in the South Vietnamese refugee camps. The professed aim of the Nixon Administration—in line with its work ethic—is to rid itself of these welfare cases and resettle all the refugees before the end of the year. But American officials say that the task cannot be completed since the Thieu regime (supported by the United States) will not, if it can help it, permit those refugees who come from P.R.G. (Provisional Revolutionary Government) or contested areas to return to their home villages.

The U.S. and the Saigon regime have other plans for these people who make up a significant proportion of the camp population, but none of them seems likely to succeed. For those people who come from areas conceded to the P.R.G. (such as the northern third of Quang Tri Province), Saigon proposes to create new villages on undeveloped land that it can militarily control.

In the past, however, the government has proved incapable of planning or implementing such projects to the satisfaction of even those few thousand people willing to abandon all hope of returning home. The resettlement of hundreds of thousands of probably reluctant people would offer problems of a new order or magnitude. As for those refugees who, like the people of My Lai, come from contested areas, the Saigon government plan is to assert military control over their villages, building new outposts or reinforcing old ones and obliging the people to build concentrated settlements—much like the old strategic hamlets—under the guns of the outposts. This second plan is just as dangerous as the first since "to increase security" usually means to violate the cease-fire-in-place and to invite retaliation by the P.R.G. And if history is any judge, any attack on a government outpost would be repulsed by an air and artillery bombardment and result in new civilian casualties and new refugees.

The U.S. and the Thieu government's plans are not very attractive to those people who come from P.R.G. or contested zones. The majority of refugees—and the category includes not only the hundreds of thousands in the camps, but the millions who have moved to the cities and the roadsides during the war—simply want to go home as soon as the fighting stops. The Thieu government is doing all it can to prevent them. In many provinces officials have taken away these people's identity cards—forcing them to check in at the police station every few days—and threatened arrest of violence against those who move from their war-time settlements.

Where refugees have disobeyed orders, the government has carried out those threats. In many provinces it has made it a practice to bomb or shell all the newly-built houses in the P.R.G. areas. In areas undefended by the P.R.G. main forces, it has sent in ground troops to burn the new houses, strip the new fields and, perhaps incidentally to loot the farmers' belongings. The police and the territorial forces that patrol the borders of the government zones have arrested farmers going to market and charged them with "supplying the VC." As was always the case during the war, these arrests are often followed by the confiscation of the farmer's belongings and sessions of interrogation and torture. These measures are not wholly effective—the P.R.G. zones do seem to have gained some population since the cease-fire—but they act as powerful deterrents to the majority, including many of those on the refugee rolls.

Thus, until the Saigon government changes, or is forced to change, its policies, American aid to refugees in South Vietnam will only

contribute to keeping the farmers estranged from their land, economically dependent on the United States and incapable of beginning the long task of reconstruction. Not only do these policies violate the whole intent of the Paris accords (specifically Article 11 on freedom of movement and freedom of work) and make a mockery of stated U.S. war aims, but they threaten, even in the absence of a major renewal of the fighting, to create a permanent refugee population, similar to that of Palestine.

The mockery seems particularly cruel in the case of the Mue Tien camp. The people of My Lai and the surrounding villages have been uprooted five, six and seven times in the course of the past decade—and largely as a result of U.S. air and artillery fire. Now, after the peace agreement has been signed, they are being held virtually as political prisoners in a sandspit camp.

"Look," one of the old men said to me, "we don't want any more American aid. We have enough rice to survive. We just want them to let us go back to our village." The Thieu government would like the American people to think otherwise. In an inept and revealing bit of public relations work the Thieu officials greeted the Kennedy delegation to the camp by putting up a sign in English that read, "The people of My Lai thank the Americans for all their help."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1974]

VIETNAM: WHAT REMAINS IS THE BASIC STRUCTURE OF A FEUDAL SOCIETY

Two incidents which were reported recently and which seem to have escaped editorial comment illustrate graphically the total failure of U.S. policy toward Vietnam. In the first instance, the South Vietnamese National Assembly voted overwhelmingly to amend the Constitution in order to allow President Thieu to run for a heretofore forbidden third term. Secondly, and at the same time, it was reported that in the rural areas of South Vietnam, villages were being called in by government authorities and made to surrender the titles to their land, given to them under the widely publicized government land reform program in the early 1970s. The land was now being returned to the original landowners and the land reform program was, in some areas, largely revoked.

When the U.S. first deployed troops to South Vietnam in 1965, the mission assigned was a limited one, that of preventing defeat of the South Vietnamese Army and government by the Communist insurgency which was being abetted by the power of North Vietnam. The arrival of significant numbers of American troops and aircraft soon turned the tide of battle. Defeat was prevented. The American objective was then expanded to a more positive one, that of "allowing the South Vietnamese to choose their own government without outside interference." Lipservice was given to a "Revolutionary Development" program which was to bring a social revolution to the countryside, "win the hearts and minds of the people," and gain their active support for a government interested in their welfare and responsive to their needs.

A Constitution was written for South Vietnam and democratic elections were held. Civic action projects, largely planned, financed, and constructed by Americans, sprang up all over the countryside of South Vietnam. Although the resources devoted to civic action and Revolutionary Development were meager in comparison to those devoted to the military effort, they were not small and these programs had significant results in localities where a dedicated Vietnamese district chief or province chief implemented and administered them with initiative, vigor, and honesty.

As the culmination of these otherwise generally shallow efforts at social reform, the United States, after much pressure, finally in 1970 cajoled the South Vietnamese Government into implementing an extensive land reform program which provided title to the land to those who actually occupied and worked it.

Here finally was one program which seemed capable of altering the traditional social structure in the rural areas by establishing a new class of independent land-owning peasantry.

But apart from land reform, most of these projects in the end were superficial. The basic structure of South Vietnamese society and government was not disturbed. Indeed, corruption and graft increased and became more open and flagrant as the rewards for such actions grew with the tremendous influx of American money and materiel. The privileged continue to prosper, to buy their way out of the Army or to buy safe assignments and rapid promotion. The posts of province chief and district chief, vital links in the effort to tie the government to the people, were the most lucrative and sought-after posts for venal officials and assignment to those posts was purchased at high cost. In a few rare cases, where the corruption became too flagrant for the Americans to tolerate, the offending Vietnamese official was transferred and replaced by one more subtle or less greedy. The government continued to appear to the rural population of South Vietnam as remote, corrupt, and feudal.

So the endless and spectacular American military victories over the North Vietnamese and Vietcong could never be translated into political gains for the South Vietnamese Government. When American forces withdrew from an area, the enemy again found shelter, or at least passive acquiescence at their presence, from the rural population of South Vietnam. The people remained alienated from a remote and corrupt government which offered them nothing.

As the American effort in South Vietnam began to be reduced subsequent to the initiation of the Vietnamization program, the South Vietnamese Government of President Thieu found it increasingly less necessary to prolong the facade of government reform and democratic process which the Americans had felt to be so important. American leverage which had never been widely used in any case, was vastly diminished. Thus, in the last presidential election Thieu was able to coerce all opposition out of the race and, despite protests by his American mentors, run and be elected as the sole candidate. The American-nurtured and -sponsored democratic process, so alien to the feudal Vietnamese society, was short-lived indeed.

The social reforms imposed upon this society also lasted only so long as American money and influence. With the apparent repudiation of land reform as reported last week, the facade of social reform and of a government devoted to the welfare of the mass of its rural population, also crumbled.

As the jungle reclaims American firebases and support installation and as the visible evidence of the American intervention in Vietnam is dismantled and fades away, what remains is the basic structure of a feudal Vietnamese society much as it has existed for centuries. The privileged urban and land-owning class, claiming their Mandarin heritage, rule for their own benefit with little regard for the plight, condition, or welfare of the peasant masses. The government remains remote, inefficient, unrepresentative and corrupt. The vast American expenditure of treasure and of lives has, finally, left nothing of permanence of South Vietnam.

H. Y. SCHANDLER,
Colonel, U.S. Army.

Arlington.

PARAMOUNT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CELEBRATES ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the week of April 23-28, the citizens of Paramount, Calif., will be commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Paramount Chamber of Commerce.

Naturally, this will be a joyous occasion of community-wide involvement in a time of fiestas parades, displays, golf tournaments, luncheons, speeches, and so forth; but it will also be a time of appreciation for the achievements of this outstanding organization.

For much has been accomplished for the citizens of this unique community by the Paramount Chamber of Commerce since its beginning 50 years ago.

Originally called the Hynes-Clearwater Chamber, this fine organization has been willing throughout its existence to provide the nucleus for community improvement.

In fact, the chamber was primarily responsible for obtaining for the city a fire department, a sewer system, a water department, a street lighting system, and a flood control system all before Paramount incorporated and became a city in 1957.

Throughout their existence the Paramount Chamber of Commerce has organized "clean-up, paint-up, fix-up campaigns," sponsored hay and dairy festivals, arranged for free movies, and numerous other activities for the citizens, in addition to its concern to promote the growth of the city.

During these 50 years the Paramount Chamber of Commerce has been served by many distinguished past presidents. These dedicated men were: H. W. McKelvey, Richmond Logan, J. J. Chamberlain, W. R. Lindsay, N. B. Haydon, Harry Wirtz, C. A. Wright, M. J. Myers, I. F. Petterson, George Rochester, W. R. Smith, Louie Spang, Lawrence Zamboni, Henry Sheller, Bob McCune, J. W. Hunter, Ed Henderson, E. S. Haymond, Glenn Jones, Myron Szabat, Bob Krabill, John A. Mies, Gerald Barber, Lloyd Mokler, Glade Mastain, C. D. Mosier, John Barr, Charles Stone, Edwin G. Brockman, John F. Lynch, Jack Thompson, Richard Zamboni, Roy Sager, Oscar Gregory, Ralph Grove, John Bozoff, George Ryan, Daniel J. Chumbley, Richard M. Wilson, Wilbur T. Laws, George E. Tanner, and James R. Carnes.

Presently, the chamber holds quarterly mixers and monthly breakfasts featuring guests and speakers of community interest. They also sponsor industrial fairs which have been very important in bringing a diversified industrial growth to the city. The officers of the chamber should be proud that the chamber has worked so well with the school district and city officials on projects benefiting the community.

April 11, 1974

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that under the careful leadership of its present officers: President Leonard Price, Vice President Jack Hall, Second Vice President Norman Whitfield, and Treasurer Jerry Cunningham, supported by their able staff, Rita Benson, manager, and her assistant, Ramona Canas; that the Paramount Chamber of Commerce will continue to serve with the same spirit which has made them such as asset to this vital community in southern California.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XLII

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago an 11-year-old boy sitting astride a fence by his home suffered a gunshot wound that ripped his right thigh apart, severing an artery and chipping the bone. Tommy Carter was senselessly victimized because a handgun was drawn when an argument ensued between the drivers of two cars which had collided. This is just one of many examples that justify removing handguns from private ownership. Reprinted herewith is the article from the March 31 edition of the Washington Post:

BOY ACCIDENTALLY SHOT IN LEG IS RECOVERING
(By John Saar)

Eleven-year-old Tommy Carter rolled his wheelchair into the physiotherapy gym at D.C. General Hospital one day this week and climbed painfully onto a treatment bed. "What's his problem?" the woman therapist asked an aide.

"Gunshot wounds."

Two weeks ago, Tommy Carter was astride a fence beside his home at 692 5th Pl. SE, when a handgun bullet ripped into his right thigh severing an artery and chipping the bone. There were more shots and more casualties that night. While Tommy was crawling toward home—eventually to faint from shock and loss of blood—two men lay wounded nearby with bullets in the shoulder and side.

While the two men and the sixth grade schoolboy were being rushed to the emergency room at D.C. General Hospital, sixth district detectives began investigating the cause of the shooting.

Police say that after two cars bumped together in a minor collision, a man pulled a gun and the child was in the line of fire of the ensuing shooting.

Tommy Carter went home this week, the last of the three to be released from the hospital. Doctors think he will be able to go back to the Harris Elementary School on crutches soon, and should be fit enough to play basketball in about six weeks.

Terming the shooting "ridiculous," Det. Sgt. Nelson Bell said police are looking for a suspect who is known to them who left the scene and are seeking an indictment of assault with a deadly weapon against him in current grand jury proceedings.

"There was a traffic accident," said Bell, "and a passenger got out of one car and fired at the other driver. He hit him and accidentally shot the man driving his car also."

"The boy was an innocent bystander and he was hit by a stray bullet."

The collision that sparked the shooting was so slight, according to Bell, "that you could hardly see a dent in the side of the car." He identified the two drivers as William Smith, 24, of 4827 G St. SE, and Henry B. Corkey of 4824 G St. SE.

It was about 9:30 p.m. on March 14 and Geneva Carter had just called Tommy, the youngest of her five children, in from play when she heard shots. "I thought it was fire crackers," Mrs. Carter recalled, "then the little girl next door came in and said 'Tommy's been shot.'"

The mother ran out, found her son calm and bleeding on a neighbor's doorstep. He remembers her crying. She says she almost fainted and needed a policeman's smelling salts to bring her round: "He was bleeding real bad. I didn't know how bad he was hurt. I didn't know if he was going to live or die."

Tommy lost three pints of blood—about all an 11-year-old 85-pound child can spare—and it might have been fatal without the presence of his sister's boyfriend, Kevin Jones, 19 who has a knowledge of first aid, Jones and Antoinette Carter slit open Tommy's pants leg and stanch the flow of blood pumping from the severed artery.

Doctors on emergency duty at D.C. General that night spent 3½ hours cleaning the wound and repairing the artery. They decided not to go after the lead slug for fear of doing more damage.

The next day, Dessiaren Jones, arriving to take her sixth grade class at Harris, was told "I think a boy in your room's been shot."

Minutes later, a boy stood before her with tears in his eyes to explain why Tommy Carter's chair was empty.

"Everybody was shocked and disgusted," recalled Mrs. Jones yesterday, "because it was so senseless."

Tommy's mother says she has long wanted to leave the cinder block row house whose trim interior is in great contrast to the unsightly rubbish-strewn surroundings. "Some of the people are nice and I like this house, but the environment is something else," she said.

She said her son's shooting was nevertheless unusual, "There's a lot of fights, but not much shooting round here."

Residents watch each others' children carefully and live in constant fear of break-ins in the far Southeast housing project, Mrs. Carter said.

Before leaving her house, to retrieve Tommy from the hospital, she peered suspiciously at three men slowly rolling past in a car. "It happens all the time, you live in danger."

She left the radio playing as a possible deterrent to burglars and double-checked the automatic lock on the front door.

The precautions are well-advised according to Sgt. Bell: "We do have our problems up here. Housebreakings, robberies—everything from soup to nuts. It's one of our crime areas."

Sgt. Bell and Tommy's doctor, Ronald Kurstin, agree he was lucky. He might have bled to death as it was and if the bullet had struck him a foot higher it would almost certainly have been fatal. "Anyone who is shot and doesn't have a massive injury is lucky," Kurstin said. "There's no good place to be shot."

It took Mrs. Carter several minutes to remove get-well notes from Tommy's classmates from the wall beside his hospital bed the other day. One signed "blood brother Chico," read: "I gave Mrs. Jones your letter and she was in tears. I told Mrs. Price and Mr. Barber and Mr. Blocker that you've been shot and they were all sorry it happened . . ."

UNITED STATES AID TO THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have risen numerous times on the floor of this House to question the wisdom of the U.S. Export-Import Bank financing trade with the Soviet Union. More and more Americans are questioning the sanity of providing such taxpayer subsidized credits to the Soviets.

A recent editorial in the Mount Vernon, Ohio, News states:

The United States has been waiting patiently for the benefits of détente to begin flowing back from Moscow in terms of tangible progress toward an arms limitation, troop reductions in Europe and other agreements that would relax international tension. So far all we have seen is a long line of Russians at the loan window.

Unfortunately, this editorial is only too correct but what else can be expected when the Soviets can get loans as low as 6 percent from the U.S. Export-Import Bank while the prime lending rate for the best borrowers in the United States is between 9½ and 10 percent.

Who is paying the bill for Soviet credits? The answer is everyone of us who are paying taxes. It is the height of folly to be giving subsidized loans to the Soviet Union to develop that country's energy resources when our own Nation is having serious energy shortages.

At this point I include in the RECORD the editorial, "Bank Moves Too Quickly To Help Russia," from the Mount Vernon, Ohio, News of April 3, 1974. I commend the attention of my colleagues to it. The text follows:

BANK MOVES TOO QUICKLY TO HELP RUSSIA

The suspension of action by the Export-Import Bank on loans to the Soviet Union and three other Communist countries gives the Administration and Congress an opportunity to take a hard look at the bank's policies. It is clearly going overboard as an instrument of "détente."

Most Americans probably would agree with the basic approach President Nixon has been taking toward the Communist world. Trying to get along with the Russians—even trading with them—is worth the effort and the risk so long as we do not jeopardize the strategic balance which prevents war. However, we think most Americans also would draw a line in how far the U.S. government should go in providing loans and credits through the Export-Import Bank, subsidized by our tax dollars, to finance Communist shopping trips for U.S. technology.

Since the beginning of 1973 the bank has loaned the Soviet Union \$160 million at 6 per cent interest to buy American goods and know-how for industrial development. Americans would jump at the chance to borrow money at that rate to buy a house or a car or start a business. The bank's low interest loans make sense when the money goes to an undeveloped country trying to become self-supporting, especially since the funds must be used to purchase goods and services from the United States.

That rationale simply does not apply to the Soviet Union, which is rich enough to be investing nearly half its gross national product in weapons—most of them aimed at the United States.

The projects now frozen by the bank include a \$49.5 million loan for developing natural gas resources in eastern Siberia and a much bigger \$6.1 billion deal for gas in western Siberia, including pipelines to make part of the fuel available for shipment to the United States in liquefied form. We need natural gas, to be sure, but how badly do we need it from a foreign source under Communist control when it is our national objective to become self-sufficient in energy production? Congress needs to square our government's support of this kind of overseas development with its own reluctance to grant price and tax concessions that would spur exploration for new natural gas deposits in our own country.

The Export-Import Bank is an agency of the U.S. government. The law creating it provides that it can make loans to Communist countries only when the President has determined that such action is in the national interest. Trade with countries behind the Iron Curtain may well fall within the definition during this period when we are exploring the opportunities of détente, but the bank has been moving too fast, too soon. The United States has been waiting patiently for the benefits of détente to begin flowing back from Moscow in terms of tangible progress toward an arms limitation, troop reductions in Europe and other agreements that would relax international tension. So far all we have seen is a long line of Russians at the loan window.

IN TRIBUTE TO SIMEON BOOKER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago American society represented an ominous frontier to black people. Segregation was intrinsically woven into the soil of the land. Its pervasive influence found willing accommodation and sustenance in the minds and occupations of white Americans. Few black Americans could succeed, let alone survive, in such a hostile, stratified environment. Those who did succeed were rightfully called pioneers. Their footsteps marked the first trails for future black Americans to follow. The professional fields were among those areas domesticated by black Americans during the fifties.

One such black pioneer, is the distinguished journalist, Simeon Booker. Mr. Booker was the first black reporter employed by the Washington Post. He won the Wilkie Award for a series on education and later received the Nieman fellowship in 1950. He is now the Washington bureau chief of the Johnson Publications Co.—their publications include *Ebony* and *Jet*. Mr. Booker was recently honored by some 350 colleagues and friends at a National Press Club luncheon. It is with great pleasure that I enter two articles on an outstanding journalist, Mr. Simeon Booker:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 28, 1974]

SIMEON BOOKER: FACTS OF LIFE

(By Angela Terrell)

"You could never be obvious, I wore old clothes and traveled at night. We used to sneak into undertakers' parlors late at night to photograph bodies of victims."

To hear Simeon Booker tell it, being a black reporter for a white-owned newspaper in the segregated Washington of the '50s was not without its moments of humor.

"Like the time I was taking an obit about a woman who had died in Freedmen's Hospital, whom I naively assumed was black. That is, until the person calling in said bluntly, 'Don't make a mistake now, she's no nigger!'" Booker laughed.

It's to his credit—and probably survival—that this 25-year journalism veteran, who is bureau chief of the Johnson Publishing Co. (their publications include *Ebony* and *Jet* magazines) can laugh about incidents with serious undertones. For this and his pioneering work—he was one of the first black reporters for *The Washington Post* and the second black Nieman fellow—Booker was honored at yesterday by some 350 colleagues and friends at a National Press Club luncheon and a later reception at the Liberian Embassy.

A few days before, from his high-rise modern office at 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Booker told some of the ironies of working for the white media in 1952.

"It was the damndest experience because it was a difficult period to work in, so many restrictions. I had a hard time covering fires because the police wouldn't let me near the place if it was in a white neighborhood. And I could only use one washroom on the editorial floor of the Post.

"I couldn't eat downtown. Like the time I was covering a case at the Federal Trade Commission. All of the other reporters could go to lunch with the lawyers and get inside information, I was left out.

"I used to eat at my aunt's house at 17th and U Streets (NW) to get a breather," he said, no longer laughing. He credits *The Post's* management with taking a special interest in him and encouraging him, but he left in 1954 to re-enter the black press because "it was a real tense situation and had me neurotic."

Booker, 55, is tall, with mixed grey hair. Usually softspoken, he works behind a paper cluttered desk and chain-smokes Vantage cigarettes. ("I don't inhale.") With his brown-framed glasses, he reminds one of a college professor.

He greets friends with a warm, "Hey Baby," and is well known around this city by politicians, businessmen and other journalists. And he loves to talk about his journalistic adventures, especially some harrowing ones covering the South for the Johnson Publications in the 50s.

"I've been caught on a Mississippi road by guys with shotguns, hit in my ribs by sheriffs and run out of more southern towns.

"You could never be obvious. I wore old clothes and traveled at night. We used to sneak into undertakers' parlors late at night to photograph bodies of victims. Undertakers would show us around then warn us 'you better be in Chicago tomorrow.'"

And covering Washington for the black press 20 years ago wasn't much better, he said. "We couldn't go to the front door to get information many times. So our story sources were maids, chauffeurs and government building elevator operators," he said.

Against this backdrop, and without bitterness, Booker will say that blacks in America "have gained a lot," adding quickly, "there's a lot to be done."

Booker, born in Baltimore, grew up in Youngstown, Ohio. After attending Virginia Union College, he went to work for the

Baltimore Afro-American, and later the Cleveland Call-Post, where he won a Wilkie Award for a series on education. He received the Nieman Fellowship in 1950.

He's written two books, one for children and a second entitled, "Black Man's America." Three times weekly he presents a one-minute commentary on Group W radio.

Booker's one word of advice to young journalists who want to last "at least" 25 years in the business is, "Never worry about criticism. Just do the story."

[From the Washington Star-News, Mar. 28, 1974]

JET'S SIMEON BOOKER: HONORING A PIONEER BLACK NEWSMAN

(By Jacqueline Trescott)

For years, when a black would come into the National Press Club dining room, the waiter would automatically escort him to Simeon Booker's table. That's just the way it was.

The salty and concise bureau chief of *Jet* Magazine, Booker is a Washington journalism institution and the second black admitted to the Press Club ("and really the first to hang out here, sit at the bar and make them nervous," says Booker.)

Yesterday, 600 friends of Booker's sat down at lunch on the 13th floor of the Press building to honor the veteran journalist on his 25th year in communications.

Actually, the entire day became "Simeon Booker Day," as he was honored by the D.C. City Council in the morning and then by his friends, including Mayor Walter Washington, at the luncheon. Next was an afternoon open house at the Pennsylvania Avenue offices of Johnson Publishing Company which produces, besides the weekly, pocket-size *Jet*, the monthlies, *Ebony*, *Ebony Jr.*, *Black Stars* and *Black World*. The day ended with a crowded reception at the Liberian Embassy and probably a nightcap at Billy Simpson's restaurant, Booker's favorite haunt, where he has squeezed many headline-making stories from sources.

Booker is usually a thundering type, and his traditional advice to beginning reporters is "sit up front, be loud and always ask about discrimination, that puts them on their guard." But yesterday he was very quiet. He whispered to NAACP lawyer Clarence Mitchell at a pre-luncheon reception, "I can't get used to all this. I think it's going to be a roasting."

He was right. The podium guests each took a potshot at either "his mushmouth voice," his "poor poker playing," or his notorious inability to catch fish. Five years ago, when Booker was asked to commentate on urban affairs three times a week for Westinghouse Broadcasting, he was also asked to take voice lessons. Reported Westinghouse's Sid Davis, "We asked your voice coach to come today, Simeon, but she hasn't recovered yet."

In between the pungent comments, Booker was praised as a "serious journalist . . . a man who never let black people down," and, as White House aide and former newsman, Stanley Scott, said, "a friend of mankind . . . a man who stands for something."

Presenting Booker the city's Meritorious Public Service Award, Mayor Washington said, "He's a man who realizes that the single most important element in the world is people." Added Rep. Charles Rangel, D-N.Y., "regardless of the indifference of politicians, they can't rest peacefully at night because Simeon Booker's out there working."

He started his career with the Afro-American newspapers, later worked for the Cleveland Call and Post and was the first black to win a Nieman Fellowship. His Washington career began in the early 1950s, when he was the first black hired by the Washing-

ton Post, and in 1954 he joined the Johnson staff.

In his own remarks, Booker defined a newsmen as a "mean man, a man who pokes around and scrutinizes," and then reviewed outstanding personalities and news events of his 25 years in the business.

In Vietnam, he listened to the soldiers' experiences and now maintains a vigilance over the Pentagon employment and promotion policies. His coverage of the '60s civil rights demonstrations didn't stop with the marches and passages of the civil rights bills; now he's a watchdog for the laws' enforcement.

"I don't get discouraged," he said yesterday, "because I have seen things, like blacks sitting on cotton bales in the Atlanta airport. We weren't served in the restaurants there. And now things have changed and we have a black mayor of Atlanta."

Many of the officials Booker has watched move through the government or political ranks to policymaking positions and then praised or berated in his "Ticker-Tape USA" column last night praised Booker at the Librarian Embassy Reception.

By a fireplace, Rep. Charles Diggs, D-Mich. was buttonholing Stan Scott, and crushed among the other 500 guests were Lt. Gen. Daniel James, James Pope of the State Department, Rep. William Clay, D-Mo., public relations man Ofield Dukes, former White House aide Robert J. Brown, M. Carl Holman of the Urban Coalition, attorney Samuel Jackson, and many media people.

Librarian ambassador Edward Peal led Booker and his wife, Carol, to the cool balcony where Booker cut his birthday cake and joked, "Well it hasn't been as bad as I thought." He was referring to the day, not the 25 years in communications.

CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's foremost consumer advocates, Mr. Ralph Nader, has called for the creation of a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. In an editorial which appeared in the Washington Star News on February 3, Mr. Nader stated that the corporation would help to restore genuine competition to the petroleum industry and would prevent the major oil companies from driving up prices, driving small, independent competitors out of business, and weakening antipollution and health standards. Mr. Nader's article clearly shows the advantages to be gained by consumers through establishment of a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, and I would like to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues at this time.

The text follows:

THE ENERGY MONOPOLIES

(By Ralph Nader)

Among the flurry of legislative proposals in Congress on the energy problem, one stands out as a constructive and lasting solution to the monopolistic grip that the giant oil companies have on the nation, small businesses and consumers.

The proposals are contained in S. 2506 and H.R. 11648, bills filed by Sen. Adlai Stevenson and Rep. John Moss to establish a federal

oil and gas corporation whose purposes are so sensible and necessary that support in the Congress is building up behind them.

Harking back to the example of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which used public water resources to produce cheap, public power that saved a large region in America from economic disaster, the Stevenson-Moss legislation would operate to save consumers and the economy from a trillion-dollar price gouge over the next generation.

The preamble to the bills makes clear their underlying rationale:

"The people of the United States through the federal government own substantial lands which would be developed for the production of natural gas and oil;

"American consumers would benefit if the forces of competition operated to a greater extent than at present in the world oil and gas market;

"A corporation owned by the federal government, engaged in the development and sale of natural gas and oil (exclusively on federal lands), could provide competition in the energy industry and, through research and development, assure adequate supplies of these fuels without harm to the environment."

The proposed company would have rights of exploration and production to half of the amount of oil and gas offered for lease by federal land authorities.

This limitation in the Stevenson bill is consistent with the purpose of stimulating competition and stopping monopolies on either side.

The added requirement that the company shall give price, supply or delivery preference to states, political subdivisions of states, co-operatives and independent refiners highlights the discrimination directed toward municipal power and transit systems by the oil giants.

Even after this fabricated energy shortage subsidies, there is every prospect of another being created any time the major oil companies want to jolt prices higher, drive small business competitor out of business, weaken antipollution health standards or pursue other irresponsible or criminal behavior. With a federal oil and gas company, such predatory moves would not be possible.

For example, if independent gas stations, fuel distributors or refiners are being squeezed through a cutoff or reduction in supplies by monopolistic tactics of the oil majors, the federal company would assure them a supply. The mere presence of such a possibility would restrain the majors from trying such tactics.

If consumers, who must pay about \$24 billion more for energy this year, are slated to be gouged by another energy scare, the federal company would be there to head it off.

If the national security is imperiled by multinational oil companies which have conflicts of interest overseas, the federal oil and gas company could protect the interests of Americans here at home.

If workers are about to be laid off due to the results of oil majors' manipulations adversely affecting other business or government employers, the federal company would assure that this would not happen.

The Stevenson-Moss bills recognize that producing some of the massive amounts of oil and gas presently on federal lands requires strict environmental safeguards.

Unlike the TVA law, enacted in the Thirties when environment was not considered an issue, these bills repeatedly emphasize the need to develop improved environmental techniques.

They also require that the company collect comprehensive and accurate information about oil and gas so that the federal government not remain at the mercy of the oil industry's assessments, as has been the case. An explicit freedom of information provision is included.

Citizens have an important stake in studying these bills, suggesting improvements and supporting Sen. Stevenson, Rep. Moss and the other co-sponsoring legislators—Senators Kennedy, Hart, McIntyre, Metcalf, McGovern, Mondale, Moss and Abourezk along with Reps. Dingell and Leggett. Write any of them for more details and a copy of S. 2506.

GAO SHOULD HAVE AUDIT AUTHORITY OVER IRS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 10, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I fear that the events of recent months have created a crisis of unprecedented dimensions in our national system of voluntary, self-assessing tax payment. I have been deeply concerned that millions of Americans, believing that taxes are avoided by a few wealthy or powerful individuals, would also begin to take deductions previously overlooked, or stretch their deductions. If large numbers of Americans move into the gray areas of the tax law, the Treasury will lose billions in revenues.

I hope I am wrong. But it is obvious that there is a crying need for a restoration of faith in the fairness and integrity of the Internal Revenue Service.

I believe that one safe yet effective step we could take immediately would be to make the IRS and the Treasury effect of its private and public rulings subject to General Accounting Office audit.

The GAO could serve as a watchdog to insure the impartiality of audits—and prevent the political use of audits.

On August 8, 1973, I asked the GAO what difficulties they presently encountered in overseeing the Service. In response, I have received a legal brief from the GAO stating the Comptroller General's opinion that the GAO already has—and should be allowed to execute—authority to audit the Service. I would like to enter in the RECORD at this time a copy of the Comptroller General's letter relating to IRS audits:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1973.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. VANIK: Your letter to us received on August 8, 1973, refers to the difficulties which the General Accounting Office (GAO) has encountered in seeking to audit and review the activities of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and requests that we provide information concerning the position of IRS in this matter.

Over the years, GAO has encountered consistent refusal on the part of IRS to afford us access to its records in connection with our efforts to review that agency's administration of the Internal Revenue laws. As indicated hereinafter, IRS takes the position that no matter involving its administration of the Internal Revenue laws is directly subject to the audit authority of our Office. Consequently, our involvement in this area has been limited to undertaking reviews at the request of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. For example, on August 9, 1973, we issued a report to the Joint Committee on IRS collection of taxpayers' delinquent accounts, B-137762.

The longstanding refusal by IRS to permit our direct review of administration of the Internal Revenue laws has been the subject of an ongoing dialogue and exchange of correspondence between our Office and IRS. The respective legal positions of IRS and our Office are essentially as follows:

Under the provisions of 26 U.S.C. 6103 tax returns are open to inspection only on order of the President and under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate and approved by the President. Existing regulations applicable to our Office, 26 CFR 301.6103(a)-1(b)(f), provide that the inspection of a return "in connection with some matter officially before" the head of an establishment of the Federal Government may be permitted in the discretion of the Secretary or Commissioner upon written application of the head of the establishment.

It is the position of IRS that no matter involving the administration of the Internal Revenue laws, as distinguished from general housekeeping details and individual tax information related to an audit or investigation of activities of another department, can be "officially before" the General Accounting Office because:

1. The administration and enforcement of tax laws have been placed by law in the IRS and, citing 26 U.S.C. 6406, the findings of fact and the decisions of the Secretary or his delegate on the merits of any claim presented under the Internal Revenue laws or interest on credits or refunds shall not be subject to review by any other administrative or accounting officer, employee or agent of the Government;

2. The Congress, citing 26 U.S.C. 8001 *et seq.*, has given to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation rather than the General Accounting Office the supervisory review of the administration of the revenue laws; and,

3. The General Accounting Office does not have authority to analyze management discretion in the collection of revenue.

With regard to the arguments made by IRS, it is conceded that we have no settlement authority over income tax claims and findings of fact relating to such claims. While section 7 of the act of July 31, 1894, 28 Stat. 206, 31 U.S.C. 71 requires GAO to receive and examine all accounts relating to the internal revenue, this provision does not apply to tax claims because under 26 U.S.C. 6406 the findings of fact and decisions on claims under the Internal Revenue Code are specifically exempted from review by an administrative or accounting officer of the United States.

However, in conducting an audit of IRS we would be concerned with audit not settlement authority. Our authority to audit, as

distinguished from our authority to settle claims and accounts is clearly set forth in the law and it is this audit authority upon which we rely. Section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, 31 U.S.C. 53 provides that the Comptroller General shall investigate all matters relating to the receipt, disbursement, and application of public funds, and section 117a of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, 31 U.S.C. 67 reaffirms this authority to review receipts and expenditures with the added authority for the Comptroller General to determine the principles and procedures to be used in conducting such audits.

In addition section 111(d) of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, 31 U.S.C. 65(d) specifically provides that—

"The auditing for the Government, conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States as an agent of the Congress be directed at determining the extent to which accounting and related financial reporting fulfill the purposes specified, financial transactions have been consummated in accordance with laws, regulations or other legal requirements, and adequate internal financial control over operations is exercised, and afford an effective basis for the settlement of accounts of accountable officers." (Italic supplied.)

It is important to note that the audits under 31 U.S.C. 53 and 67 are for the purpose of reporting to Congress rather than for settlement or disallowance. In this regard, we audit and report to Congress on many Government activities which are financed by appropriated monies notwithstanding the fact that final settlement authority is lodged with the agency audited. Examples include our audit and report on certain activities of the Veterans Administration, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Railroad Retirement Board and the Government corporations.

The purpose of any GAO audit of IRS would be to ascertain and report to the Congress on the use by IRS of appropriated funds in its tax collection efforts. This would in no way involve review of tax claims and decisions with a view to set aside or change decisions which under the law are final when made by IRS. Similarly, such an audit of IRS would not entail any supervision of the procedures followed in making tax determinations. This is not to say that our audit reports would not advise the Congress, if necessary of weaknesses in procedures followed but we would not actually supervise these procedures. Therefore, the 26 U.S.C. 6406 authority of IRS over tax determinations does not in any way preclude audits of IRS under 31 U.S.C. 53, 67.

The argument is made by IRS that the Congress has given the Joint Committee on

Internal Revenue Taxation rather than GAO the supervisory review of the administration of the revenue laws. The Joint Committee was established by the Revenue Act of 1926, 26 U.S.C. 8001-8023, and its statutory functions include the investigation of the administration of taxes by IRS and the investigation of measures and methods looking forward toward simplification of the tax law. We perceive no basis for the argument that the establishment of the Joint Committee preempted the field in the review of IRS. Certainly the law does not specifically indicate such preemption and parenthetically it has never been argued that the legislative oversight of the departments by the standing Committees of the Congress precludes GAO review of the activities of such departments.

Thirdly, it is argued that GAO does not have authority to analyze the exercise of management discretion in the collection of revenue. Much is made over the fact that when enacted section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, 31 U.S.C. 60, provided for a GAO "expenditure analysis" rather than an "administration management analysis" that was provided for in the Senate-passed version of the bill. It is clear that the language enacted is designed to broaden GAO review and it does not in any manner preclude GAO audit of IRS.

The language of 31 U.S.C. 67 provides that "Except as otherwise specifically provided by law" the financial transactions of the agencies shall be audited by GAO in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General. The only specific exception provided by law which applies to IRS is 26 U.S.C. 6406, which makes the findings of fact and decision on claims under revenue laws exempt from GAO review. It is therefore our position that except for the restrictions of 26 U.S.C. 6406, GAO has authority to conduct audits of IRS. As already pointed out a GAO audit would not concern itself with the matters covered by 26 U.S.C. 6406. Accordingly, it is our view that we have authority to do management-type audits of IRS.

In summary, it is our view that 26 U.S.C. 6103 does not require IRS to deny us access to tax returns and that the reasons accepted by IRS for allowing certain agencies access under the regulations found at 26 CFR 301.6103(a)-100-109 have particular validity as a basis for allowing GAO access. In fact, IRS even permits us to have access to the tax returns we need to see in connection with any other audits we perform.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 11, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father Joseph F. Thornington, D.D., Ph. D., honorary professor of sociology, economics, and international relations, Pontifical University of Chile, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Author of light and of love, let the light of Thy countenance shine brightly upon the Speaker of this House and upon all the distinguished members of legislative bodies throughout the Western Hemisphere, including Canada.

Grant a special blessing, we beseech Thee, upon the President of the United States of America and upon the chief executives of the American Republics that

their programs of partnership may be fruitful.

Almighty God, we pray that, as a result of brotherly love and cooperation, this inter-American partnership program may bring better education, improved housing, more robust health, and nutritious food to the peoples of the Western Hemisphere, including the divine blessings of free elections to the noble people of all races and religions in Cuba.

Vouchsafe, moreover, dear Saviour, that a fair distribution of rewards for labor and prayer may be granted, not only to the owners and managers of farms, factories, banks, and merchandising centers, but also to the conscien-

tious, hardworking producers of copper, fruits, grains, sugar, coffee, long and short staple cotton, cattle, poultry, fibers, and other forest products, petroleum in all its myriad forms, hydroelectric energy, thermonuclear force, particularly for peaceable, constructive purposes, and such therapeutic creations that may be helpful to human beings of all ages. And, do not overlook, beloved Christ of the Andes, the fishermen who go down to the sea in ships like Paul and Silas as of old, their wives and their children who want to see them again.

It is with humility and thankfulness and a deep sense of responsibility that we seek these divine graces and favors on the 30th official celebration of Pan